

Trumpet Weekly

MARCH 6, 2015



U.S. President Barack Obama speaks during the White House Summit on Countering Violent Extremism at the U.S. State Department February 19 in Washington, D.C.

Lies About Islam and Destroying America From Within

ON FEBRUARY 18, PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA TOLD AN AUDIENCE at a conference on “Countering Violent Extremism” that “Islam has been woven into the fabric of our country since its founding.”

Really?

The president continued: “Generations of Muslim immigrants came here and went to work as farmers and merchants and factory workers, helped to lay railroads and build up America.”



ROBERT MORLEY

This is a lie. Islam was not woven into the fabric of the United States anywhere near its founding. The first mosque in America wasn't even built until 1915—after the commencement of World War I, about 140 years after the nation was founded, 308 years after the colony at Jamestown was established.

Sure, there may have been some Muslims who traveled to America during those early years, but to suggest they had a major role in shaping America is a lie. Even today, only 0.6 percent of the population is Muslim.

In reality, the major contribution of Muslims to America has been profoundly negative.

Immediately after America gained its independence from Britain, the Barbary States, located in North Africa, attacked American shipping. Hundreds of American sailors were captured and sold into slavery by these Muslim nations beginning in 1784. In 1795, the U.S. government paid \$1 million—one sixth of its entire budget—to ransom captured crews and ships.

That would be about \$630 billion in today's dollars.

When Thomas Jefferson went to negotiate with one of the Barbary States' ambassadors, he asked why the Barbary States made war on nations that had done them no injury. Jefferson recorded the ambassador's response (“Making of America,” *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 30): “It was written in their Koran, that all nations which had not acknowledged the prophet were sinners, whom it was the right and duty of the faithful to plunder and enslave; and that every musulman who was slain in this warfare was sure to go to paradise.

“He said, also, that the man who was the first to board a vessel had one slave over and above his share, and that when they sprang to the deck of an enemy's ship, every sailor held a dagger in each hand and a third in his mouth; which usually struck such

terror into the foe that they cried out for quarter at once.”

To that point in America's history, extortion is the most significant Muslim contribution toward America.

It wasn't until 1801 that America finally stopped paying tribute to Tripoli. That was the year America struck back with force—sending its newly constructed navy and a message that targeting Americans would no longer be tolerated.

According to historian David Barton, the only other major contribution Muslims made to early America was selling slaves to American slave traders.

The president's lie that Muslims made any *major positive* impact on America during its early history is significant. He has often repeated similar statements, and they obscure the danger posed by Islamists to America. They also perpetuate *another* lie, which is that *Islam is a religion of peace and that its violent elements are just isolated misguided individuals*.

On February 25, the BBC published a new poll on the attitudes of Muslims in Britain. Twenty-seven percent of those surveyed said they had “sympathy for the motives behind the *Charlie Hebdo* attacks in Paris.” An additional 8 percent said they were “unsure” if they had sympathy or not.

More than a third of British Muslims would not strongly condemn the murder of 11 journalists and four shoppers at the Jewish deli.

In a separate BBC survey, 32 percent of Muslims did not agree that violence against those who publish images of Mohammed is never justified. Over 50 percent of British Muslims surveyed would not condemn clerics who speak of the need for violence against the West.

These are shocking facts that show just how radical Muslim communities are in one of the world's most tolerant, liberal and welcoming nations.

What do you think those poll numbers would be in Iran, or Saudi Arabia, or Libya, or Pakistan? Places where the nation's spiritual leaders, and often their political leaders, speak of jihad and destroying the West?

But many Americans refuse to accept facts, especially when they contradict their worldview. Americans want to believe that people are inherently good and peaceful. But goodness is not the natural state of mankind. What these people don't understand is that the concept of goodness in the West is based on Judeo-Christian ideals of what is good.

However, the vast majority of people in the world are not Christians, nor Jews. And their idea of what is good is totally different from that of the West. It is not based on the Ten Commandments, and “love your neighbor as yourself” does not extend beyond your family and tribe.

In Islam, for example, “doing good” is waging war against non-believers who refuse to submit to the prophet, and dying a martyr. That is why Muslims strap bombs to themselves, walk onto crowded buses and blow themselves up. That is why Muslims launch rockets into cities, *trying* to kill civilians. It is why Muslims wage holy war, chop off heads of infidels, take war brides, and proclaim to the world that they won't stop until they reach Rome, or until both the “little Satan” (Israel) and the “great Satan” (the United States) are destroyed.

Most people refuse to accept that the human heart is inherently evil. That evil is the baseline condition of all humanity. Thus

so many people continue to believe obvious and increasingly apparent lies.

And thus America's acceptance and willingness to cooperate with people who want to destroy both our *way* of life and our *life* itself.

But there is another, far more dangerous reason the White House refuses to confront radical Islam.

Consider the Summit on Countering Violent Extremism hosted by President Obama. There were so many radical, hateful anti-Americans present that it should have been called the Summit for Legitimizing and Empowering Violent Extremists.

President Obama said the conference would build upon his strategy of “Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violent Extremism in the United States.” Problem is that many of these local partners *are* the extremists. Here is how Breitbart described the Boston delegation of Muslim leaders: “One Boston Muslim leader taking part in the summit, Nicole Mossalam, has been dishonest about her controversial mosque blocking congregants from giving police information during their investigation of the Boston Marathon bombing. Another Muslim leader from Boston invited to the White House summit designed a lawsuit to stop the Boston media from reporting what it knows about the radical nature of the largest Islamic center in New England. In addition, this man, Nabeel Khudairi, persecuted moderate Muslim members of his own mosque after they tried to warn New Englanders about Islamic extremists in their midst.

“As we expected and warned, the Islamic Society of Boston's (ISB) Cambridge mosque—the radical Muslim Brotherhood front group attended by the Boston Marathon bombers—was invited to join the summit and is represented there by its executive director, Nicole Mossalam. A few days ago, in Breitbart News and the *Washington Times*, we reported how over the past decade, 12 of the ISB's worshipers have either been killed, imprisoned or declared fugitives due to their involvement in terrorist activity.”

Another attendee was Salam al-Marayati. He is a 9/11 denier who says Israel is the likely suspect for the 9/11 terror attacks.

There were also representatives from the Council on American-Islamic Relations, which holds the title for being an undicted co-conspirator in the largest illegal funding case for the terrorist group Hamas in America.

These are the supposed “moderate” partners the president is trying to empower. And they were not alone. Several other Muslims affiliated with militant groups and or Islamic radicals were also noted at the White House conference.

Furthermore, many of the purported goals of the conference actually do the opposite of what the summit was supposed to be about and, if implemented, *would make America less safe*. The Blaze highlights “Ten Troubling Aspects of the Summit.” Here are some of the points:

- The groups the president is empowering are those who may pose the biggest threat.
- According to the administration, there is no profile of a “violent extremist.”
- The administration thinks a key focus should be on non-Muslim terrorist groups, like those in Colombia.
- The administration disavows a link between jihadism—a word it won't use—and religion.
- The administration continues to attribute radicalism to

economic, social and political disparities—but not religion.

- The administration wants to rehabilitate and reintegrate violent extremists.
- The Obama White House has regularly partnered with and enabled “violent extremists,” without whom a countering violent extremism summit would not be necessary in the first place. For example, partnering with Iran.
- The key issues crucial to understanding the nature and means of best countering Islamic supremacism are not going to be addressed.

So why is the president so set on working with and even empowering the very people who want to destroy America and Western civilization in general? Why won't the president label radical Islam for the threat that it is? Why is he perpetuating lies about America's history with Islam? Is he really that naive, or is there an agenda at work behind the scenes that most people don't recognize?

To understand why President Obama seems to side with America's enemies, read [America Under Attack](#).

 Follow **Robert Morley**

MIDDLE EAST

Vatican: The Islamic State's Threats Against Pope Are Real

Jeremiah Jacques | March 5

THE ISLAMIC STATE'S THREATS AGAINST POPE FRANCIS ARE NOT just media propaganda but quite “real,” the chief of the Vatican police force said in a rare interview published on March 1.

“The threat exists,” Domenico Giani, the head of the Vatican's security and police force, said in an interview with Italian state publication *Polizia Moderna*. “This is what has emerged from my conversations with Italian and foreign colleagues.”

Last month, the Islamic State released a graphic video made expressly for Italy and its Christians. The five-minute video, titled “[A Message Signed With Blood to the Nation of the Cross](#),” depicts Islamic State jihadists beheading 21 Coptic Christians on the coast of Libya. A masked jihadist issues a threat to Italy's capital, emphasizing how geographically close the site of the slaughter was to the European city: “[T]oday, we are on the south of Rome, on the land of Islam, Libya And we will conquer Rome, by Allah's permission, the promise of our prophet, peace be upon him.”

Giani said threats against the Vatican and the pope extend beyond the Islamic State to also include the risk of lone-wolf

attacks. Such lone wolves are “more dangerous because they are unpredictable,” he added.

Pope Francis has been made aware of the risks the Islamic State presents. But Giani says Francis “is not compromising the style of his pontificate, based on closeness to the people, that is, on personal contact with the greatest number of people possible.”

Giani added that his force knew of no plans for a specific attack at the time of the interview.

This is not the first time [the Islamic State has threatened Rome](#), but it is the first time the Vatican has let it be known that it takes the threats seriously.

Political support for Italian military involvement is growing. Last month, the president of Italy's Senate Defense Commission warned that if diplomatic efforts fail, Italy must be ready to engage in military intervention to halt the Islamic State's advance.

The *Trumpet* has long said that radical Islam will continue to antagonize and push against European nations until a “last crusade” crushes radical Islam by violent force.

 Follow **Jeremiah Jacques**

Netanyahu: The Last Defense Against a Deal With Iran

Callum Wood | March 2

AS THE MARCH DEADLINE FOR A NUCLEAR DEAL APPROACHES, questions are again raised about the merits of making a deal with Iran. On one side stands the Obama administration—champion of a deal. On the other is Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu—the most vocal opponent to a bad deal.

Netanyahu argues that a deal with Iran will likely allow it to maintain its nuclear infrastructure, meaning Iran could still manufacture nuclear weapons if it wishes. The Israeli prime minister believes that any deal reached should require Iran to tear down its infrastructure—a move Iran will never agree to.

Netanyahu has been a staunch defender of this position ever since negotiations began in November 2013. Yet since that time,

he has enjoyed little support from the international community. And from Washington—a historic ally—there has been clear and evident hostility.

Netanyahu is very much alone. As such, if the Obama administration is to be uncontested as it pushes through a deal, Netanyahu must be silenced.

As dangerous as a nuclear deal may look today, it would be far worse without a strong voice of opposition. And don't think this only affects a tiny nation in the Middle East—this concerns the whole world! Notice what *Trumpet* editor in chief [Gerald Flurry](#) said in his *Key of David* program titled “[Why You Must Watch Jerusalem](#)”: “Mr. Netanyahu is coming here to speak before Congress,

he wants to talk to the world really about a massive danger—not only to Israel, but to this entire planet. And he is very passionate about it. You will see that when he comes here in March, I'm sure. He will be talking about the number one problem facing humanity, which is that of human survival.”

This affects us all!

Mr. Flurry continues: “[M]an is about to destroy all human life off this planet! Is there anything more urgent than that? I tell you,

if you listen to Mr. Netanyahu's speech I think you'll get a lot of that from it, and I hope that you will listen to it when he speaks in March because it is something that this whole world needs to be listening to.”

This pivotal speech by the loudest opponent to a nuclear deal is about to take place. Watch as the Obama administration does everything in its power to discredit and undermine that speech and ultimately silence any opposition to a nuclear deal.

Iran: The Netanyahu Regime 'Should Be Annihilated'

The Times of Israel | March 5

IN AN NBC INTERVIEW ON WEDNESDAY, [IRANIAN FOREIGN MINISTER Mohammed] Zarif finessed a series of questions raised by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in his speech to Congress Tuesday, including over Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei's tweet last year urging the annihilation of Israel, and about his own laying of a wreath at the grave of Imad Mughniyeh, the arch-Hezbollah terrorist responsible for the killings of hundreds of Americans. ...

When the NBC interviewer quoted the text of Khamenei's tweet last year—“This barbaric wolf-like and infanticidal regime of Israel which spares no crime, has no cure but to be annihilated”—and asked Zarif whether he understood why Jews and others “would take umbrage at that kind of language,” the foreign

minister said no, “Because this is a regime—we're talking about Mr. Netanyahu—who has butchered innocent children in Gaza. We are not talking about annihilation of Jews. We never have, we never will. Because if we wanted to annihilate Jews, we have a large number of Jewish population in Iran who not only live in the country in peace, but, in fact, have a representative in Iranian parliament allocated to them.”

Pressed repeatedly, Zarif then insisted ... that the Khamenei tweet referred to the Netanyahu regime, and that the supreme leader was saying “it should be annihilated. That this regime is a threat, is a threat. A regime that engages in the killing of innocent children, a regime that engages in acts of aggression.” ...

Libya Chaos Deepens as Islamic State Strikes Threaten to Halt Oil Production

Telegraph | March 5

LIBYA'S STATE RUN OIL COMPANY SAYS IT MAY BE FORCED TO CEASE all production if security deteriorates further across the country, after suspected Islamic State militants attacked three oil fields, and the national army bombed an airport in the capital.

Four years after mass protests hastened the fall of dictator Muammar Qadhafi, oil-rich Libya is divided between rival governments, each affiliated with a coalition of militias.

Oil facilities across the country have been targeted by a panopoly of armed groups as they compete for territory and resources. Production currently stands at around 400,000 barrels per day, less than half the rate of 1.6 million it produced before Qadhafi's

overthrow.

In a statement on Wednesday night, the National Oil Corporation declared 11 of its oil fields nonoperational, opting for a force majeure clause that exempts the state from contractual obligations.

It blamed the Islamist-dominated authorities in Tripoli for failing to protect the oil fields, and warned that it could be forced to shut down production nationwide.

On Wednesday, militants from the Islamic State-dominated city of Sirte attacked the al-Dhahra oil field, shortly after capturing facilities in Bahi and Mabruk. ...

U.S. General in Afghanistan Calls for Slower Troop Withdrawal Between Now and 2016

International Business Times | March 4

U.S. GEN. JOHN F. CAMPBELL HAS THROWN HIS HAT INTO THE ring of military and government leaders calling for President Barack Obama to reconsider his path to withdraw most troops from Afghanistan by 2016. Speaking recently to the House Armed Services Committee, the general said the U.S. may require troops removed from the country at a slower pace to allow them to complete their mission to train Afghan security personnel.

According to the *Washington Post*, Campbell testified that he would like to see how well the new “train, advise, assist

commands” succeed in allowing senior Afghan military officials to stand on their own before reducing troop numbers to 5,500 by 2016, as currently planned. ...

Campbell is one of many prominent figures urging Obama to slow the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the country, where Taliban and al Qaeda forces have been stepping up violence recently.

CNN noted that newly appointed U.S. Defense Secretary Ashton Carter already began managing people's expectations about the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan last month at a joint

appearance in Kabul with Afghan President Ashraf Ghani.

“Our priority now is to make sure this progress sticks. That is why President Obama is considering a number of options to reinforce our support for President Ghani’s security strategy, including possible changes to the timeline for our drawdown of U.S. troops,”

U.S.-Backed Syrian Rebels Crumble Under al Qaeda Fire **CBS | March 3**

THE U.S.-BACKED HAZM MOVEMENT REBEL GROUP, ONE OF THE first such groups in Syria to be deemed moderate enough to receive military support from Washington, has announced that it is dissolving after being forced from its base in Aleppo by al Qaeda-linked militants.

With an official statement released online, heralding the dissolution of the group, Hazm became the second U.S.-backed rebel militia to fall to the al-Nusra Front. In September 2014, the Syrian Revolutionary Front of Jamal Maarouf was defeated by Nusra and thrown out of their base in Idlib.

The statement said surviving members of the Hazm would join the Levant Front—an umbrella group of Islamic extremist and mainstream brigades in Aleppo province. ...

A message posted by an al-Nusra supporter on Twitter Monday,

Carter said. “That could mean taking another look at the timing and sequencing of base closures to ensure we have the right array of coalition capabilities to support our Afghan partners.” ...

RELATED: “BURIED IN AFGHANISTAN”

claimed the group had seized dozens of anti-tank missiles supplied to the Hazm Movement by the U.S. CBS News could not verify the authenticity of the image. ...

The al Qaeda group frequently cooperates with more-moderate rebel factions, but has turned more hardline since the U.S. targeted Nusra Front fighters with airstrikes as part of its wider campaign against Islamic extremists in Syria and Iraq.

Hazm’s move is unlikely to have a dramatic impact on the battlefield, but it highlights the struggles of Western-backed opposition factions to remain relevant in the face of Islamic extremists like the Nusra Front and [the Islamic State].

RELATED: “SYRIA IS READY TO EXPLODE”

EUROPE



A Strong German Leader Is Imminent **Gerald Flurry,** **The Key of David | March 6**

WATCH FOR GERMANY’S NEW STRONGMAN TO APPEAR SOON.



Germany’s New Policy Plan Puts the U.S. on Catch-up **Patrick Smith, The Fiscal Times | March 2**

IT TAKES A STRONG NATION, AS OPPOSED TO ONE THAT’S MERELY powerful, to rethink the way it conducts its foreign relations. Germany now proves the point, and Americans should sit up straight and take a long look. This is nothing short of the 21st century arriving.

Quietly, as the Germans often do things, Berlin’s Foreign Ministry began a study last year to determine the core principles guiding its relations with the rest of the world. Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier announced the results in the Bundestag last week. The project shows Germany to be a standout among the Western powers for its agility, imagination, openness and altogether its guts.

“The world has changed, and the Federal Foreign Office must change with it,” Steinmeier told the assembled parliamentarians.

Quickly: Can you think of a nation whose foreign policy elite is entirely incapable of making a similar assertion? I can. To be clear, Review 2014—Foreign Policy Thinking Ahead, as Steinmeier named his project when he took office in December 2013, is an implicit challenge to the U.S. policy establishment. It is almost certainly intended to be so, although those courteous Germans would never say as much.

Crisis—Rules—Europe, as the report published last week is titled, is interesting in all sorts of dimensions. It positions Germany, which is to say Chancellor Merkel, as Europe’s all-but-declared leader. ...

It commits Berlin to a course of action that has long been evident as a preference but never quite stated. While Germany acknowledges that military force will at times be

necessary—which is big enough in the context—Steinmeier has rethought how best to use every resource at Berlin's disposal. ...

"Crisis is likely to become the norm in the next 10 to 15 years," Steinmeier said in his parliamentary presentation. In response, the ministry will create an independent department to anticipate crises, address them when they erupt, and help advance beyond them afterward. ...

Berlin is now on the record as alarmed over our steady drift toward global chaos—on its doorstep, dramatically enough—and intends to counter it by advocating tougher enforcement of the law as we already have it. ...

Berlin's looking beyond Germany from now on and will embed its policy in the European context, Steinmeier said. Translation:

We speak for Europe and will act accordingly. Intent: "to give Europe more influence in world affairs."

I read a declaration that Europe's going to turn its preferences into policies and advance them with more determination than it has to date. The ready-to-hand example is the Ukraine crisis. It has been clear for some time that Europe doesn't want more sanctions imposed on Russia—pro forma measures to oblige the U.S. notwithstanding—and it doesn't want to arm Ukraine. On these and other such questions, Steinmeier may well have put the Obama administration on notice: It's more-explicit resistance from here on out. ...

"Germany has much to offer the world, Steinmeier wrote in an opinion piece a few days ago, and we will do so with confidence and humility." ...

'Risk Has Gotten Greater': German Jews Advised Against Wearing Kippah **Spiegel Online | March 27**

BEFORE MARK KRASNOV LEAVES HIS BERLIN HOME, HE ALWAYS asks himself: Should I play it safe or should I wear the kippah? "I don't want to provoke anyone or for people to get any silly ideas," says the 26-year-old Jewish man. The result is that he hardly ever wears the headgear when he goes out. He feels it's too risky.

The question of Jewish safety in Germany became the subject of public debate on Thursday after Josef Schuster, president of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, wondered in a radio interview whether it "really made sense" in "problem neighborhoods with large Muslim populations to make one's self recognizable as a Jew by wearing a kippah?" He suggested that it "might be better to choose a different head covering" in such instances.

"The risk is always there," agrees Krasnov, who is head of the Wiesbaden Jewish community's youth center. "When you leave the synagogue, the security people often say: It's better to take off the kippah. It's safer." Krasnov says he almost never shows his kippa when he's out in public. "It's a preventative security measure for me—and, ultimately, self-defense." ...

Germany is home to around a quarter-million Jews with about 118,000 being members of the country's 108 official Jewish communities. The country is the only one in the EU that has registered growth in its Jewish population in recent years, with many others, including France, recording an exodus. Indeed, nervousness among French Jews is extremely high following an increase in high-profile anti-Semitic attacks. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin

Netanyahu has even called on French Jews to emigrate to Israel.

Still, the community in Germany feels threatened from three sides here: from right-wing extremists, who are responsible for most violent attacks on Jews; from the anti-Israeli and anti-Zionist left-wing; and from Islamists. ...

When he goes to the synagogue, his youth center or to Jewish cemeteries, Krasnov says he always wears a kippah. And sometimes he'll wear one in public. "If I'm with a group when I go home from the synagogue, then I sometimes dare to wear it," he says. "Because I know there are others with me who can help in an emergency."

"Attacks on Jews are becoming much more frequent in Europe and everyone—especially the Jews—know that these are not isolated incidents. This anti-Jewish sentiment goes much deeper than a recession or an election or even demographics. This hatred goes back generations. It goes back far before the Nazis and the Holocaust. We need the real causes of this not-so-new anti-Semitism. We need to know: Why do so many people hate the Jews?"

Trumpet Daily, July 24, 2014

RELATED: "IS ANTI-SEMITISM EXTINCT?"

Benelux Countries Sign Air Defense Pact **EU Observer | March 5**

THE THREE BENELUX COUNTRIES, BELGIUM, NETHERLANDS AND Luxembourg, Wednesday agreed to share surveillance and protection of their air spaces, in the first agreement of its kind among EU countries.

Starting from 2017, Belgian and Dutch air forces will take turns to monitor the Benelux airspace. Luxembourg has no military airforce and will only open its air space to its neighbors' jets.

The common missions will involve the so-called "Renegade"

procedure aimed at identifying suspect civil aircrafts that might pose a terrorist threat. "The agreement is a step forward in the intensification of European military cooperation," said Belgian Prime Minister Charles Michel in a statement.

"We work together to make sure that European security progresses. The terrible events of the past months motivate us greatly," said his Dutch counterpart Marc Rutte, referring to recent terror attacks in France and Denmark.

The Benelux agreement is a novelty in European defense policy because it is the first time countries agree that a foreign air

force may operate and potentially shoot down a civilian plane over its territory. ...

ASIA

Vladimir Putin's Invisible Empire

Fraser Nelson, *Telegraph* | March 4

IT'S EASY TO LAUGH AT VLADIMIR PUTIN, TO DISMISS HIM AS A Cold Warrior trapped in the '80s. His nostalgia for the old Soviet Union, his fondness for ballistic missile testing and denouncing NATO in speeches all seem to underline the image of an old KGB agent who can't bring himself to admit that the war is over. At first, his behavior just seemed odd. When he annexed Crimea, it seemed more sinister. But now, we ought to consider a third possibility: that we're the ones stuck in the past. That Putin is fighting a war of the future—and winning.

In the old days, Russians built and maintained an empire by sending tanks over borders. ... When that war ended, NATO was expanded to make sure it couldn't happen again. The United Nations has rules based on the inviolability of borders. So, for example, if Russia invaded Cyprus to give its navy access to the Mediterranean then everyone—Uncle Sam included—would come riding to the rescue.

But Putin, now, would do nothing so gauche as to invade. He cuts deals instead: This week, he agreed to a €2.5 billion (US\$2.7 billion) loan for Cyprus. In return, Russian Navy vessels will be able to dock in its ports. ...

It's quite a coup for the Kremlin. Cyprus was British until 1960; now it has been absorbed into Putin's new empire. It's not an empire that NATO, with its Cold War mind-set, would recognize; it's not one that can be described by coloring in nations on a map. This is an empire of influence—far cheaper to acquire, harder to spot and easier to maintain. ...

The Cold War involved puppet leaders and an old-style empire that was so expensive to maintain that it eventually brought down the Soviet Union. Putin doesn't have puppets, but he does have buddies—politicians, usually in need of loans, who want to shake things up. ...

The last time Russia played hardball, America played back.

This time, Barack Obama has concluded that while the Ukraine crisis may be a problem for Europe, it's not really one for America—so we're left to deal with this ourselves. But even Britain ... is trying to pretend that this isn't happening. David Cameron is good at minting strong words, but Britain's determination to play a role resolving the world's disputes is undermined by our ever-declining defense budget.

All this suits Putin perfectly. He can now pose as the leader of an indefatigable superpower. "No one should have the illusion that they can gain military superiority over Russia," he boasted recently.

Its army isn't so impressive—however, as Putin has discovered, it's not the size of an army that matters but willingness to use it. And if he were to make a move on Latvia, he wouldn't send tanks. A group of well-funded Russian-speaking Latvians would pop up, declaring they are discriminated against by a wicked, CIA-funded government. There would be a provocation of some kind, and they'd beg Russia for "protection." Mysterious men in balaclavas would emerge, and Putin would deny all knowledge.

Then what would we do? NATO has no real protocol: The alliance is dismally out-of-date and has been hopelessly late in responding even to the conventional trouble in Ukraine. Its members have no budget for entanglement. ...

For the first time in years, the RAF is having to escort Russian fighters out of the English Channel as Putin tweaks our tail. Yet even now, we still can't commit to defense spending. Our strategy is to hope Mr. Putin gets bored, and kindly goes away.

Recently, a British diplomat was quoted saying that Putin's new empire of influence is "something we and others are certainly looking at." That's good to know. But this is something that Putin has been looking at, and acting on, for years. He has changed the rules of the game, while we have been playing the old one.

T Russia Is 'Pulling a Crimea' in Georgia Jeremiah Jacques | February 27

GEORGIA SAID THE SIGNING OF A BORDER DEAL BETWEEN RUSSIA and its breakaway region of South Ossetia on February 18 means Moscow was one step nearer to officially annexing the territory.

"It's yet another action directed against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia and an attempt to artificially redraw internationally recognized borders," said the Georgian Foreign Ministry.

In 2008, Russia fought a war with Georgia over South Ossetia and another separatist region, Abkhazia. After the five-day conflict ended, Moscow recognized both regions as independent nations and asserted control over them. Only a handful of other countries have recognized the two regions' declarations of independence, and Tbilisi insists they remain part of Georgia.

Last November, Moscow moved toward consolidating the

spoils of that war by signing a “strategic partnership” deal with Abkhazia, which integrates Russian security and military forces into those of Abkhazia. The February 18 deal shows that Russia is now creating a similar scenario with South Ossetia.

Georgia has ambitions to join NATO, but Russia has said it would not allow such a move. Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said Russia would “take measures to prevent the negative effect of attempts to drag Tbilisi into NATO.”

Russia’s maneuvers in Georgia come less than a year after it annexed Ukraine’s Crimean Peninsula, and at a time when Russia-Ukraine tensions remain high. Both Ukraine and Georgia were part of the Soviet Union before its 1991 collapse. Some in Georgia believe Russia’s recent deals with South Ossetia and Abkhazia parallel Moscow’s actions in Ukraine. “Russia, in a way, is pulling a Crimea here,” Dr. Irakli Bokuchava, a Tbilisi-based political commentator, told the *Trumpet*. In both nations, President

Vladimir Putin’s plan is the “creation of a renewed USSR.”

Just after the 2008 war between Russia and Georgia, *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry issued this bold forecast: “Russia’s attack on Georgia in August marks the beginning of a dangerous new era in history. This was the first military strike of a rising Asian superpower—and there will be more! ... Today, you have [Western leaders] trying to also bring Georgia and Ukraine into NATO. I don’t believe Russia will ever allow that to happen. ... Will a crisis occur over Ukraine? That area is the breadbasket of Russia, and surely it is willing to wage war over that as well.”

Time has proven that forecast stunningly accurate.

Mr. Flurry could see in 2008 that Ukraine and Georgia were not safe from Putin’s expansionist ambitions, and now it is clear that he was right. To understand more, read Mr. Flurry’s article “[The Crimean Crisis Is Reshaping Europe](#).”

 Follow [Jeremiah Jacques](#)

Japan’s Intelligence Reform Inches Forward

Stratfor | March 2

WHEN THE ALLIES DEFEATED JAPAN AT THE END OF WORLD War II, they dismantled the Japanese security apparatus and deliberately left the country dependent on outside powers. This entailed not only taking apart the military but also the extensive imperial intelligence apparatus that had facilitated Japanese expansion in Asia. ... This system worked through the Cold War, when Japan was more essential to U.S. anti-Soviet strategy. Since then, however, Japan has found itself unable to count on its allies to provide vital intelligence in a timely manner. The Islamic State hostage crisis in January, during which Japan depended on Jordanian and Turkish intelligence, reinforced this lesson.

In response to the recent incident, Japan’s ruling Liberal Democratic Party has started drafting a proposal to create a new agency specializing in foreign intelligence. To address Japanese dependence on outsiders, the new system will shift away from a decentralized model with limited collection capacity to a centralized system with in-house capabilities. The plan would support Japan’s slow normalization of its overall military capabilities in order to face new threats. ...

Japan ... is moving slowly and inexorably toward intelligence reform, just as it is moving forward with its military normalization. ... [T]he demands for fast and accurate intelligence are rising, and Japan cannot depend on its allies to meet its needs. ...

The United States is likely to encourage Japan throughout this process by sharing its own experiences and expertise. ... For its

part, the United States wants to empower Japan to shoulder more alliance burdens. However, the long-term effect will be to afford Japan the autonomy needed down the road to independently pursue and protect its own interests abroad.

“[J]apan has long been building toward a military capable of more than defense. Narushige Michishita, a former adviser to Japan on defense explains: ‘We are not pacifist in that sense. ... Japan isn’t remilitarizing—we are already there.’ Michishita says it was ‘very convenient’ that the U.S. has pushed long and hard for Japan to take up a more assertive military posture. ‘We didn’t have to get involved in conflicts. But now the U.S. wants Japan to be more proactive,’ he said. [T]he U.S. officials who wrote Japan’s constitution were wise. If they were around today, they would recognize Japan’s shifting tides and take action to reverse them. But U.S. leaders today are snubbing history, turning inward and pushing for dangerous geopolitical shifts. The barriers established to prevent another world war are being systematically dismantled.”
theTrumpet.com, July 2, 2014

Russia and China Aren’t Less Committed to Nuclear Force. So Why Are We?

The Daily Signal | March 1

AS RUSSIA AND OTHER NATIONS AROUND THE WORLD FLEX THEIR “nuclear muscles,” when it comes to the United States, maintaining a credible nuclear force is certainly a tough task.

Challenges include: declining research, development and acquisition budgets; uncertain prospects for modernization, and an American public that lacks a clear understanding of how nuclear

weapons contribute to national security.

The U.S. nuclear force has prevented a great power war for seven decades. Yet the commitment to maintain a credible nuclear force appears shaky.

That is certainly not the case in competitor nations such as Russia, China and North Korea. While sanctions and low oil prices have crippled Russia's economy, the Kremlin is still doggedly spending billions of dollars on modernizing its strategic rocket forces. ...

The Heritage Foundation's newly released 2015 Index of U.S. Military Strength evaluates the health of the U.S. nuclear

complex according to nine categories. In four of those categories—warhead modernization, delivery systems modernization, nuclear weapons complex and nuclear test readiness—the complex was rated as “weak” (the second-worst rating possible). ...

The Index's low rankings indicate the areas of America's nuclear force that are in greatest need of investment. And it's a force that must be sustained. The nuclear mission is critical. Its ultimate purpose is to deter a catastrophic attack on our homeland, our forces abroad, and our allies. While it is true that we require a nuclear force we never hope to launch, it is important to recognize that our nuclear weapons serve to keep the peace every day.

China's Neighbors Bulk Up Militaries

Wall Street Journal | February 26

CHINA'S NEIGHBORS ARE MOVING FORWARD WITH THE MODERNIZATION of their militaries with new fighter jets, submarines and other hardware, even as Beijing has tried to tamp down territorial tensions in the region.

The military buildup is an indication that many Asian countries see little reason to adjust their long-term preparations for potential friction with China, despite Beijing's diplomatic and economic charm offensive. ...

Smaller nations like Vietnam don't expect to seriously challenge China's military, but want to make China think twice before pressing claims. ...

Better-equipped countries, such as India and Japan, want China to respect them as military equals. ...

China continues to outpace its neighbors in military spending—its military budget has grown around 10 percent annually for the past two decades.

The U.S. has encouraged its allies in Asia, particularly Japan, to build up military capability, which takes some pressure off Washington itself and also creates markets for U.S. weaponry. ...

“Daniel 11:40 speaks of a showdown in this end time between the king of the north—a German-led European empire—and the king of the south, a radical Middle Eastern empire led by Iran. Daniel 11:40-41 explain that, at the time of the end, this European entity will enter into ‘the glorious land’—called Israel today—and overthrow many countries. ... The pivotal prophecy continues in verse 44, saying that ‘tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him.’ After destroying the Middle Eastern power, the European empire will be troubled by what is happening to its east and north—that is, in Asia! The burgeoning military spending throughout Asia is the result of bickering and disputes among Asian states, but all of that military might will soon be pooled together and channeled against a colossal European enemy.”

theTrumpet.com, Nov. 26, 2010

India Increases Military Budget By 11 Percent to Nearly \$40 Billion

Wall Street Journal | February 28

INDIA INCREASED THE AMOUNT OF MONEY IT PLANS TO SPEND ON its military next fiscal year by 11 percent to nearly 2.47 trillion rupees (US\$40 billion) as the South Asian nation plans to continue to invest in expanding and modernizing its armed forces. ...

India has become the world's biggest arms importer in recent years as it attempts to build up its military to deal with tensions with Pakistan and the growing military strength of China.

India plans to cut its outlay toward new aircraft and engines for the Indian Air Force to 189 billion rupees (\$3 billion) for the coming fiscal year from 215 billion rupees this year. ...

Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi has made military modernization one of his top priorities since his government came to power in May. Soon after taking charge, Mr. Modi's government started allowing foreign firms to hold up to 49 percent stakes in defense ventures. Previously, foreign firms were only allowed to own up to 26 percent stakes in military joint ventures.

Analysts said the government's push for greater local manufacturing of equipment by foreign firms may not materialize

unless the foreign ownership limit is increased. ...

India received a meager \$5 million worth of foreign direct investment in defense in the last 14 years. The telecommunications and automobile industries have each attracted more than \$10 billion each over that period.

“Modi joins a group of Asian strongman leaders who have been rising to power or consolidating power as U.S. influence in the region fades. Most of Modi's fellow strongmen seem to welcome him as the newest participant in their shared quest to shift global power from Occident to Orient.”

theTrumpet.com, May 20, 2014

RELATED: “RESULTS OF LARGEST ELECTION IN HUMAN HISTORY MEAN INDIA-RUSSIA-CHINA TIES WILL ADVANCE”

China's Big Chess Move Against the U.S.: Latin America

CNNMoney | March 4

LATIN AMERICA IS CHINA'S LATEST BUSINESS BUDDY. CHINESE banks increased investments in Latin America by 71 percent last year, and the country plans to double its trade volume with the Central and South American region over the next decade.

This comes as U.S. power in the Americas is starting to erode. U.S. cash is actually fleeing the region as investors see better deals at home or elsewhere.

China doesn't appear as worried about the short-term.

"What we're looking at is not simply an economic play. It's an economic play that also has political and strategic undertones," says Ilan Berman, vice president of the American Foreign Policy Council in Washington.

Outside of economic ties, Berman points out that China has helped fund Argentina's nuclear power plant, launched Bolivia's first satellite and is rumored to be helping Venezuela start its own drone program. But for now, the relationship is mostly economic.

Although America is still the No. 1 trade partner with Latin America, China is already beating it in some places. China is ahead of the U.S. in trade with Brazil, Argentina, Peru and Venezuela, according to M.I.T. data.

It's a win-win for China and Latin America for many reasons. China needs all of Latin America's abundant commodities, like oil and soybeans, while some Latin countries are desperate for cash, which China is happy to provide.

In a sign of the shifting alignments, Latin American countries formed an alliance in 2010 called CELAC (Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), which excludes the U.S. and Canada.

Two months ago, the CELAC countries held a big meeting. Instead of going to Washington, they went to Beijing for the first

formal conference between China and the region. ...

[T]he potential for long-term ties is strong. China's President Xi Jinping has vowed to double trade between his country and Latin America over the next decade to \$250 billion.

"China provides a source of financing and export markets without pressures to adhere to practices of transparency, open markets, and Western-style democracy," says Evan Ellis, a Latin American expert and professor at the U.S. Army War College. ...

China's banks lent \$22 billion to Latin America last year. That's more than the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank sent to the region combined, according to Margaret Myers, an expert at the Inter-American Dialogue, which is not associated with the bank.

"These countries have really welcomed China with open arms," says Myers. ...

"China is waging economic war on the U.S., a war that is intensifying and will soon precipitate America's collapse. As a means to this end, China is forming an economic axis with Germany and Europe. Scripture says this China-Europe economic axis will be responsible for besieging America and causing its final economic downfall. 'And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedst, throughout all thy land: and he shall besiege thee in all thy gates throughout all thy land, which the Lord thy God hath given thee' (Deuteronomy 28:52)."

Trumpet, December 2010

ANGLO-AMERICA

T U.S. Downgrades Britain's Military

Richard Palmer | March 4

AMERICA CAN NO LONGER RELY ON BRITAIN AS A MILITARY PARTNER because of cuts to its armed forces, head of the United States Army, Gen. Raymond Odierno, told the *Telegraph's* Con Coughlin, according to an article published March 1.

The U.S. Army once relied on the United Kingdom to contribute a division-size force—around 10,000 men—to any conflict it was involved in. Now, it must plan for Britain to contribute half that. This means the British Army is no longer able to work alongside the U.S.A. as a separate unit; instead it is only able to supplement U.S. forces.

"I would be lying to you if I did not say that I am very concerned," General Odierno warned.

Coughlin noted that the general's statements come as "the RAF [Royal Air Force] is desperately short of combat squadrons, the

Navy is still trying to work out how it will provide the expert manpower and equipment needed to operate its two new Queen Elizabeth-class aircraft carriers, and the Army is struggling to cope with the drastic reductions to its ranks."

Odierno's comments came just over a week after British fighter jets rushed to intercept two Russian bombers flying off the Cornish coast. Due to budget cuts, the jets had to scramble from a base in Lincolnshire, over 300 miles away.

"They fly in these regions to check our air defenses and have probably worked out we are not as sharp as we were," the former head of the RAF told the *Daily Mail*. "They know it is provocative and they are doing it at a time when defense in the West is pretty wet compared to where they are."

Air Commodore Andrew Lambert gave an even starker warning:

"If Putin wanted to attack, he would not send a pair of bombers, he would send the lot and saturate our defenses; we couldn't cope.

"The Typhoon is a really good aircraft but with their relatively small numbers they would be overwhelmed: The Russians would outflank us, go around us, or just go through us. ...

"The modern generation of politicians has grown up in absolute security—they've never felt a threat to their existence, safety or security. They've taken peace for granted and decimated the

Armed Forces. Let's hope we don't pay the price."

Britain's military cuts have greatly weakened it, both in the esteem of its allies and enemies. The growing rift between Britain and America is a trend the *Trumpet* has been watching for a long time. For a full picture of this sorry state of affairs, as well as the solution to Britain's military weakness, read our article "[Want to Know What a Former Superpower Looks Like?](#)"

 Follow [Richard Palmer](#)



Win the War Against Sin

Stephen Flurry, *Trumpet Daily* | March 3

LEARN HOW TO BE AN OVERCOMER.

 Follow [Stephen Flurry](#)



Britain's Biggest Problem Is Not the EU

Richard Palmer | March 3

THERE'S A NEW MOOD AMONG BRITAIN'S EUROSKEPTICS. THEIR meetings once revolved around holding a referendum on Britain's relationship with the EU. The assumption was that if only someone would hold a referendum, then of course Britain would vote to get out.

Now that a referendum seems likely, these meetings revolve around a slightly different question: *How do we win?*

For years, many have taken for granted that a referendum would be a walk in the park. Pro-EU politicians are overwhelmingly against having a referendum, therefore, the logic went, a referendum must result in their defeat.

In fact, the poll numbers have jumped all over the place—making the results of a referendum, from a purely statistic point of view, hard to call. Why is the EU so popular? Why would Britain's euroskeptics struggle to win a vote? At the heart of this question is a deep, long-standing problem in Britain that is hurting the nation far more than EU membership ever could.

At the core of Britain's EU membership and all the problems it brings, is a failure of Britain's leadership.

For 40 years or so, the British public has reluctantly gone along with EU membership, only because it has been persuaded to do so by those at the top. The overwhelming majority of Britain's politicians and political parties are pro-EU.

Then consider journalism. The BBC, by far Britain's most influential news source, is pro-EU, as are the vast majority of Britain's newspapers—the *Sun*, the *Times*, the *Guardian*, the *Independent* and the *Mirror*. Only the *Telegraph* and *Daily Express* are against it.

In business, the opinions are more mixed. However the loud-est voices, like the Confederation of British Industry, tend to be pro-EU. And on the left, trade unions are also very keen on Britain's EU membership.

Even Britain's religious leaders are EU supporters.

This support goes back decades. In 1972, as Britain prepared to join what became the EU, the church published "Britain in Europe: the Social Responsibility of the Church," a document gushing with praise for the "brilliant and innovating creators" of the EU.

Many today talk about how Britain signed up for a free-trade union only to find itself a member of an aspiring superstate. That may be true of Britain's voters—who were promised that this was about free trade and nothing more—but it is not true of Britain's leaders. They knew exactly what they were signing up for.

In 1971, the Foreign Office wrote a memo advising the government that EU membership would mean the "transfer of major executive responsibilities to the bureaucratic commission in Brussels." This, it said, "will exacerbate popular feelings of alienation from government." The Foreign Office concluded that "there would be a major responsibility on HMG and on all political parties not to exacerbate public concern by attributing unpopular measures or unfavorable economic developments to the remote and unmanageable workings of the [European] Community."

Britain's EU membership, then, is something foisted on the nation by the consensus of its leaders. It was made possible only by those at the top—the political leaders—hiding the true nature of membership from voters.

In other words, Britain's EU membership is Britain's fault. The EU did not dupe our leaders into membership—they entered wide-eyed and willingly. The EU did not force Britain in. We cannot blame foreign interference.

That fact is not talked about enough. Even if British voters dragged their leadership out of the Union in a referendum, the same people would still be in charge at home. The core problem

would remain, and many more poor decisions would follow.

A recent speech by Douglas Carswell elucidates the point.

"I don't think there's any mileage ... in blaming Brussels," he cautioned at a recent Bruges Group meeting. "It's a homegrown problem. It's entirely the result of sclerotic thinking in Westminster. It is entirely a failure of our own political leadership in this

country to think up some fresh alternatives."

Britain once produced great leaders—now it does not.

"O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err," God warns in the book of Isaiah. That's exactly what we see in Britain. And that's a far bigger problem than EU membership.

 Follow [Richard Palmer](#)

Stoners Rejoice—It's 4/20 in Washington, D.C. **Jeremiah Jacques | March 1**

ON THE MORNING OF FEBRUARY 26, WASHINGTON, D.C., BECAME the newest frontier in the national movement for legalizing recreational marijuana. Adults in the district can now possess two ounces, grow up to six plants, and share their crop yields with others—but it's not yet legal to buy or sell the drug.

D.C. follows Colorado, Washington and Alaska in legalizing pot. But policymakers in those states are still working out regulatory structures, and, under federal law, marijuana remains a Schedule 1 narcotic. That makes using it a federal crime. D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser says that doesn't matter, though, because the people of the District favor legalization: "We would encourage the Congress to not be so concerned with overturning what 7-in-10 voters said should be the law in the District of Columbia," she said at a February 25 conference.

House Republicans say the voter approval is inconsequential and that Bowser could face prison time for the initiative. The District of Columbia is under Congress's jurisdiction, so any legislation must be submitted to Congress for approval. In December,

Congress passed a spending bill for D.C. that included a provision banning the legalization of marijuana. This bill makes D.C.'s new pot laws illegal. "[T]oday we have one Washington against the other," the *New York Times* wrote of the conflict.

Concern abounds not just over the contradiction between federal and regional laws, but also over D.C.'s failure to open up legal channels to buy and sell cannabis. In the absence of customary commerce, a social economy is expected to take root. And aspects of the illegal trade will inevitably be seedy. "People are going to rush into the breach here and try to take advantage," says Allen St. Pierre, executive director of the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws. "And some will not do it right."

Twenty-seven U.S. states have either decriminalized pot possession or legalized medical use. With the nation's capital now on board, the movement for legalizing recreational use will likely accelerate. For more on this trend, read "[What Can Sharks and Jellyfish Teach Us About Marijuana and President Obama?](#)"

 Follow [Jeremiah Jacques](#)

UK Bans Ad for Implying Old Jerusalem Part of Israel **Al-Arabiya | March 4**

BRITAIN'S ADVERTISING WATCHDOG BANNED AN ISRAELI GOVERNMENT tourism advert for suggesting that the Old City of Jerusalem was part of Israel on Wednesday.

The newspaper brochure showed a panorama of the walled Old City with the text "Israel has it all," and was ruled misleading by the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA), which said it implied the UNESCO World Heritage Site was part of Israel.

The international community regards the Old City as occupied Palestinian territory, while Israel has claimed it as part of its capital.

The dispute is an emotional subject as the area contains places precious to Christians, Jews and Muslims, including the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, Western Wall and al-Asqa Mosque.

Following a complaint, the ASA ruled the title of the brochure "Israel Land of Creation" and references to Old City attractions were misleading and banned the advert from appearing again in its current form.

"We understood that the status of the territories in question was the subject of much international dispute," the watchdog said. ...

"We've talked to you before about the prophetic significance of Britain's break with Israel. The Prophet Isaiah said [in Isaiah 9:21] that this historical alliance between Israel and the United Kingdom would unravel. And he said that this would happen just before the Messiah came. Be sure to request Herbert W. Armstrong's most popular book, *The United States and Britain in Prophecy*. "If you want to understand who the British and who the Jews are in Bible prophecy, you need this book. In this powerful book you'll see how the British and the Jews are actually related, which is why this latter-day break in the relationship is big news! It's actually the story of a united and strong family that once dominated the globe. But now that family is breaking apart."

Trumpet Daily, August 14, 2014