/IN LAMARQUE/AFP/GETTY IMAGES

Trumpet Weekly JANUARY 22, 2016



Iran's Implementation Day: A Landmark for the Middle East



ANUARY 16, 2016, WAS A LANDMARK MOMENT FOR THE MIDDLE East and the world.

It was Implementation Day. That day that America's nuclear agreement with Iran went into effect, and economic sanctions were lifted on this terrorist-sponsoring state.

This put a stamp of finality on anointing Iran "king of the south."
In his column this week, Charles Krauthammer said January
16 "marked a historic inflection point in the geopolitics of the
Middle East. In a stroke, Iran shed almost four decades of roguestate status and was declared a citizen of good standing of the

JOEL HILLIKER

international community, open to trade, investment and diplomacy. This, without giving up, or even promising to change, its policy of subversion and aggression. This, without having forfeited its status as the world's greatest purveyor of terrorism."

This is an earthshaking moment—but it completes a protracted process we at

the Trumpet have closely followed for more than 20 years.

With an eye to biblical prophecy, we reported on Iran's ascent back in the 1990s and foretold how it would come to dominate the region. We showed the acceleration in its upward trajectory in 2001, after America began intervening in the region in the wake of 9/11—launching its "war on terror" by targeting *Afghanistan* rather than going after Iran. "Make no mistake about it: Iran is the head of the snake," we wrote in our November 2001 issue. "[W]e can see unequivocally that the terrorist snake will survive America's aggression—head intact, and *stronger than ever.*"

That is precisely what happened. "Overnight," Krauthammer continued, Iran "went not just from pariah to player but from pariah to dominant regional power, flush with \$100 billion in unfrozen assets and virtually free of international sanctions" (emphasis added throughout). He talked about the billions Iran will receive from oil trade. About how President Hassan Rouhani is now predicting 5 percent annual economic growth, after years of financial malaise and contraction. About how contracts on military deals with European companies are already being signed.

He concluded: "Cash-rich, reconnected with global banking and commerce, and facing an Arab world collapsed into a miasma of raging civil wars, *Iran has instantly become the dominant power of the Middle East.*"

Krauthammer may as well have used the words "king of the south." That is the terminology the *Trumpet* references all the time regarding Iran—in a phrase straight from the prophecy in Daniel 11:40.

IRAN IS THE KING! Everybody can see it. Is it OK to say, "We told you so"? And just as the *Trumpet* has reported for the past 15 years, the United States is astoundingly, shamefully responsible for a great deal of Iran's rise.

Events surrounding Implementation Day forcefully demonstrate this truth. The day the deal was put into effect, January 16, the Obama administration completed a prisoner exchange with Iran that brought four Americans home. Thus, media reportage on the astonishing strategic victory America gave Iran—in the form of international legitimacy and \$100 billion in sanctions relief—was focused instead on a telegenic, heart-warming story about American prisoners being brought home. The White House promoted the narrative that this was wonderful evidence of the power of diplomacy, and of a new era in warmer relations with Iran.

But *another* event on January 16 revealed that there was more to the story. That same day, news broke that three Americans were kidnapped in Baghdad by an Iranian-backed Shiite militia. In one sense, the Obama administration wasn't surprised: One week earlier, the U.S. Embassy in Iraq was reportedly warned that Iranian-sponsored militants were plotting to kidnap American contractors in Iraq. But in another sense, it *was* surprised—and CBS News explained why: "Officials in Washington had hoped the Iranian government would tell the militia group to HOLD OFF because of *all the negotiations surrounding the prisoner swap*"

Apparently, America didn't want anything to jeopardize its Implementation Day photo op! And clearly, Iran couldn't or wouldn't stop one of its proxies from kidnapping the citizens of its negotiation partner. It knows Washington will let it get away with virtually *anything*.

If this is what happened, it is only the latest incident in a disgraceful trend from Washington. In apparent determination to prevent *anything* from derailing the realization of this nuclear agreement, America has been ignoring a tremendous amount of provocative, illegal and warlike behavior by Iran!

In the last couple of months, Iran has tested ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear payloads, in blatant violation of United Nations resolutions that should have set off economic sanctions.

Rather than announcing plans for new sanctions, however, the White House, announced an indefinite delay of those sanctions.

Now, in hindsight, it looks suspiciously like one of the main reasons for the delay was *to avoid jeopardizing the prisoner swap*. On January 17, one day after the trade, the U.S. went ahead and imposed the sanctions pertaining to Iran's ballistic missiles.

Just this month, Iran displayed footage on national television of a new underground cache of precision-guided missiles. The Obama administration has ignored near unanimous calls by both parties in Congress to act. Then came Iran's seizure of two U.S. Navy patrol boats in the Persian Gulf, where it took 10 sailors hostage and filmed them having to drop to their knees at gunpoint and apologize for "trespassing." For that, the Obama administration *thanked* Iran for letting the sailors go without further incident and once again hailed it as an example of a diplomatic victory.

It requires an extraordinarily distorted perspective to view Iran's current behavior as evidence of its rehabilitation. The realistic view is precisely the opposite.

As the Hudson Institute's Michael Pregent told Business Insider, "Once Implementation Day is announced, Iran is going to step up its provocative actions in the region and the hard-liners know this White House won't do a thing about it for the next 12 months."

As if to underline that analysis, *immediately* after the nuclear deal's implementation, the regime in Tehran reviewed the list of about 3,000 candidates hoping to run in next month's parliamentary elections—and eliminated literally 99 percent of them. It only deemed 33 candidates sufficiently in line with its aims to be considered for office.

This is the status quo for Tehran's mullahs. *Nothing* has changed. This is how the Islamic Republic of Iran has always conducted its business. And *everything* the U.S. has done has encouraged and strengthened its position.

The *Tablet*'s Lee Smith wrote that the results of America's capitulation "are likely to prove catastrophic for American allies and, as we shall soon see, America itself. The violence and turmoil may reach epic proportions this year as Iran races for bargains in a fire sale that it believes is coming to an end in January 2017. ... In the meantime, 2016 is going to be a year like no one has ever seen in the modern Middle East."

The United States' waning influence and lack of willpower are on full display. So too are Iran's terrorist activities and waxing belligerence. What we are seeing is directly in line with the Bible's prophecy of a king of the south: an Iran that is newly dominant, stronger than ever, and ready to *push* as never before.

Follow Joel Hilliker

MIDDLE EAST



THE NEXT ECONOMIC COLLAPSE AND GERMANY'S OMINOUS TURN TO THE RIGHT \mid JANUARY 21

MAKE-BELIEVE PEACE: IRAN KIDNAPS THREE MORE AMERICANS | JANUARY 20

IN A WORLD GONE MAD, BRITISH LAWMAKERS GATHER TO DEBATE BANNING DONALD J. TRUMP | JANUARY 19

IRAN USES UNFROZEN CASH FOR TERRORISM, FRANCE'S WAR ON TERROR, AND PUTIN'S TERRORIST ATTACK IN BRITAIN | JANUARY 22

Israel and the Russian Challenge

Caroline Glick, Jerusalem Post | January 18



I SRAELI AIR FORCE COMMANDERS ARE REPORTEDLY DEEPLY WORried about Russia's military presence in Syria.

When Russian President Vladimir Putin deployed his forces to Syria last year, he claimed that the deployment would be brief. ...

Last week, when the terms of the deployment agreement concluded between Russia and Syria were made public, we discovered that those early claims were false. Under the terms of the deal, Russia can maintain permanent bases in Syria. ...

To be sure, Putin's decision to set up permanent bases in Syria is not directed against Israel. ... Russia and Israel have been able to reach tactical agreements over Syria. ...

But Israel's ability to reach tactical understandings with Russia doesn't mean Israel can trust that Russia's operations in the area will not harm its national security in significant ways.

For instance, the reports that Russia is transferring arms to Hezbollah are deeply worrying. For the past five years, according to reports in foreign media, the Air Force has repeatedly bombed shipments of Iranian weapons destined for Hezbollah forces in Lebanon. ...

The government and military have no options for dealing with

Russia's sudden emergence as a major power in our backyard. And there is nothing new in Israel's helplessness.

We've never had an option for reining in Moscow.

Until Barack Obama entered the White House, every U.S. president from Franklin Roosevelt on believed it was a U.S. economic and strategic interest of the first order to curb Russian power in the Middle East. The chief reason the U.S. began its strategic alliance with Israel after the 1967 Six Day War was because by defeating Russian clients Egypt and Syria, Israel proved its value to the U.S.'s Cold War strategy.

In the succeeding decades, Israel and the U.S. had a division of labor. It was Israel's job to defeat or deter Russian—or Soviet—clients in the Arab world. It was the U.S.'s job to deter Russia—or the Soviet Union.

Now, in the final year of the Obama presidency, all that is gone. Obama is content to see Russia exert power and influence that none of his predecessors would have countenanced. And so, for the first time, Israel finds itself standing alone against Russia, with no clear means of protecting its vital national security interests. ...

Why the U.S. Should Stand by the Saudis Against Iran

Bret Stephens, Wall Street Journal | January 19

THERE IS SO MUCH TO DETEST ABOUT SAUDI ARABIA. THE KING-dom forbids women from driving and bars its doors to desperate Syrian refugees. For years its sybaritic leaders purchased their legitimacy by underwriting, and exporting, a bigoted and brutal version of Sunni Islam. Crude oil aside, it's difficult to find much of value produced by the desert kingdom.

More recently, the Saudis have increased tensions with Iran by executing, over U.S. objections, a prominent radical Shiite cleric while waging a brutal war against Iran's Shiite proxies in Yemen. So why should the U.S. feel obliged to take sides with [Riyadh] especially when the administration is also trying to pursue further opening with Tehran? ...

So let's remind ourselves why it would be a bad—make that very bad—idea for the U.S. to abandon the House of Saud, especially when it is under increasing economic strain from falling oil prices and feels acutely threatened by a resurgent Iran. Despite fond White House hopes that the nuclear deal would moderate Iran's behavior, Tehran hard-liners wasted no time this week disqualifying thousands of moderate candidates from running in next month's parliamentary elections, and an Iranian-backed militia appears to be responsible for the recent kidnapping of three Americans in Iraq.

No wonder the Saudis are nervous. The nuclear deal guarantees Iran a \$100 billion sanctions windfall that will offset

its losses from falling oil prices while doing nothing to stop its regional imperialism. Russia's military support for the Assad regime in Syria, along with its sale of advanced weaponry to Tehran, means that Riyadh's regional enemies now enjoy the protection of a major nuclear power. Armed Iranian proxies are active in Lebanon, Syria and Yemen, and dominate much of southern Iraq. Restive Shiite populations in Saudi Arabia's oil-rich Eastern Province and neighboring Bahrain provide further openings for Iranian subversion on the Arabian Peninsula. ...

The U.S. would not be safer without this kind of intelligence cooperation [that it currently maintains with Saudi Arabia]. Much worse would be a scenario in which the monarchy collapsed. The generally depressing results of the Arab Spring don't inspire much hope of a peaceful democratic transition, and Saudi Arabia's internal sectarian and tribal divisions could lead to an outcome similar to Syria's. Islamic State and other jihadist groups would flourish. Iran would seek to extend its reach in the Arabian Peninsula. The kingdom's plentiful stores of advanced Western military equipment would also fall into dangerous hands. ...

As we've seen in Syria, Libya and Iraq, radical Islam flourishes in areas of chaos And a civil war in Saudi Arabia, population 30 million, could lead to a fresh refugee exodus that would further

erode and overwhelm Europe's borders. ...

Foreign alliances are not like wardrobes: You cannot change

them on the tide of fashion. America's 71-year alliance with the kingdom is one we abandon at our peril.

Three Americans Missing in Baghdad Were Kidnapped by an Iran-Backed Militia—and the U.S. Apparently Had Warning Business Insider | January 19

THE U.S. EMBASSY IN IRAQ REPORTEDLY RECEIVED WARNING THAT an Iran-backed Shiite militia wanted to kidnap American contractors operating in Baghdad, an unnamed State Department source told CBS News. ...

Two Iraqi intelligence and two U.S. government sources confirmed to Reuters on Tuesday that the Americans are being held by an Iranian-backed Shiite militia.

"Officials in Washington had hoped the Iranian government would tell the militia group to hold off because of all the negotiations surrounding the prisoner swap that saw the release of five Americans," CBS reported. "The State Department source said the fear was that one of the groups might have 'gone off the reservation."

[If verified, this development] would not be the first time the U.S. delayed taking action on a provocative threat or action from Iran in the name of securing the prisoner swap and finalizing the landmark nuclear deal, as critics were quick to point out.

Iran tested ballistic missiles at least twice in 2015 in violation of a UN resolution, but the U.S. delayed imposing sanctions on individuals connected with the ballistic missile program until after the exchange and the deal were finalized on Saturday.

The imminent prisoner swap might also have explained why the U.S. did not respond more forcefully to videos Iran released of American sailors detained in its waters last week, Middle East analyst Aaron David Miller, a former senior State Department official in Republican and Democratic administrations, noted on Twitter over the weekend. ...

"Once Implementation Day is announced, Iran is going to step up its provocative actions in the region," Michael Pregent, an adjunct fellow at the Hudson Institute and former Defense Department adviser on Iraqi security forces, told Business Insider on Saturday. "And the hard-liners know this White House won't do a thing about it for the next 12 months." ...

A Terror State in Libya

Wall Street Journal | January 18

I SLAMIC STATE FIGHTERS LAUNCHED A NAVAL ASSAULT IN NORTHern Libya last week, dispatching three boats that fired on an oil terminal at Zueitina. Local guards repelled that attack, but it was a reminder of Islamic State's growing capabilities and reach beyond its heartland in Syria and Iraq. Too bad Western capitals seem unprepared to stop it. ...

Following the Zletin truck bombing [that killed 65 people on January 8], the European Union—300 miles across the Mediterranean—offered \$108 million in security assistance to Libya. The aid is supposed to take the form of technical and logistical support to the newly formed Libyan unity government, currently based in neighboring Tunisia. ...

The West's central interest in the region isn't to salvage a Libyan state, assuming that's even possible. It's to ensure that the territory doesn't become a haven for jihadists with access to oil revenues

and a dangerous perch on the Mediterranean. A dedicated NATO bombing campaign, if necessary combined with limited ground forces, to destroy Islamic State in Libya would send the valuable signal that the West won't tolerate such a threat so close to its shores. That signal might also give Libya's factions more incentive to reconcile, but in any case it would make the world safer.

"Now America and the West have paved the way for another Iranian victory in Libya. We are rejoicing about the overthrow of Libya's Muammar Qadhafi, while we should be mourning. Libyan chaos is now the ideal setting for Iran to bring that nation into its deadly terrorist web. The government that replaces Qadhafi will be a thousand times worse."

Gerald Flurry, "Egypt and Libya to Join Iran's Terror Network," Trumpet, October 2011

U.S. Backs European Move to Distinguish Israel From West Bank

Times of Israel | January 20

THE U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT CAME OUT IN SUPPORT OF A EUROpean Union move to distinguish West Bank settlements from Israel proper, and said that settlement product labeling is not tantamount to a boycott.

"Our long-standing position on settlements is clear," State Department spokesman John Kirby said at the department's daily press briefing Tuesday.

"We view Israeli settlement activity as illegitimate and

counterproductive to the cause of peace," he said. "We remain deeply concerned about Israel's current policy on settlements, including construction, planning and retroactive legalizations." ...

The move by the European Council, which was also applied to East Jerusalem, underscored the EU's unhappiness over Israel's

continued expansion of settlements on territory that Palestinians are seeking for a future state. ...

RELATED: "THE COUNTERFEIT PEACEMAKER" AND "BREAKING THE BROTHERHOOD"

Obama's Make-believe Peace With Iran Ushers in a Wild 2016 in the Middle East

Tablet | January 19

T'S HARDLY SURPRISING THAT DURING HIS STATE OF THE UNION address last week, President Barack Obama made no mention of American sailors detained by the naval command of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. ... [N]o matter what the occasion, the Obama White House systematically looks the other way whenever Iran does something intended to provoke the United States.

In the last several months alone, Iran has at least twice tested ballistic missiles, in violation of UN Security Council resolutions. Its military also fired rockets within 1,500 yards of a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Strait of Hormuz. It sentenced, in a secret trial, American journalist Jason Rezaian and imprisoned another Iranian-American national. A few days into the New Year, the regime directed Iranian mobs to set fire to two diplomatic missions belonging to longtime U.S. regional partner Saudi Arabia. That was before they ritually humiliated America by taking its

sailors into custody, photographing them kneeling on deck with their hands on their heads, and then broadcasting those images throughout the Middle East. ...

What's now clear is that the White House is never going to "push back" against Iranian aggression, as it promised Democratic lawmakers who reluctantly signed on to the nuclear deal. Nor will the administration deploy the marvelously named but poorly conceived "snap back" sanctions to check Iranian transgressions. ...

The results are likely to prove catastrophic for American allies and, as we shall soon see, America itself. The violence and turmoil may reach epic proportions this year as Iran races for bargains in a fire sale that it believes is coming to an end in January 2017. ... In the meantime, 2016 is going to be a year like no one has ever seen in the modern Middle East.

Normalizing Iran

Bret Stephens, Wall Street Journal | January 18

HAT BETTER TIME FOR RIGHT-THINKING LIBERALS TO ASK: "IS Iran really so evil?"

That's the title of a revealing essay in *Politico* by Stephen Kinzer "The demonization of Iran is arguably the most bizarre and self-defeating of all U.S. foreign policies," Mr. Kinzer begins. ...

Mr. Kinzer's essay was published Sunday, as sanctions were lifted on Tehran and four of America's hostages came home after lengthy imprisonments. The Obama administration publicly insists that the nuclear deal does not mean the U.S. should take a benign view of Iran, but the more enthusiastic backers of the agreement think otherwise. "Our perception of Iran as a threat to vital American interests is increasingly disconnected from reality," Mr. Kinzer writes. "Events of the past week may slowly begin to erode the impulse that leads Americans to believe patriotism requires us to hate Iran."

What a weird thought. My own patriotism has never been touched one way or another by my views of Iran. ...

Today's liberal foreign policy, to adapt Churchill, is appeasement wrapped in realism inside moral equivalency. When it comes to Iran policy, that means believing that we have sinned at least as much against the Iranians as they have sinned against us; that our national-security interests require us to come to terms

with the Iranians; and that the best way to allay the suspicions—and, over time, diminish the influence—of Iranian hard-liners is by engaging the moderates ever more closely and demonstrating ever greater diplomatic flexibility.

That's a neat theory, proved wrong by experience at every turn.... Now we're supposed to believe that [a change in Iran has] finally arrived. The proof, supposedly, is that the regime has so far kept to its nuclear promises (in exchange for a \$100 billion windfall), that it swiftly released U.S. sailors (after scoring a small propaganda coup), and that it let the other hostages go (though only after very nearly taking the wife and mother of one of those hostages in his turn, and then after an additional \$1.7 billion reward from the U.S.).

Are these signs of a new-and-improved regime? Or merely one that is again being given good reasons to believe that it can always extract a bribe for its bad behavior? ... Any country that believes it will never be made to pay the price for the risks it takes will take ever greater risks. ...

Iran will become a "normal" country only when it ceases to be an Islamic Republic. In the meantime, the only question is how far we are prepared to abase ourselves in our quest to normalize it.

TrumpetHour

THE IRAN THREAT, MERKEL'S LAST STAND, PUTIN-APPROVED MURDER, EPIC DEBT DEFAULTS. AND MORE I JANUARY 22

CHINA'S NEW BANK, TAIWAN'S ELECTION, IRAN'S BILLIONS, AND MORE | JANUARY 21

Europe's New Medieval Map

Robert D. Kaplan, Wall Street Journal | January 15

OOK AT ANY MAP OF EUROPE FROM THE MIDDLE AGES OR THE early modern era, before the Industrial Revolution, and you will be overwhelmed by its dizzying incoherence—all of those empires, kingdoms, confederations, minor states, "upper" this and "lower" that. It is a picture of a radically fractured world. Today's Europe is, in effect, returning to such a map.

The decades of peace and prosperity, from the 1950s to 2009, when the European Union's debt crisis began, made the political and economic contours of the Continent look simple. ...

For the U.S., the reality of this new situation is only just now coming into view. Europe, whose economy rivals that of the U.S. as the largest in the world, remains an asset and an ally, but it is also a profound problem. The pressing question is how to manage it. ...

Europe thus now finds itself facing an unhappy historical irony: The decades in which it was able to develop its high ideals of universal human rights, including the right of the distressed to seek havens in Europe, was made possible, it is now clear, by the oppressive regimes that once held sway on its periphery. The Arab world was slammed shut for decades by prison states whose dictator-wardens kept their people in order. Saddam Hussein in Iraq, the Assad family in Syria, Muammar Qadhafi in Libya—they allowed Europe to have its idealistic cake and eat it, too.

Worse for European unity, geography and history have conspired to make some regions of the Continent more vulnerable to the flood of migrants and refugees than others. ...

Another critical factor in the period of relative stability now coming to an end in Europe was the geopolitical role played by Russia. During the Cold War, the Soviet Union was an obvious strategic threat, but it was a threat well managed by the U.S.

Today, needless to say, Russia is very much back as a strategic player in Europe. Mr. Putin's consolidation of control inside Russia following the infirmity of the Boris Yeltsin era has created a deep divide between Paris and Warsaw, Berlin and Bucharest. ...

As the EU continues to fracture, this power vacuum could create a 21st-century equivalent of the late Holy Roman Empire

This means that there is still no alternative to American leadership in Europe. For the U.S., a Europe that continues to fracture internally and to dissolve externally into the fluid geography of Northern Africa and Eurasia would constitute the greatest foreign-policy disaster since World War II. ...

The decades when we thought of Europe as stable, predictable and dull are over. The Continent's map is becoming medieval again, if not yet in its boundaries then at least in its political attitudes and allegiances. The question today is whether the EU can still hope to permanently replace the multicultural Habsburg Empire, which for centuries sprawled across Central and Eastern Europe and sheltered its various minorities and interests.

The answer will depend not only on what Europe itself does but also on what the U.S. chooses to do. Geography is a challenge, not a fate.

"Europe right now is a place where dreams are beginning to meet reality.... Harsh realities are forcing Europeans to substitute postwar values with basic human urges. Tolerance is being replaced by prejudice, multiculturalism by patriotism, the community spirit with a greater determination for self-preservation and self-advancement."

"Europe's Old Demons Return," Trumpet, November-December 2015

Germany's 'Dirty Deal' With Libya to Stop Migrants

Ben Knight, Deutsche Welle | January 20

G ERMANY'S OPPOSITION LEFT PARTY HAS EXPRESSED ITS SUSPIcions of a "dirty deal" after German Defense Minister Ursula von der Leyen raised the prospect of sending troops to Libya to support a potential unity government in the fractured North African country.

"Germany will not be able to duck its responsibility to make

a contribution," von der Leyen told Monday's edition of the *Bild* newspaper. If a unity government were established in Libya, "it will quickly need help to establish justice and order in this huge state and at the same time fight against Islamist terror."

The Left Party's foreign policy spokesman Jan van Aken said he suspected a "dirty deal" was being hashed out to support the government in exchange for demanding that it prevent more migrants from reaching Europe via Libya's coast.

Germany is one of a number of states (including Italy, France and Britain) currently discussing Libya in Rome, alongside representatives of the European Union and the United Nations, and van Aken claims that not only is a senior Bundeswehr officer among the German delegation, but the countries are planning to send in

ground troops. "The plans for Libya go way beyond training Libyan soldiers," he told the "Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung" newspaper. He also described it as a dangerous move to even start training Libyan soldiers, because "at the moment it is not clear who is fighting who." ...

Providing a new unified Libyan government with a training mission has been on the table in Rome for some time

The EU is already running Operation Sophia to try and thwart human traffickers on the Mediterranean

Of course, the EU has always tried to pressure Libya—and indeed any country on the Mediterranean—into stemming the flow of migrants. Until now, Libya's solution has been internment camps. ...

EU Nations Go It Alone to Guard Against Migration Catastrophe

Bruno Waterfield, David Charter and Francis Elliott, Times | January 21

THE EUROPEAN UNION IS ON THE BRINK OF "CATASTROPHE," THE German vice chancellor warned, after Austria broke ranks to curb the number of refugees that it will allow to claim asylum.

In another signal that the migration crisis was worsening, the Netherlands admitted the existence of a "Plan B" to the EU's asylum system and Schengen passport-free travel zone if the crisis continues beyond another eight weeks.

Mark Rutte, the Dutch prime minister, warned that the EU risks a "proliferation of initiatives like Austria" as national governments try to protect their frontiers. "We need a sharp reduction in the number of refugees in the coming six to eight weeks," he told the European Parliament in Strasbourg. "The current numbers aren't sustainable, we are running out of time. We have to think about a plan B, but I don't want to talk about that."

The European Commission confirmed plans for a radical shake-up of the EU's asylum system, which would lead to more asylum seekers entering Britain. David Cameron will fight proposals for mandatory migrant quotas, but the row will dominate the beginning of his referendum campaign to keep Britain in the EU....

Austria said yesterday that it would cap the number of asylum seekers at 37,500 this year, far fewer than the 90,000 who applied in 2015, in a challenge to the Schengen system of open internal

borders and a break with Germany's unlimited approach.

Angela Merkel, the German chancellor, faced pressure from her Bavarian conservative allies in the Christian Social Union party, which repeated its demand for no more than 200,000 migrants to be allowed in this year after the 1.1 million in 2015.

Werner Faymann, the Austrian chancellor, said: "We cannot take in all asylum seekers in Austria. We must step up controls at our borders."

His move means that any migrants over and above the cap will be refused entry and pushed into Austria's neighboring countries in breach of the Geneva Convention that requires all people fleeing persecution and war to be given refugee status.

Sigmar Gabriel, Germany's vice chancellor, described the decision as a "cry for help" and warned that closing borders would lead to "catastrophe."

President Gauck of Germany repeated his call for "morally and politically necessary" limits. ...

Calls for a cap on migrants were also pressed home at a conference of Christian Social Union, Ms. Merkel's coalition partners. Joachim Herrmann, the interior minister of Bavaria, said that 3,000 people were arriving every day, mainly through the southern state. ...

Merkel's Last Stand? Chancellor Running Out of Time on Refugee Issue

Spiegel Online | January 19



A NGELA MERKEL HAS REPEATEDLY SAID THAT IT WILL TAKE TIME to solve the refugee crisis. But impatience is growing, particularly following the sexual assaults in Cologne. Voices of discontent are getting louder, and the chancellor's hold on power may be weakening. ...

It wasn't all that long ago that things were radically different. Only a month ago, the CDU [Christian Democratic Union] met in Karlsruhe for its annual party conference and Merkel's refugee policies received a standing ovation....

But then came New Year's Eve in Cologne, and since then

everything has changed—both in Merkel's party and across the country. ... And within the population, ... concerns are growing: Will the effort to integrate more than a million refugees overwhelm German society? Can the government still guarantee the safety of its citizens? Is the state failing?

And the pressure is rising quickly in Berlin as well. On Tuesday, the chancellery received a letter signed by 44 conservative parliamentarians demanding that Merkel reverse course on the refugee issue. ...

Now, even her supporters are concerned that her plan for a European solution to the problem could fail. Former allies, such as the government of Sweden, have reintroduced tight border controls. ...

Among German conservatives, as well, the criticism has grown sharper. If at all possible, Merkel would like to stick with her policies. But within her CDU, many believe that there isn't enough time left for her plan to find success. The CDU's Bavarian sister party, the Christian Social Union (CSU), has recently turned the screws even tighter. "In the next 14 days, we will submit a written demand to the federal government to reestablish legally regulated conditions at the borders," said CSU head Horst Seehofer recently. "If it does not do so, the Bavarian government will have no choice but to submit a complaint to the Federal Constitutional Court."

The clock has begun to tick. Either Merkel and Seehofer will be able to find a compromise prior to an important trio of state elections in March. Or the chancellor faces a lasting power struggle with her own political allies—a tussle that could ultimately cost her the chancellery.

The fact that the refugee crisis has now intensified is not entirely due to the scandalous events on New Year's Eve in Cologne. The primary reason is that Merkel has made little progress with her plan to stop the inflow of refugees at the EU's external borders. Negotiations with Turkey have faltered and Germany's neighbors in the Continent's south and east are refusing to help. "Europe," a member of Merkel's cabinet recently complained, "is leaving us hanging." ...

Even a member of Merkel's cabinet has recently begun publicly opposing Chancellor Merkel's course. ...

The number of queries from unsettled Germans who have nothing to do with xenophobic movements like PEGIDA [Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamization of the West] or other rightwing groups has likewise increased significantly. That has led many parliamentarians who had thus far supported Merkel to change their approach. "Those in favor of a different strategy are now distinctly in the majority," says one representative. ...

"Thus far, there was a consensus that we had to solve the refugee crisis with Merkel at the helm," says a senior CDU politician. "Now, some are saying, we have to solve the problem, without Merkel if necessary. That is still a minority, but it is a growing minority." ...

Merkel is fully aware that she is running out of time. If she isn't soon able to demonstrate that she is making headway, she could be in trouble. Even her own confidants say as much. "Then we would be facing a power struggle," says one. ...

Merkel is particularly concerned about the gradual erosion of her authority. Throughout her time in office, she has earned a reputation as someone who has mastered all of the crises facing Germany and Europe. Now, however, every promise Merkel makes is bursting like a soap bubble. German voters are watching Merkel fail at one of the most fundamental tasks facing a state: That of controlling who enters the country. ...

German Finance Minister Wants EU-Wide Petrol Tax to Pay for Migrants

Deutche Presse-Agentur | January 16

G ERMAN FINANCE MINISTER WOLFGANG SCHÄUBLE ON SATURday mooted the possibility of an additional EU-wide petrol tax to cover the increasing cost of migration to Europe.

"We have to secure the external borders of the Schengen zone. We mustn't fail to solve these problems because of limited funds," the conservative politician told daily *Süeddeutsche Zeitung*.

Schäuble's proposals come in the wake of a EU finance ministers' meeting in Brussels, which failed to come up with a feasible plan to pay for the cost of migration.

"I suggested we could raise a tax on each liter of petrol if there

aren't sufficient funds in national budgets or in the European budget," Schäuble said without a naming a figure. ...

"[Writing for Real Clear World, Matthew] Del Santo also notes the power of some kind of euro tax system. '[A] common eurozone treasury, financed by indirect taxes' would be 'a classic compromise for nascent federations (for example, the 19th-century U.S., the German Empire after 1871, and the Australian Commonwealth before 1942),' he writes."

"Building a United States of Europe," the Trumpet.com, Aug. 4, 2015

TW IN BRIEF

Germany's Jews 'no longer feel safe': The spokesman for the Jewish community in Hamburg, Germany, said Tuesday that Jews living in Germany no longer feel safe. The reasons he gave include excesses of Germany's extreme right wing and the country's declining political credibility. The main reason he pointed to is that political correctness prevents German authorities from

dealing with the rising tide of Islamism within its borders. These trends, he said, have contributed to an insecure environment for Jews. Reports show that the feelings of insecurity for Jews are not confined to Hamburg but extend throughout Germany and into other European nations as well.

President Putin 'Probably' Approved Litvinenko Murder

BBC | January 21

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS

THE MURDER OF EX-RUSSIAN SPY ALEXANDER LITVINENKO IN 2006 in the UK was "probably" approved by President Vladimir Putin, an inquiry has found.

Mr. Putin is likely to have signed off the poisoning of Mr. Litvinenko with polonium-210 in part due to personal "antagonism" between the pair, it said.

Home Secretary Theresa May said the murder was a "blatant and unacceptable" breach of international law.

But the Russian Foreign Ministry said the public inquiry was "politicized."

It said: "We regret that the purely criminal case was politicized and overshadowed the general atmosphere of bilateral relations." ...

The long-awaited report into Mr. Litvinenko's death found that two Russian men—Andrei Lugovoi and Dmitry Kovtun—deliberately poisoned the 43-year-old in London in 2006 by putting the radioactive substance polonium-210 into his drink at a hotel. ...

The use of polonium-210 was "at the very least a strong indicator of state involvement" as it had to be made in a nuclear reactor, the report said.

The inquiry heard evidence that Mr. Litvinenko may have been consigned to a slow death from radiation to "send a message."

"In the West, many see Russian President Vladimir Putin more as a schoolyard bully than a ruthless tyrant. He's mischievous and unfriendly, but his behavior, we tell ourselves, is the result of insecurity. If we ignore him, he'll grow out of it. Many are amused by and even admire Putin's personality and behavior. He is the John Wayne of world politics: decisive, uncompromising and masculine. He is the antithesis of the soft, politically correct Western politician. ... Leaders of the United States and Britain appear willfully blind to the nature of Vladimir Putin. He is not the schoolyard bully with a penchant for creating mischief and occasionally stepping over the line. He is much more than a macho-man caricature who sells himself as a bastion of conservative, traditional values. This man is a killer. He needs to be feared and respected. He is changing the course of history."

"Fear This Man," Trumpet, January 2016

China Prepares for Worst After Tsai Victory Upends Taiwan Plans

Bloomberg | January 17

SAI ING-WEN'S LANDSLIDE ELECTION WIN IN TAIWAN REVIVES A long-dormant source of tension in Asia, as China waits to see how far the new president will push her party's goal of independence.

The result, in which Tsai's Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) also won its first legislative majority, was fueled in part by skepticism over Taiwan's rapprochement with its former civil war foe during President Ma Ying-jeou's eight-year tenure. While that policy put both China and the U.S. at greater ease, Taiwanese voters anxious over dependence on their giant, Communist-run neighbor overwhelmingly elected a party that officially supports separating from the mainland.

Now, less than three months after Xi Jinping's historic meeting with Ma in Singapore, China must revise its road map for eventual reunification with Taiwan, which it considers a province. ...

"Cross-strait political relations are entering a new juncture," said Xu Shiquan, a senior researcher at the government-run Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing. "The only certainty is the uncertainty ahead, and we can't see where it's heading for now."

The Communist Party's suspicion of Tsai dates back to her days as an adviser to the KMT [KUOMINTANG] administration of ex-President Lee Teng-hui, when she helped draft a policy redefining the cross-strait relationship as a "special state-to-state" one, a move seen in Beijing as secessionist.

Formally joining the DPP in 2004, she served as minister for mainland affairs under DPP President Chen Shui-bian. He refused to accept the mainland's precondition for talks and agree that both sides belong to one China, an idea known as the "1992 consensus."

Chen's pursuit of independence led the Communist Party to pass in 2005 a law authorizing attack to prevent secession, a threat that still hangs over the island. ...

Officials on the mainland will be watching Tsai for even small signs of departure from the policies of Ma, who signed 23 cross-strait agreements on everything from allowing direct flights to opening each other's financial sectors to investment. ...

Ma's trade agreements give China a myriad of new options for putting economic pressure on Taiwan that don't involve military threats....

To Check Radical Islamism, Tajikistan Cops Shave 13,000 Men's Beards

Time of India | January 20

AJIKISTAN POLICE IS REPORTED TO HAVE SHAVED NEARLY 13,000 men's beards and closed more than 160 shops selling traditional Muslim clothing to check "foreign" influences.

A report by Al Jazeera on Thursday said police in the central Asian Muslim-majority country also convinced more than 1,700 women to stop wearing headscarves in measures seen as the secular leadership's efforts to prevent influences from neighboring Afghanistan.

Last week, Tajikistan's parliament banned Arab-sounding names and marriages between first cousins, otherwise allowed in Islam.

Last year, Tajikistan's Supreme Court banned the Islamic Renaissance Party of Tajikistan—its only registered Islamic political party—following months of violence, which the government blamed on radical Islam. ...

U.S. Weighs Tighter Sanctions on North Korea If China Fails to Act

New York Times | January 20

THE UNITED STATES AND ITS ALLIES WILL BOLSTER SANCTIONS and go on the defensive against North Korea in ways that China may not like if Beijing fails to lend greater support to efforts to curb the North's nuclear ambitions, a top American diplomat said here on Wednesday.

The diplomat, Deputy Secretary of State Antony J. Blinken, made the warning a day before he planned to meet with Chinese officials in Beijing to pressure them to use their economic leverage over North Korea to force it to end its nuclear weapons program.

"I think what we will be talking to China about is that we will, both in terms of sanctions and in terms of our defense postures, have to take additional steps in order to use the leverage we have in order to defend ourselves and our allies if North Korea doesn't change its behavior," Mr. Blinken said in an interview.

Some of those steps "won't be directed at China, but China probably won't like them," he said. ...

Last week, President Park Geun-hye of South Korea said her country would consider agreeing to the United States' deployment of its Terminal High Altitude Area Defense, or THAAD, missile system in South Korea to cope better with the North's growing nuclear and missile threats.

China has vehemently opposed a THAAD deployment in South Korea, saying it would constitute a threat to its security. Secondary sanctions against North Korea, if put in place, would also affect China the most, because most of the North's external trade is with China or goes through the country.

"I think China has an incentive to use its own leverage to achieve the result and thus make it less necessary for us and our partners to take steps that China may not like," Mr. Blinken said.

For years, the United States has called on China to use its economic leverage to force North Korea to give up its nuclear weapons. But Beijing has been reluctant to put as much pressure on the North as Washington has wanted, because of fears that doing so would make the North more aggressive or even push its government to collapse. ...

After the North conducted a nuclear test on January 6, the United States and its allies, including South Korea and Japan, cited the test as proof that China had not done enough to curb the government it has supported for six decades. They urged China to agree that the United Nations Security Council should adopt a resolution authorizing "strong and comprehensive" sanctions against the North. ...

China, while condemning the North Korean nuclear test, has suggested that it is the Americans, not the Chinese, who are largely to blame for the North's pursuit of nuclear weapons. It has emphasized the need to start dialogue with the North, saying that the United States and other countries need to address "both the symptoms and root causes" of the North Korean nuclear issue. ...

"How has the dangerous personality cult that rules over North Korea ... been allowed to develop and maintain nuclear weapons? ... Because mighty China has stood by the Kim dynasty for decades—like a big brother defending his dysfunctional, beligerent younger brother. ... The evidence shows that Beijing won't be coming around to the West's viewpoint any time soon, and it won't withdraw its support of the Kim Dynasty. ... China continues ... to collude in many of Pyongyang's illegal activities. And Beijing continues to pump enough capital into the regime to guarantee that it can preserve complete control over the people of North Korea." "No, Beijing Isn't Withdrawing Support for North Korea," the Trumpet.com, July 7, 2015

China to Allocate \$4.6 Billion to Shut 4,300 Coal Mines

Reuters | January 21

CHINA WILL ALLOCATE 30 BILLION YUAN (US\$4.56 BILLION) IN funds over the next three years to support the closure of small and inefficient coal mines and redeploy around 1 million workers, state media reported on Thursday.

The Chinese government is determined to reduce the share of coal in its overall energy mix as part of efforts to cut smog and greenhouse gas emissions, but it also looking to secure a soft landing for a sector that employs around 6 million people.

Total raw coal output fell 3.5 percent to 3.68 billion tons last year, according to official data, the second annual decline in a row. Prices fell by about a third during the year, causing heavy losses in the industry.

China, Russia to Help Iran Build New Nuclear Facilities

CNS News | January 20

THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL CALLS ON TEHRAN'S NEGOTIATING PARTners to help develop its civil nuclear program, and long-standing allies Russia and China have wasted little time in offering to do so. The head of Iran's atomic energy organization, Ali Akbar Salehi, said Tuesday that Iran plans to move ahead with the construction of two new nuclear power plants, with the help of China, and two others with Russian assistance. ...

U.S. Unprepared to Face Growing Threats From China, Russia and North Korea, Report Finds

IB Times | January 20

C HINA AND NORTH KOREA ARE GROWING AS MILITARY POWERS AS the United States struggles to maintain its influence in the Asia-Pacific region amid defense spending limits, according to a study released on Tuesday. ...

"Chinese and North Korean actions are routinely challenging the credibility of U.S. security commitments, and at the current rate of U.S. capability development, the balance of military power in the region is shifting against the United States," the study said. "Robust funding is needed to implement the rebalance." ...

"The Chinese People's Liberation Army's anti-access/area denial capabilities that many once viewed as Taiwan-specific are rapidly expanding to the Second Island Chain and beyond, affecting not only an increasing number of U.S. allies and partners, but also U.S. territories such as Guam," the report states. ...

ANGLO-AMERICA



Micah and Your Astounding Potential

Gerald Flurry, The Key of David | January 22

As the world falls apart, one small Church is pointing to a time of peace that will last forever.



World Faces Wave of Epic Debt Defaults, Fears Central Bank Veteran

Ambrose Evans-Prichard, Telegraph | January 19



THE GLOBAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM HAS BECOME DANGEROUSLY unstable and faces an avalanche of bankruptcies that will test social and political stability, a leading monetary theorist has warned.

"The situation is worse than it was in 2007. Our macroeconomic ammunition to fight downturns is essentially all used up," said William White, the Swiss-based chairman of the [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development]'s review committee and former chief economist of the Bank for International Settlements.

"Debts have continued to build up over the last eight years, and they have reached such levels in every part of the world that they have become a potent cause for mischief," he said.

"It will become obvious in the next recession that many of these debts will never be serviced or repaid, and this will be uncomfortable for a lot of people who think they own assets that are worth something," he told the *Telegraph* on the eve of the World Economic Forum in Davos.

"The only question is whether we are able to look reality in the eye and face what is coming in an orderly fashion, or whether it will be disorderly. Debt jubilees have been going on for 5,000 years, as far back as the Sumerians."

The next task awaiting the global authorities is how to manage debt write-offs—and therefore a massive reordering of winners and losers in society—without setting off a political storm.

Mr. White said Europe's creditors are likely to face some of the biggest haircuts. ...

The European banking system may have to be recapitalized on a scale yet unimagined

Mr. White said the Fed is now in a horrible quandary as it

tries to extract itself from [quantitative easing] and right the ship again. "It is a debt trap. Things are so bad that there is no right answer. If they raise rates it'll be nasty. If they don't raise rates, it just makes matters worse," he said.

There is no easy way out of this tangle. ...

"It was always dangerous to rely on central banks to sort out a solvency problem when all they can do is tackle liquidity problems. It is a recipe for disorder, and now we are hitting the limit," he said.

2016's Resemblance to 1937

Eric Wilson, Washington Times | January 19

E HAVE BEGUN TO HEAR THE DRUMBEAT THAT WE MAY BE ON the verge of another 2008. Truth is, if you really want to better understand where we may be heading, you might want to look back even earlier: It's time to party likes it's 1937.

The stock market has started 2016 with its worst performance ever. This has provoked a bandwagon of prognosticators to come out to foretell why this is the next recession. My question is, what took them so long? Looking at cycles, it was predicted, and I wrote about this downturn for 2016 more than three years ago. What you should be asking—and even more frightening—is what the cycles predict is coming next.

Donald Trump is correct that our country is disappearing—he just misses the mark on why

... Looking at economic indicators and current conditions confirms a recession is inevitable. It is not that the experts are entirely wrong about 2016; it is just that they fail to see a larger cycle that may exist and the bigger problem that may be looming. If you want to understand what may be coming and learn from history, we need to go further back than 2008 and first look at 1937.

We can begin with not a recession but the Great Depression, which engulfed our economy until the early 1930s. The recovery in the four years after Franklin Roosevelt took office in 1933 was incredibly rapid. Annual real gross domestic product (GDP) growth averaged more than 9 percent. Unemployment fell from 25 percent to 14 percent. By 1937, production and wages had regained their pre-1929 Great Depression levels.

The economy faltered in the spring of 1937 and tanked in the autumn. Unemployment jumped from 14.3 percent to 19.0 percent. Manufacturing output fell by 37 percent. Real GDP fell 11 percent, and industrial production fell 32 percent. ...

The actual lessons of Roosevelt's recession are much different than many of the history books. ...

Perhaps the experts could have looked 80 years earlier to the Panic of 1857, a time that the nation was in uncertainty and government was driving policies that led to the apex of disaster in the 1861 Civil War—a war that was the bloodiest conflict in U.S. history, claiming more than 2 percent of the population.

Perhaps they would have seen similarities another 85 years prior with the credit crisis of 1772. The majority was not taking up arms against the crown but instead was uninterested, angry or paralyzed with fear and subordinate to power. Ultimately, the times saw a foreign government that overregulated and drove social and economic conditions that exploded in 1775 with the shot heard around the world and the Revolutionary War.

The prognosticators could have even learned looking just 82 years before at the seven ill years and crisis of the 1690s that led to the War of the Spanish Succession. Eighty years before that was the downturn of economies of the 1610s that ultimately begot the English civil war, which claimed 3 percent of the population.

We can go back over 400 years and see this same pattern play out every 80-85 years. In 1937, the culture in the United States and the world was primed for social, economic and geopolitical problems. Not because it would be a repeat of eight years prior but because liberties continued shrinking and centralized power and apathy were growing. ... The climax was not the recession of 1937, but the years that followed that enveloped us in World War II, which claimed more than 400,000 U.S. casualties.

Almost exactly 82 years later, we wake up now to a shift in culture and attitudes that are repeating history. ...

Unfortunately, we have already paved the "road to serfdom," and as many fight to change policies and institutions to preserve liberty, one fears—and facts are beginning to support—that the cycle has progressed past the point of no return.

History is repeating itself, and I am less worried about the recession of 2016 than I am the reset of 2020.



What Is The Apocalypse? Stephen Flurry, Trumpet Daily | January 22

ew people understand what the word 'apocalypse' actually means.

Follow Stephen Flurry

