

Trumpet Weekly

JULY 17, 2015

German and EU flags fly at the Reichstag in Berlin, Germany.



Greece Euro Crisis Reveals That Germany Rules Europe

By Stephen Flurry and Richard Palmer | July 16

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



OVER THE PAST WEEK, WE HAVE SEEN THE CLEAREST, MOST NAKED display of German aggression since the end of World War II. Germany, of course, has been ruling the eurozone for years. *Der Spiegel* even called Germany the new “Fourth Reich” earlier this year. But for the most part, Germany has concealed its dominance behind a fig leaf of consensus.

That ended this week.

Last Sunday, the voice of the Greek people was loud and clear: Greece would not submit to German hegemony. On Monday, Germany ignored the referendum and unilaterally imposed its will on the Greek government. As noted by the *EU Observer*, “Monday, July 13, will go down in history as the day Greece lost its independence after 185 years of freedom, the day democracy died in the country that invented it ...”

From the left to the right, the mainstream media now sees

what the *Trumpet* has been warning about for years. Greece is now a German colony. Here are some of the conditions Greece must now submit to:

- European Union officials have veto power over new Greek laws.
- The Greek government must repeal laws the EU officials do not like.
- €50 billion (US\$54.5 billion) worth of assets are to be taken from Greece and given to an independent fund. The fund will then sell them off.
- Greece must reform pension and tax laws in line with what EU officials want.
- The government must commit to automatic spending cuts if it isn't making enough money.

If the bailout deal is implemented, it is *Germany*—not

Greece—that controls Greece.

Stratfor's George Friedman sums up the deal this way: "The specifics are less important than the fact that Greece invoked its sovereign right, and Germany responded by enforcing an agreement that compelled the Greeks to cede those rights."

"It was not the government's position that troubled Germany the most, but the Greek referendum," he writes. He says Germany forced the Greek government to capitulate—calling it an "attack" on Greece's national sovereignty. "The Germans could not accommodate the vote. They had to respond by demanding concessions on Greek sovereignty," Friedman wrote.

Wolfgang Münchau went so far as to say that Europe has "reverted to the nationalist European power struggles of the 19th and early 20th century." He wrote in Britain's *Financial Times* (emphasis added throughout): "But it was not just the brutality that stood out, nor even the total capitulation of Greece. The material shift is that Germany has formally proposed an exit mechanism. ... This was the real coup over the weekend: not only regime change in Greece, *but also regime change in the eurozone*. ... Any other country that in future might challenge German economic orthodoxy will face similar problems."

Germany's rule extends far beyond Greece. In many ways, the negotiations last weekend were not about Greece. Greece's economy and debt are too small to cause a real problem for Germany. Instead it is about Spain, Portugal, Italy, even France—the large EU economies that could cause real problems for Germany. Greece tried to defy Germany, and Germany had to make an example of it. Now these other debtor states are much less likely to oppose the German will. If they try to stand up to Germany, they know they will suffer the same fate as Greece.

In the article we quoted earlier, Friedman explains what this means for Europe: "The Germans have long been visible as the controlling entity of the European Union. This time, they made no bones about it. Nor did they make any bones about their ferocity. In effect they raised the banner of German primacy, German national interest, and German willingness to crush the opposition. ...

"[I]n making these moves, Germany crossed two lines. The lesser line was that France and Germany were not linked on dealing with Greece, though they were not so far apart as to be even close to a breach. The second, and more serious, line was that the final negotiation was an exercise of unilateral German power."

As we have long predicted based on the sure word of Bible prophecy, this is headed for a smaller, more integrated group

of nations, DOMINATED by Germany. The nature of Europe is dramatically changing—and fast!

The world may be shocked by the harshness of German Chancellor Angela Merkel over the weekend. But a lot of Germans want her to be even stronger! On Tuesday, for example, German Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble publicly broke with Merkel over the bailouts for the first time over this crisis. He said Greece should have been BOOTED OUT of the euro.

The Greek referendum has AWAKENED A BEAST in the heart of Europe.

For decades, this was the signature prophecy repeatedly proclaimed by Herbert W. Armstrong: the seventh and final resurrection of the Holy Roman Empire—a 10-nation European super-state dominated by Germany.

The euro crisis is helping to bring all of this about.

Sixty years ago, no one could foresee Germany rising again and dominating Europe—except for Mr. Armstrong. Ten years ago, no one could have envisioned Germany unilaterally and aggressively transforming a fellow European power into a vassal state—except for Mr. Armstrong's successor, Gerald Flurry.

In August 1950, Herbert Armstrong predicted that "the world will be stunned, dumbfounded, to see Germany emerge suddenly in a power never equaled by Hitler—by a union of 10 nations in Europe, probably including some at present puppets of Russia—in a gigantic United States of Europe. ... Soon the 'United States of Europe' will emerge, with Germany at its head."

Those "puppets of Russia" are now part of the EU! We don't yet see the union of 10 nations—that is coming—but we see Germany clearly as Europe's head.

In his booklet *Germany's Conquest of the Balkans*, Mr. Flurry wrote, "It will not be long before Europe is reunited as the Holy Roman Empire. It will be led very assertively by Germany." Again, today we see that leadership openly and assertively on the march. In 2011, [he wrote](#): "Germany has the economic might and the political will to do what it feels must be done, and nobody else does. Whoever controls the money controls the empire."

At the start of this crisis, [he warned](#), "How the Germans are dealing with the economic crisis is far from democratic! Those nations that can't or won't comply will be kicked out of the European Union!"

That is *exactly* what we have been witnessing over the past week. This, Mr. Flurry wrote, is one of the most significant moments *ever* in the history of Europe.

 Follow [Stephen Flurry](#) and [Richard Palmer](#)

MIDDLE EAST

TrumpetDaily
RADIO SHOW

THE PLAGUE OF THE HUMAN HEART | JULY 17

THE GERMAN EMPIRE IS BACK | JULY 16

THE CORONATION OF IRAN AS KING OF THE SOUTH | JULY 15

GERMANY CONQUERS GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES
SURRENDERS TO IRAN | JULY 14



The Coronation of Iran as King of the South

Stephen Flurry | July 15

BACK IN 1994, THEN UNITED STATES PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON spoke about a historic deal the U.S. had just made with North Korea: “This is a good deal North Korea will freeze and then dismantle its nuclear program. ... The entire world will be safer The United States and international inspectors will carefully monitor North Korea to make sure it keeps its commitments.”

Eight years later, North Korea stunned the world by saying it had been secretly developing a nuclear weapons program since the late 1990s. Today, North Korea is armed to the teeth.

In the situation now unfolding with Iran, we are told it will be different. It has been said that yesterday’s deal will *verifiably* prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

U.S. President Barack Obama said on Tuesday that “Iran will reduce its stockpile of enriched uranium by 98 percent, remove two thirds of its installed centrifuges—the machines necessary to produce highly enriched uranium—and store them under constant international supervision.”

We were told that Iran would do all of this *during the negotiations*, which it didn’t. And now that the deal is done, we expect it to dismantle everything?

In January, President Obama said: “Our diplomacy is at work with respect to Iran, where, for the first time in a decade, we’ve halted the progress of its nuclear program and reduced its stockpile of nuclear material.”

The reality though is that under the Obama administration’s watch, Iran actually increased its nuclear fuel stockpiles by about 20 percent in the 18 months of negotiations.

Celebrate Good Times

You can see why they were cheering in Tehran yesterday!

As Con Coughlin wrote, “You only had to look at the beaming smiles on the faces of the Iranian negotiating team to see who had emerged as the undisputed winners.”

Two years ago, the Iranians were desperate for some kind of deal. Today, they are celebrating—and they have good reason to!

After the deal was announced, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani said, “Negotiators have reached a good agreement, and I announce to our people that our prayers have come true.”

Here is what the Iranians said, through the nation’s state-controlled news agency, about yesterday’s deal: “Rouhani said his country has achieved all its four goals in the agreement”

Besides sanctions relief, the Islamic Republic also gets the *release* of around \$150 billion in frozen assets. And think about the international legitimacy this gives Iran. Far from pushing the mullahs out of power, this agreement only solidifies their position. There will be no regime change.

An American Surrender

For the U.S., this represents *a total surrender*! Go back and look at what America said after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. At the time, President George W. Bush identified Iran as one of three nations in the “axis of evil,” and told Congress that the war against terrorism wouldn’t end “until *every* terrorist group of global reach has

been found, stopped and defeated.”

At the *Trumpet*, we said that U.S.-led effort was doomed to fail from the very beginning because America lacked the will to face the problem head on.

Analysts often called Iran the head of the terrorist snake. But America chose to call its campaign the “War on Terror.” We chose to fight against *a battle tactic*, rather than against radical Islam or the number one state sponsor of terrorism. This is why we wrote, within weeks of the 9/11 catastrophe, that [the number one state sponsor of terrorism](#) would not only survive America’s retaliatory wrath, but emerge from the war “stronger than ever.”

We wrote that at the end of 2001! And today, the Iranian head of the snake is fully intact and unquestionably stronger than ever.

The Response From Israel

They are celebrating this deal in Iran. But in the nation of Israel, the reaction is the opposite.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said: “The world is a much more dangerous place today than it was yesterday. The leading international powers have bet our collective future in a deal with a formal sponsor of international terrorism. ... In the coming decade, the deal will reward Iran, the terrorist regime in Tehran, with hundreds of billions of dollars. This cash bonanza will fuel Iran’s terrorism worldwide Amazingly, this bad deal does not require Iran to cease its aggressive behavior in any way.”

He’s right. Not even economic hardship has been able to dissuade the regime from sponsoring terrorism. Soon, it will be flooded with cash. America has just unleashed a *monster*!

The Big Picture

When we consider the sobering implications of Tuesday’s deal, it is vital to view it in the context of Bible prophecy. Daniel 11:40 contains a key end-time prophecy about a time in the very near future: “And *at the time of the end* shall the king of the south push at him: and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.”

The *Trumpet* identified Iran as the prophesied “king of the south” back in 1994. *Iran is king*. Now think about what just happened Tuesday!

Since the end of World War II, it is the U.S. that has maintained security and order in the Middle East. For nearly 70 years, America has been *the* strongest force for stability in the Middle East.

But yesterday, the U.S. effectively ceded control of the region to the number one state sponsor of terrorism! Yesterday, America *coronated* Iran as king! That’s how the Bible labels this nation—the “king” of the south.

The *Trumpet* has long explained that the “king of the north” discussed in Daniel 11:40 is the German-led European combine. The Bible says Iran will aggressively “push” at Europe. Germany will then retaliate forcefully against this Islamic push and then enter into Jerusalem.

Iran's pattern has always been to *provoke* Europe and the West with its pushy foreign policy.

It is important that "Israel" (a name that refers to the United States in end-time prophecies) isn't even mentioned in this Daniel 11:40 war! Sobering clues as to why that is the case are everywhere today. For the past several years, for example, America has been desperately working to get out of the Middle East and to hand control over to the king of the south.

In 2009, after President Obama's Cairo speech, *Trumpet* editor in chief **Gerald Flurry** said: "How much did America's president help the terrorist cause? Probably far more than we imagine." He went on to explain that the president's speech would have a powerful impact on the flow of prophetic events. He wrote, "President Obama's speech is a great turning point in this world. It is going to play a major role in terrifying prophecies of your Bible being fulfilled."

Watch and Pray

My father recently said that he has never seen so many Bible prophecies *being fulfilled* this fast! Time is short.

Jesus said, "Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is" (Mark 13:33). *Bring God into your watching*, in other words. "Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning: Lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping" (verses 35-36). The word "watch" means to be awake and be vigilant! It means to pay attention and be active.

The pace of prophetic events marches on inexorably and without delay. Mankind's experiment with self-government is about over. How do we know? Because the events Jesus *Himself* prophesied to be a sign of the end of the age and His soon-coming return are now coming to pass—exactly as He said they would.

 Follow [Stephen Flurry](#)

How the Iranian Nuclear Agreement Will Change History

Joel Hilliker | July 15

IRAN JUST MADE A DEAL TO MODERATE ITS NUCLEAR ACTIVITY FOR sanctions relief. This is a decisive moment, setting the course in the time ahead for the Middle East and beyond.

On Tuesday, it was announced that the P5+1 nations reached a deal with Iran regarding its nuclear program. If enacted, the deal will lift economic sanctions against Iran in exchange for concessions in its pursuit of nuclear technology.

Many observers are describing this deal as *historic*. That is absolutely right—but most people fail to understand why. A full appreciation for its significance requires viewing events from the unique perspective of how it *fulfills biblical prophecy*.

In a number of ways, this deal will accelerate events in the Middle East and far beyond that align exactly with what the *Trumpet* has been anticipating would happen based on the prophecies of the Bible.

The most important effect is that it cements Iran's position as king of the Middle East. This is a prophetically significant role that the *Trumpet* has believed for over two decades that Iran would fulfill. Probably nothing has highlighted the truth of this analysis more than what just happened. You can read the proof behind this conclusion in our booklet *The King of the South*.

Most broadly, this deal puts Iran on a path to have crushing sanctions lifted and to take its place in the global economy—even while it maintains its nuclear program.

This agreement stipulates that Iran can continue to develop and improve advanced centrifuge machines that can be used to fuel reactors or bombs. Advanced centrifuges are unnecessary for peaceful nuclear power generation, which Iran has repeatedly insisted is the only purpose for its nuclear program. Such centrifuges are only essential if Iran wants to "sprint for a nuclear bomb."

This agreement does not even address Iran's intercontinental ballistic missile program, another project that is useful only for the delivery of weapons of mass destruction.

Under this deal, for a limited time, Iran is not allowed to enrich uranium. Those restrictions gradually go away after a prescribed number of years, as few as eight and as many as 15. This aspect of the deal belies the fundamental gamble underpinning the agreement: Essentially, the United States and these other nations hope that by that future time, the Iranian regime will have become so enmeshed in the global community, and that the overwhelmingly youthful Iranian population will have grown to possess such a strong moderating influence, that all will be well.

Put another way, at the foundation of this deal lies the notion that, in the end, Iran can be trusted.

When he announced the agreement, President Barack Obama said, "This deal is not built on trust, it is built on verification." It is unclear exactly what makes him so confident in outside nations' verification ability, considering how much Iran has repeatedly deceived nuclear inspectors. But that reality aside, there is no denying the fact that it *is*, in fact, ultimately based on trust. The whole arrangement is built on faith that over time, given proper engagement by and collaboration with other nations, Iran will blossom into a stabilizing force within the Middle East.

Now, however, with this agreement in place, the money is going to start to flow into Iran again.

Soon, we will be able to witness the results.

This agreement says sanctions would "snap back" if Iran violates its terms. This is almost certainly impractical and thus untrue. As many analysts have noted, it took enormous effort to convince the world to agree to the sanctions to begin with. It is ludicrous to think that Russia and China, for example—which have been so resistant to punitive measures against Iran and so eager to find ways around them—will reimpose them once they have been removed.

Once Iran's seized assets are released and the sanctions start to come off, once oil money again starts flowing into Iran, watch what happens.

So what will Iran do? What sort of behavior will we see within the coming 6 to 12 months?

Considering how emphatically this underscores Iran's dominance of the region, it seems inevitable that all its nefarious activity over the last 2½ decades to pursue that dominance is going to start ramping up.

What will happen in Afghanistan? What will happen in Iraq? In both of these theaters Iran has invested substantial resources to foment trouble, to create problems for the West, and to spread its influence. Iraq in particular is squarely in Iran's sights for something of a long-term conquest—as the *Trumpet* has diligently tracked, and as is [revealed in biblical prophecy](#).

What will happen with Saudi Arabia and other Arab states? These nations, fearful of an ascendant Iran, have been stridently opposed to this nuclear agreement—precisely because it is so clearly favorable to Iran. They insist that whatever concessions Iran receives for its nuclear program, they are entitled to receive as well. Even the negotiation process appeared to be setting off an [arms race throughout the Middle East](#). This too is an extremely dangerous consequence to watch for.

More specifically from a prophetic standpoint, the strengthening of Iran's position is catalyzing [an alliance among these Arab nations](#). This is prophesied in the Bible, and it is increasingly taking shape as an *anti-Iran* alliance.

Another critical nation to watch is Germany. The *Trumpet* has forecast and tracked [Berlin's response to Iran's rise](#), and how, because of the U.S.'s policy of appeasement and its broken will, Germany is preparing itself for what it views as an inevitable confrontation with Iran. What will happen with Germany? Watch for it. Pay special attention for it to become even more involved with those anti-Iranian Arab nations, which is also prophesied.

What's going to happen with the Islamic State? This Islamist group's barbaric antics have demanded a lot of attention and aroused a lot of fear lately. By comparison, Tehran has emerged looking quite moderate and reasonable. It has even found itself on the same side as the U.S. and the West in fighting the Islamic State. From Iran's perspective, this has served as a useful distraction during nuclear talks. But now that a deal has been struck, and particularly once Iran is flush with cash and far freer to do as it pleases, we could well see it rise up against the Islamic State and deal with it powerfully and decisively, putting to rest any confusion about who rules the region.

What will happen with Israel? It has emerged as practically the only nation unreservedly critical of this agreement. This whole process of negotiations has progressively left Israel more vulnerable and isolated than it has ever been. This deal exacerbates both its isolation and its vulnerability. This too is deeply significant from a [prophetic perspective](#).

Perhaps the most fearsome question of all is, *what will happen when Iran gets a nuclear weapon?*

This deal was supposed to prevent this. In reality, it *guarantees* it—it is simply a matter of time. The *Trumpet* has warned for years about how the Bible's description of the sequence of end-time events reveals it will be a radical Middle East power that triggers World War III. It also reveals emphatically that this war will be a [nuclear war](#).

This truly was a historic deal. It is setting the course for the Mideast from this point forward—and for nations far beyond that region. Soon the whole world will recognize just what a decisive moment in human history this agreement really was.

 Follow Joel Hilliker



'The Most Robust and Intrusive Inspections and Transparency Regime Ever Negotiated?'

Brent Nagtegaal | July 17



WE TALKED ABOUT THIS

IN DEFENSE OF THE NUCLEAR DEAL WITH IRAN, UNITED STATES President Barack Obama has repeatedly touted that under the terms of the agreement, Iran is now subject to "the most robust and intrusive inspections and transparency regime ever negotiated for any nuclear program in history."

Is it true? The answer to that question does much to determine whether this is a good deal or not.

In President Obama's mind, there are two possibilities going forward after this deal is ratified.

The first is that Iran will hold to its side of the agreement: that it will not further enrich nuclear material, and it will reduce its stockpile at some locations. In this fairyland, Iran, driven by blissful economic success, will realize the error of 3½ decades of Islamic revolution and join the international community.

The second option is that Iran breaks the agreement and increases production of nuclear material for a bomb. In this instance, President Obama believes that the international

community will have more time than it has right now to forcefully stop the creation of the bomb.

Initially, that deal sounds good. What is there to lose?

Knowledgeable observers realize that the key to the president's arguments rests on the international community's ability to detect whether Iran is complying with the agreement.

For a moment, let's accept the idea that the international community would, in fact, act forcefully if Iran is seen to be breaking the deal. Iran has agreed to allow monitoring at its *known* nuclear facilities at Natanz and Fordow.

But what about future secret facilities? What happens on the off chance Iran tries something sly, cunning and deceitful—like covertly creating other nuclear facilities elsewhere without letting the world know? (If history is anything to go by, this is likely, considering that both Natanz and Fordow were clandestine facilities until the Western intelligence community found them.)

If one day the intelligence community happens to notice suspicious actions at the new site, what then?

If the deal did include the *most robust and intrusive inspections and transparency regime ever negotiated*, surely scientists

from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) would have immediate access to the suspect site to determine whether or not Iran, a known violator of such agreements, has broken the rules.

Alas, this is not the case. Instead, a complex process of back and forth gets initiated in which IRAN WOULD HAVE AROUND A MONTH TO REMOVE AND STASH THE FUEL AND POTENTIALLY DESTROY THE FACILITY.

“Unfortunately, when you examine the details, you discover that the inspection mechanism for undeclared military sites is actually just a mirage,” said Yuval Steinitz, Israeli M.K. and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s point man on Iran. “This is not just a worthless inspection method—it serves the Iranians. It’s backfiring. It’s counterproductive. It’s better to have an agreement without it,” Steinitz said.

He said that the fact that the Iranians have so much time will actually embolden them to cheat.

Netanyahu also denounced the inspection clauses. “Can you

imagine giving a drug dealer 24 days’ notice before you inspect the premises?” he asked. “That’s a lot of time to flush a lot of meth down the toilet.”

Far from being *the most robust and intrusive inspections and transparency regime ever negotiated*, this agreement doesn’t allow scientists to intrude anywhere.

But instead of dealing with a drug dealer, we are dealing with a religiously motivated rogue regime’s quest for a nuclear bomb whose desire has always been to use it!

Far from curbing Iran’s nuclear program, the deal has made it more difficult for the West to stop Iran’s path to a bomb.

The Iranians were still building a bomb while under constant threat of attack of its nuclear sites by the U.S. and Israel and while under economic sanctions. How can anyone believe they will not do so when they are flooded with cash and they know they have a month to act before the world will do a thing?

 Follow [Brent Nagtegaal](#)

Much Worse Than Munich

Rick Richman, Commentary | July 15

IF ONE PERUSES THE PAGES OF THE *NEW YORK TIMES* FROM mid-September 1938 through the first week of October 1938, it is apparent that what we are witnessing today is a virtual replay of those three weeks—only worse.

Two weeks before the Sept. 30, 1938 Munich agreement, Germany increased its demands, while promising (the *Times* reported) “heartily reciprocal cooperation in the work of solving other problems incidental to a wider European settlement.” A week before the agreement, German “demands had become higher,” but Hitler reassured Chamberlain that they were his “final” ones. A few days before the signing, Hitler appeared before 15,000 people in Berlin’s largest auditorium, where the “Sieg Heils” from the audience “were heard around the globe, for Hitler had a world hook-up” on radio. Chamberlain sent a letter to Hitler stating that Germany’s demands were unacceptable but urged continued negotiations, because “force produces no solution.” By the end of the week, Chamberlain had accepted virtually all of Hitler’s demands. The British leader was, the *Times* reported, “obviously exhausted and had resolved to make an end of the whole business.”

As soon as the Munich capitulation was signed, it was portrayed as a great success. In the letters published in the *Times* in the first week of October, one finds 1) a letter suggesting that “the führer was finally swayed by the moderates” around him and predicting a “more moderate” German policy “from now on”; 2) a letter asserting the “gains” from the Munich agreement “far outweigh the sacrifice” and that Hitler would now “be required to make good his assurance that he has no further territorial claims”; 3) a letter arguing Munich was “the greatest tribute” to Britain and France, since they had exhibited “solicitude for their civilians” by rejecting war; 4) a letter alleging that the “tumultuous cheers given to Mr. Chamberlain in Munich were not so much because he gave Sudetenland back to Germany as because he brought peace”; 5) a letter urging readers not to concentrate on “bemoaning what

Czechoslovakia lost,” but to focus on “this outstanding defeat of Hitler’s,” since it had been “proved beyond doubt” that Hitler now realized that “power politics does not work anymore.”

On Oct. 9, 1938, the *Times* published its weekly “News of the Week in Review,” which observed that a “new Europe began to emerge last week ... as new alignments appeared over the horizon.” There was little doubt, the *Times* noted, that Germany would soon dominate Eastern Europe and the Balkans, but it reported that Britain saw the agreement as the first step toward stabilizing the Continent. The countries most directly affected, however, had “many doubts,” and made it clear that in the future “they would depend less upon the bulwark of diplomacy than upon the strength of their arms.” The *Times* then described what had happened during the week:

“Britain, [with] the crisis over ... kept aloof from the events in Czechoslovakia while the government defended its foreign policy in a full-dress Parliamentary debate. From the start, even though some of the nation’s best speakers were ranged against Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, the outcome was never in doubt.

“Debate was opened by Alfred Duff Cooper, former First Lord of the Admiralty, who resigned in protest against the Chamberlain policy. ‘The prime minister,’ he said ‘has believed in addressing Herr Hitler through the language of sweet reasonableness. I have believed he was more open to the language of the mailed fist.’ Because he could not ‘swallow’ the Munich agreement, he had resigned. ‘I can still,’ he told Parliament, ‘walk about the world with my head erect.’

“Winston Churchill attacked the Munich agreement as an ‘unmitigated defeat’ for Britain and prophesied that it would be but ‘the bitter foretaste of a bitter cup which will be proffered to us year by year unless by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigor we rise again and take our stand for freedom as in olden times.’

“Prime Minister Chamberlain and his supporters defended

what had been done. Said Mr. Chamberlain: "The government deserves approval ... for its conduct of affairs in this recent crisis which saved Czechoslovakia from destruction and Europe from Armageddon." He insisted that negotiations with the dictatorships, that agreements with them, were the sole alternative to war." ...

What we are living through now is worse than Munich, not only because we are ignoring the lesson learned from that event ... but because even Chamberlain would be shocked at what is transpiring again.

Chamberlain implemented what was, at the time, a mainstream theory of international relations—that appeasing a dictatorship with respect to its colorable claims could limit its ultimate aims. But at least Chamberlain did not pay Hitler a huge amount of money for signing the agreement. At least he did not finance Hitler's regime at home and his plans abroad. At least he did not publicly assure him he could be a "very successful regional power." At least he did not proceed without a parliamentary majority. At least he did not adopt a constitutionally suspect procedure enabling him to prevail with a one-third partisan minority. At least he did not assure his fellow citizens they could rest assured it was a good deal because it would have his name on it. At least he did not negotiate a time-limited agreement and acknowledged it would put Germany in a position to prevail at

the end of the agreement.

In the past two weeks, Iran increased its demands while holding out the possibility of a new era once the agreement was signed. The "moderate" Iranian president marched with huge crowds behind him holding signs reading "Death to America" and "Death to Israel," with the pictures flashed throughout the world with the world hook-up of the Internet. After an exhausting 17 days of negotiations, with "deadlines" serially ignored by Iran and seriatim U.S. concessions escalating as they went along, the president and secretary of state made an end of the whole business by accepting virtually all of Iran's demands, while paving the path toward its ultimate goal.

In 1938, there was Winston Churchill's prophetic eloquence and Alfred Duff Cooper's principled resignation, but they were insufficient to stop the biggest disaster of the 20th century. In the United States 77 years later, Congress will have not one week, but 60 days, to review what is worse than Munich. It is more than enough time to understand the pending disaster. But because of the procedure the president has adopted, the question is not what the majority of the Congress thinks but what one third of it does. We are about to find out if there are any senators and representatives in today's Democratic Party comparable to Churchill or Cooper.

EUROPE

Trumpet Hour

GREECE CONQUERED BY GERMANY—AND THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL | JULY 17

HOW THE IRANIAN NUCLEAR DEAL WILL CHANGE THE WORLD | JUNE 15

T NATO's Weakness Will Make Europe Stronger Richard Palmer | July 14

NATO has suffered a quarter of a century of existential angst. After all, what does an alliance forged to defend the West against Russia do once Russia has lost? NATO has lost an enemy and is yet to find a role.

This dissonance is at the core of NATO's weakness. And it was exposed in last month's Pew poll.

The survey asked, "If Russia got into a serious military conflict with one of its neighboring countries that is our NATO ally, do you think our country should or should not use military force to defend that country."

Collective defense is at the heart of NATO, under its Article v. But across Western Europe, a clear majority wanted to abandon its allies. In France, 53 percent said no to defending an ally, compared with 47 percent who said yes. In Italy, it was 51 percent against to 40 percent in favor. Germany was the most decisive, with 58 percent saying they should not defend a NATO ally and only 38 percent saying they should.

The poll also showed that Poland's trust in the United States for defense has collapsed. Only 49 percent believe America will defend a NATO ally. And no wonder. [America had promised to](#)

[defend Ukraine](#), for example. That didn't do Ukraine much good.

Where is this leading? Paradoxically, to closer military cooperation within Europe.

Consider Poland's situation. It knows it cannot defeat Russia in an all-out war. To have a chance to survive or, even better, to prevent such a war, it knows it needs allies.

Now, if you're not sure your allies will honor a piece of paper they've signed, how do you make sure they'll protect you? You hug them closer. Invite them into your country. Have them build bases in your borders. Have your soldiers serve in their armies. Make it almost impossible for an enemy to attack you without attacking them too.

This is exactly what Poland is doing. A great deal of that reaching out is aimed at America. But there's one more country they're working hard to draw close to—Germany.

This strategy of drawing close to wavering allies is exactly what we see with NATO's new Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (VJTF), deployed for the first time in Poland last month. Designed to deploy to any NATO state in 48 hours, it is NATO's fastest responding unit. In its initial configuration it strongly involves Germany. The VJTF

is built around the German-Dutch Army Corp. The Corp's staff make up the command units of the new force. The head of the Corp, Lt.-Gen. Volker Halbauer, is the head of the interim VJTF. In fact, this interim VJTF is essentially a rebranded German-Dutch Corp with a few other units bolted on. Even when it reaches its full strength of 5,000 soldiers, one fifth of them will be German.

Historically it's an incredibly odd situation. The Germans have been put in charge of a new blitzkrieg force and invited into Poland.

That's a potent symbol of what is going on here: Eastern Europe fears Russia, doesn't trust American guarantees or its NATO allies, and so is forced into close cooperation with Germany.

This close integration goes beyond NATO. The Dutch Army has

three brigades. One is officially part of the German Army, and a second is [on its way to joining](#). The Netherlands is signing the heart and core of its army over to Germany. [Poland and Germany are beginning on a similar path](#) together. Their two navies closely cooperate and their armies have swapped a battalion to pave the way for future cooperation—a Polish battalion is serving in the German Army and vice versa.

Watch for the combination of a strong Russia and weak-willed U.S. to force European states to bind together in exactly the way the *Trumpet* has forecast for years. For more information on Europe's strategy to create a combined European army, read our article "[Under Construction](#)." [Follow Richard Palmer](#)

ASIA



Russia and China Unite (Crimea)

Gerald Flurry,
The Key of David | July 17

China has announced to the world that it agrees with Russia's invasion of Crimea in Ukraine.



Expanding the Empire: Russia Continues Slow Advance Into Georgian Territory

Jeremiah Jacques | July 17



WE TALKED ABOUT THIS

GEOORGIA IS CALLING ON THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY TO "properly respond" to Russia's ongoing creeping occupation of Georgian territory.

On July 10, Russian forces placed new "border" markers in several villages near Georgia's central highway. This action, according to Georgian officials, brought a new strip of Georgian territory more than a mile wide under Russian control. The newly occupied territory includes part of a major BP-operated oil pipeline.

"We've lost most of our fields," said a farmer from Tsitelubani, one of the villages affected by the newly declared border. "The Russians said we are no longer allowed there."

The move is the latest in a series of Russian operations, which

analysts say are part of Moscow's creeping annexation of South Ossetia and Abkhazia—both breakaway Georgian territories. Russia has occupied the two territories since 2008 after a brief war with Georgia. Now, Russia appears to be expanding the Georgian territories it holds.

Georgia's Foreign Ministry urged the international community to stand up against these Russian actions that "violate fundamental principles of the international law." Georgia is seeking membership of the NATO military alliance. It has no diplomatic relations with Moscow, and says one of its foreign policy aims is to avoid antagonizing Russia.

Since Georgia lies on the ever deepening geopolitical fault line between Russia and Europe, accomplishing this aim will not be easy. [Follow Jeremiah Jacques](#)



Connecting the Empire: Russia Approves Construction of \$4 Billion Bridge to Crimea

Jeremiah Jacques | July 16

THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT APPROVED PLANS ON JULY 6 TO build a bridge connecting the Russian mainland to the Crimean Peninsula.

Reports from earlier this year said the [12-mile bridge](#) will span the Kerch Strait through the Tuzla spit, which divides Russia's Krasnodar region from Crimea. The design will accommodate a

railway and four lanes of automobile traffic. At an estimated cost of \$4 billion, it will be the most expensive bridge Russia has ever built. Completion is expected by December 2018.

The Crimean Peninsula was Ukrainian territory until last March, when it was absorbed into the Russian Federation. The absorption happened after covert Russian forces had occupied government buildings in Crimea, and later supervised a referendum on whether the people of the peninsula wanted to join Russia or not. Moscow

claims that 96.8 percent voted in favor of union with Russia.

The bridge project could allay concerns among some Westerners who speculate that Russia wants to annex regions of eastern Ukraine in order to make a “land bridge” connecting Crimea to mainland Russia. With plans now approved to build an actual bridge over the water, Russia would have a connection to Crimea without needing to pry away other territories from Ukraine.

 Follow [Jeremiah Jacques](#)

Goodbye, Global Zero, and Hello, a More Dangerous World **Breitbart | July 12**

AS RECENTLY AS 2010, U.S.-RUSSIAN RELATIONS WERE IMPROVING. ... Unfortunately, Russia's deeds over the past year have dashed these hopes, as highlighted by President Obama's nominee for Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Joseph Dunford, in his confirmation testimony: “If you want to talk about a nation that could pose an existential threat to the United States, I'd have to point to Russia If you look at their behavior, it's nothing short of alarming.”

Russia's creeping expansion borrows tactics from the Chinese. It integrates paramilitary units to produce a *casus belli* for intervention, conventional force to coerce or threaten its neighbors, and counter-intervention measures to dissuade Western involvement.

An alarming development is that Russia contemplates the early use of small-yield, tactical nuclear weapons and withering cyberattacks to dissuade the United States and Europe. It is an effective asymmetric play.

It also directly challenges the underpinnings of U.S. deterrence. ...

Russian use of small-yield nuclear weapons as a war-fighting tool early in a conflict could limit U.S. or NATO options to retaliate with its arsenal of large-yield nuclear weapons. U.S. strategic weapons were not built for war fighting but for deterrence. They were meant to be the ultimate reprisal weapon. ...

It begs the question whether the deterrence logic of the U.S. large-yield nuclear arsenal remains credible. This has been a key underpinning of successful U.S. deterrence for 70 years. But it depended on the Russians believing the U.S. would use these weapons when pressed.

Persistent cyberattacks against U.S. commercial networks

could not only devastate the U.S. economy but also disrupt U.S. conventional military operations that depend on these networks. If the U.S. is banking on conventional force to deter Russian use of small-yield nuclear weapons, this vulnerability is so attractive that it could serve to incentivize a Russian attack. ...

While the idea of exchanging nuclear weapons is indeed horrific, the unthinkable is quite thinkable for other world leaders. The nation and future presidents deserve credible tools to respond. Abandoning the notion of a secure United States free of nuclear weapons is a great first move. Only then can we begin to think about and truly understand deterrence in a more dangerous world.

“The Russia-China axis is no longer merely a forecast. It is here, and it is changing the world. The world now faces the most serious crisis since World War II, and it is thanks in part to America's broken will and mismanaged power. In their book, Schoen and Kaylan argue that ‘only a rebirth of American global leadership can counter the corrosive impact of this anti-democratic alliance, which may soon threaten the peace and security of the world.’ Such a rebirth won't come about by something as meaningless as ‘getting the GOP back in the White House.’ The nation's illnesses are too numerous and too deep-rooted to be remedied by a topical balm of that kind. But there is a solution for America's crisis in leadership, and for the increasing power, cooperation and belligerence of the Russia-China axis. To understand it, read [Russia and China in Prophecy](#).” *Trumpet*, January 2015

China Just Revealed How Much Gold It's Been Hoarding for the First Time Since 2009 **Business Insider | July 17**

BACK IN APRIL WE WROTE THAT “THE MYSTERY OF CHINA'S GOLD Holdings Is Coming to an End” as a result of China's willingness to add the yuan to the IMF's SDR currency basket, which would require the disclosure of China's gold holding ahead of an IMF meeting on SDR composition which may be held in October.

By way of background, the reason why everyone has been so focused on Chinese official gold holdings is that there has been no official update to the gold inventory of the world's biggest nation, which have been fixed at 33.89 million ounces since April 2009, a little over 1,000 tons. In other words, the PBOC's gold

inventory has been “unchanged” for over six years, which is in stark contrast to the ravenous buying of physical gold China has been engaging in for the past five years.

As we further noted in April, “with China disclosing so little about its hoard, finding out how much the central bank has in its vaults is of increasing interest to traders. Confirmation of bigger holdings would signal the importance of the metal as a reserve asset and boost market sentiment, TD Securities' Melek said. At a time when prices are languishing, the buying could give support, said Suki Cooper, director of commodities at Barclays Plc

in New York.” ...

Well, the long-awaited moment has finally arrived and this morning, after a six-year delay, China finally admitted that it had been misrepresenting its gold holdings for a very long time, when it

announced that its gold holdings had increased from 38.89 million to 53.31 million troy ounces, a 57 percent increase “in one month.” ...

China had to wait until its stock market was crashing to present the “systemic stability” bazooka: gold. ...

Japan's Lower House Passes Bills to Give Military Freer Hand to Fight **New York Times | July 16**

THE LOWER HOUSE OF JAPAN'S PARLIAMENT PASSED LEGISLATION on Thursday that would give the country's military limited powers to fight in foreign conflicts for the first time since World War II.

The lawmakers acted despite broad public opposition to the legislation, which has set off Japan's largest demonstrations since the aftermath of the Fukushima nuclear accident four years ago. ...

The bills represent a break from the strictly defensive stance maintained by Japan in the decades since the war, under which it would fight only if directly attacked. ...

[Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo] Abe has presented the package as an unavoidable response to new threats facing Japan, in particular the growing military power of China. ...

China condemned passage of the bills, describing them as a potential threat to peace in Asia and invoking the memory of Japan's wartime aggression. ...

If it clears the remaining procedural hurdles, the legislation is

likely to face challenges in the courts, but to what effect is uncertain. The Constitution, written by Japan's American occupiers after the war, states that “the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.” ...

Mr. Abe has long argued that the Constitution should be amended to remove its restrictive antiwar provisions, but changing the charter would require a national referendum that he would probably lose. ...

“Japan's shift away from pacifism and toward becoming a full-fledged military power has long been a focus of the Trumpet as well as our forerunner, the Plain Truth. We have drawn attention to the shift because we believe it will culminate in a violent conflict affecting millions, possibly even billions. ... Japan's march toward militarization points to a dark future.”

Trumpet, August 2015

Putin Rebuilds Russia's Military While U.S. Strategy Is All Over the Map **Breaking Defense | July 13**

THANKS TO PUTIN, THE RUSSIAN STAVKA (OR NATIONAL HIGH command) has enjoyed a rebirth with the infusion of new, young blood into the Russian Armed Forces' senior ranks.

Having reorganized Russia's army, creating mobile armored battle groups of 6,000 troops under generals to replace its aging and unwieldy division structures, Putin is reequipping it with new weapon systems creating new capabilities in the process. ...

Putin has answered the key questions in Russia's national military strategy: Where do we fight? Whom do we fight? How do we fight? Russia will fight in Eastern Europe to expand Russia's borders and in Northeast Asia to secure its control of eastern Siberia's resources. Russia's forces will fight as an integrated

force structure responsive to unified national military command in Moscow.

Meanwhile, America's new National Military Strategy fails to ask, let alone answer, the critical questions for our national defense. ...

In contrast to Putin's laser-like focus on these issues, Washington is all over the map. In Asia, Washington ignores the impact of China's aggressive posture in the South China Sea. ... In the Middle East, Washington seems unable to decide who its friends and enemies really are. ... Building effective military power takes time, resources and imagination.

Now is the time to build for the future. Putin gets it. Do we?

‘China Would Be the Bank and Russia Would Be the Big Gun’ in Central Asia **Business Insider | July 15**

WE ARE SEEING THE EMERGENCE OF A DUAL POWER STRUCTURE in Central Asia, with China as the dominant economic power and Russia as the big security player.

Or, as Alexander Gabuev, senior associate and the chair [for] Russia in the Asia-Pacific program at the Carnegie Moscow Center, told *Foreign Policy*: “China would be the bank and Russia would be the big gun.”

China continues to take the lead in economic-power ventures, including the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and the potential SCO development bank (which Russia is finally warming

up to). Additionally, China has become the main moneylender in Central Asia: Its trade volume with the region surpassed that of Russia in 2009.

At the same time, Russia wants to keep its military bases and arms deals in Central Asia, along with the Collective Security Treaty Organization, a security bloc of former Soviet countries.

China “sees economics as power,” according to a report by Stratfor. “For Beijing, military might rests on a strong economic base, and global power stems as much from the ability to shape global markets as it does from military force.” ...

Chattanooga Shootings: Four Marines and Gunman Dead in Rampage at Tennessee Military Facilities

NBC News | July 17



WE TALKED ABOUT THIS

A GUNMAN UNLEASHED A BARRAGE OF GUNFIRE AT TWO MILITARY centers in Chattanooga Thursday, killing four Marines, injuring a police officer and a Marine recruiter, and critically injuring a Navy sailor, authorities said.

The gunman was killed after a shootout with police at the second facility, authorities said. An autopsy is pending, and it is not clear whether police killed him or he killed himself.

The gunman was identified as Mohammed Youssuf Abdulazeez,

24. He was a naturalized U.S. citizen from Kuwait, a federal official said. ...

Authorities offered no immediate information on a motive. Bill Killian, the top federal prosecutor for eastern Tennessee, said the attack was being investigated as an act of domestic terrorism.

The shootings began at around 10:45 a.m. and occurred over about 30 minutes and six miles apart, first at a military recruitment station and then at a Navy and Marines reserve center. A defense official said the gunman used an automatic weapon. ...

Obama Writes Personal Letters to 46 Felons; No Contact with Kathryn Steinle's Family

Breitbart | July 13

NEARLY TWO WEEKS AFTER 32-YEAR-OLD KATHRYN STEINLE WAS murdered on San Francisco's Pier 14 by an illegal alien and convicted felon who was released from prison earlier this year, President Barack Obama has failed to contact the victim's family or mention her in public. Yet Obama took the time to write (and release) 46 personal letters this month to felons imprisoned for non-violent drug offenses whose sentences he has commuted.

Like the 46 felons to whom Obama wrote, Juan Francisco

Lopez-Sanchez had served time for non-violent offenses, some of them drug-related. After his arrest, Lopez-Sanchez, who had been deported five times to Mexico, confessed to shooting Steinle as she walked with her family at the popular tourist spot. ...

Critics have noted that Obama was quick to reach out to the family of Michael Brown, who was killed while charging a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, last year, enhancing Brown's heroic status to drive a political narrative. ...

Krauthammer on Iran Nuclear Deal: 'This Is Quite Insane'

Fox News | July 14

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER REACTED ON "SPECIAL REPORT" TO THE nuclear agreement with Iran, stating that "this is quite insane."

He stated that even skeptics of the deal were "shocked by the degree of the capitulation."

Krauthammer asserted that "a farce" of the whole inspection process is made by giving Iran up to 24 days to grant permission to international inspectors.

He added that lifting the embargo on ballistic missiles and

conventional arms is even worse, because Iran is going to use the billions of dollars they're going to get to provide weapons to all of their allies around the region.

"They are now going to be able to acquire the most sophisticated land-to-ship missiles to deny us, not our allies, the U.S. Navy, control of the Persian Gulf ... which we have had for half a century," Krauthammer said. "This is quite insane." ...

David Cameron Will Take Whatever Abuse the Eurocrats Dish Out

Daniel Hannan, Capx | July 16

IMAGINE THAT A GANG OF REGULARS FROM YOUR LOCAL PUB ASKED you to join them in an investment scheme. Suppose you politely declined, only for them to start pestering you.

"Listen," they say, "if you don't get involved you'll regret it for the rest of your life. In fact, if you insist on staying out, you might not be quite so welcome in this pub in future."

You mull it over, and you're just not convinced. You wish them well, but it's really not your kind of thing. "Well then, suit yourself," they reply coldly, turning back to their pints.

Not long afterwards, their investments go sour, and they demand that you bail them out. "Hang on," you say. "How is this

my problem?" "We're not asking you, we're telling you," they declare. "We've just had a vote. You lost. Hand over your wallet."

That's pretty much how the EU is treating Britain and the other non-eurozone states, insisting that they pay to rescue a currency that they declined to join.

The really outrageous thing is not so much the cash as the dishonesty. I mean, don't get me wrong, the cash matters This is, as the French say, an important amount of money.

But even if it's paid back promptly, the EU has shown itself so untrustworthy, so unable to keep to a contract, that Britain's coming renegotiation must be considered a waste of time.

In 2010, the EU agreed that the European Financial Stability Mechanism, to which the UK had contributed, would not be used to bail out the euro. Instead, a new pot was created, filled only by states within the single currency.

David Cameron didn't just get a gentlemen's agreement; he got a binding, written guarantee. Yet the moment that guarantee became inconvenient, Jean-Claude Juncker and his fellow commissioners—to say nothing of the other heads of government—tore it up.

How can we deal with an organization that behaves this way? Whatever we think we have consented to, it can be altered

whenever Brussels feels like it.

Ministers are hoping to sell changes in Britain's relationship with the EU to voters in a referendum next year. But voters can now see that such changes won't be worth the paper they're written on. ...

The point is that, by officially proposing to activate the fund, in clear breach of all its commitments, the European Commission has shown itself to be an unreliable negotiating partner. The criticism that Eurocrats leveled against Yannis Varoufakis—that you can't deal with someone who won't stick to his word—applies precisely, from a British point of view, to them. ...

Pentagon Announces Plan Aimed at Lifting Transgender Ban in Military

Associated Press | July 13

DEFENSE SECRETARY ASH CARTER SAYS THE PENTAGON'S current regulations banning transgender individuals from serving in the military are outdated, and anyone willing to serve the country should be able to do so.

Carter is creating a working group to do a six-month study on the impact of lifting the ban. Carter says the group will begin with the presumption that transgender people should be able to serve openly.

The plan, which was first reported by the Associated Press, gives the services time to work through questions about health care, housing, physical standards, uniforms and costs associated with the change. ...

Some of the key concerns involved in the repeal of the ban

include whether the military would conduct or pay for the medical costs, surgeries and other treatment associated with any gender transition, as well as which physical training or testing standards transgender individuals would be required to meet during different stages of their transition.

Officials said the military also wants time to tackle questions about where transgender troops would be housed, what uniforms they would wear, what berthing they would have on ships, which bathrooms they would use and whether their presence would affect the ability of small units to work well together. The military has dealt with many similar questions as it integrated the ranks by race, gender and sexual orientation. ...

Looking Good, Pluto

LA Times | July 17



WE TALKED ABOUT THIS

NASA TOOK A FLIER ON ITS PHOTO SAFARI TO PLUTO, BETTING that a journey of 9½ years and 3 billion miles to get sort of close and not even stop would yield some great pix. It did; in fact, what the New Horizons spacecraft sent back was a revelation. The flyby returned images of towering icy mountains on the scale of the Rockies, unexpected features on the least understood planet—dwarf planet, really—in our solar system. Not only were NASA officials counting on the spacecraft the size of a grand piano getting to Pluto, they were assuming they could keep communicating with it over that distance—no mean feat, considering how tricky it can be to keep a mobile phone connection on a car trip from one end of town to the other.

NASA's venture to the farthest reaches of the solar system is a credit to scientific perseverance and chance-taking. It's a reminder that while science and technology have given us

marvels of speed such as instant messaging, Instagramming and Netflix (OK, maybe not Netflix), they have also given us extraordinary discoveries that required enormously lengthy investments of time. Consider that when New Horizons launched, in January 2006, Barack Obama wasn't yet running for president and Pluto was still a full-fledged planet. (It got downgraded later that year.) ...

Over time, the information gathered will not only teach scientists more about Pluto but may also yield insights into the beginnings of other planets and of our solar system. ...

Space exploration, manned and unmanned, that takes us beyond the solar system will require even lengthier commitments of time and discipline. But it will enhance our knowledge of our universe and our world. And in this instance, it's nice to see Pluto, nine years after its demotion, rehabilitated as a wondrous object.

TW IN BRIEF

Food stamp beneficiaries top 45 million for 48 straight months: The number of people receiving food stamps has exceeded 45 million for 48 straight months, according to data released by the Department of Agriculture. The number of

recipients first broke the 45 million mark in May 2011. It hit a record over 47 million in December 2012. Households on food stamps on average received a benefit of \$256 per month. When the food stamp program was first initiated in 1969, it assisted 2.8 million people.