Trumpet Weekly MARCH 25, 2016



Belgium Attacked— Europe 'Under Attack'

By Robert Morley and Richard Palmer | March 23

I SLAMIC TERRORISTS DETONATED THREE BOMBS, KILLING DOZENS of people in Brussels on Tuesday. The attack follows the arrest of the mastermind behind the French terrorist attacks that killed 130 people on November 13. Now European leaders say Europe is at war. Is Europe finally waking up to the threat posed by radical Islam? What will it do about it?

Many Europeans are still in shock. Brussels used to be one of the safest cities in the world. It had very little crime.

Politically, there have been a lot of statements of unity from various leaders. "We are all Belgians" is the common sentiment.

But events are forcing opinions to change about potential threats from Islam.

It is now clear that Islamic terrorists are embedded within Europe and have an extensive network. Analysts note that for the Paris mastermind to elude authorities for so long and for the extremists to still coordinate such an attack, the web of linkages must go far beyond just close family members.

The consensus appears to be that it took at least 30 people to pull this off, but probably more. There are even reports that these terrorist groups are linking with organized crime.

There's no denying Europe has a major problem with radical Islam. "Attacks like those in Brussels today, especially on soft targets like large, unprotected public transportation centers, are likely the new normal for Europe," Lili Bayer wrote at Geopolitical Futures.

But even as people wake up to the threat, there also seems to be some effort by leaders to avoid identifying where the terrorist danger is coming from. There is an obvious avoidance of making any link between Islam and terror—even as the Islamic State claimed responsibility for the bombing.

That said, the standard political narrative may be changing.

"We are at war," French Prime Minister Manuel Valls said after a crisis meeting. "We have been subjected for the last few months in Europe to acts of war."

Europe is being left with little choice but to act. The Brussels attack was a direct assault on the European Union.

"Belgium is not only one of the countries of Europe's core, as is France, but it is also in some sense the capital of Europe," George Friedman wrote on Geopolitical Futures. In addition to striking at Europe's headquarters, this attack poses an existential threat to the union. Between the Paris attacks and the migration crisis, Europe's open border zone suffered a near mortal wound. Borders were "temporarily" suspended, and some have still not been reopened. Can the union survive continued attacks?

"International terrorism arising from Belgium is, in a way, a national security equivalent of the economic crisis that emanated from Greece in past years," wrote Matthew Yglesias on Vox.com. "They are the result of Europe currently sitting at an unsustainable midpoint in the process of integration."

Like Greece, Belgium has major problems, and the half-baked nature of the union means it is exporting those problems around the EU while other nations are powerless to effect a cure.

Europe could respond by falling apart and closing borders. "But the other possibility would be to follow in the footsteps of the reaction to the debt crisis, where problems caused by partial integration have tended to lead to even deeper integration ..." continues Yglesias.

The Vox article concludes by noting, "But time and again over the decades, Europe has faced decision points where it either needs to go forward to more integration or backward to less, and the ultimate decision has almost always been in favor of more integration in the end."

At the same time, Europe will have to combine and improve its military.

Some Europeans realize that *Islamic terrorism has to be stopped overseas at the source.* This means a more assertive military. After France was attacked in November, it invoked Europe's collective

defense clause for the first time ever. Europe is getting ready to take charge of its terrorist problem itself, without U.S. help.

Meanwhile, these continued attacks threaten to bring a monumental change to European society. Europe's political system has already been knocked out of balance by the migrant crisis and earlier terrorist attacks. On March 8, Spiegel Online even wondered if Germany's post-war political system could survive the turmoil. The *Local* wrote, "German politics as we know it is crumbling." The far right is rising across the Continent. How much faster will this rise once people realize that the policies of the current leadership have made terrorist attacks "the new normal"?

Some of the most logical yet disturbing analyses of where this is leading came from George Friedman after the *Charlie Hebdo* attacks. He drew attention to French Prime Minister Valls calling this a "war on radical Islam." But it is unlike most wars: "If only they wore uniforms or bore distinctive birthmarks, then fighting only the radical Islamists would not be a problem," Friedman wrote.

As Friedman points out, it's very hard for Western police to sort the minority of murderous Muslims from the moderates. And so, "the world can either accept periodic attacks, or see the entire Muslim community as a potential threat until proven otherwise. These are terrible choices, but history is filled with them."

"It is difficult to imagine another outcome save for another round of ghettoization and deportation," he continued. "This is repulsive to the European sensibility now, but certainly not alien to European history. Unable to distinguish radical Muslims from other Muslims, Europe will increasingly and unintentionally move in this direction."

The rise of the far right and the political turmoil show that Europe is already moving in this direction. Some European leaders are talking about accepting *only Christian* migrants. It is getting much easier to imagine states beginning to view all their Muslim citizens with suspicion.

This is where these terrorist attacks are pushing Europe. It's helping to create a unified and more integrated Europe. A Europe that moves away from the evils of multiculturalism toward a darker future where the state discriminates among its citizens. A Europe with a Christian identity—where Muslims are not welcome. A Europe that is fighting Islam abroad.

This is exactly how Bible prophecy says Europe will ultimately deal with its terrorism problem.

Follow Robert Morley and Richard Palmer

MIDDLE EAST



HISTORY RETURNS IN EUROPE AND GOD'S STANDARD OF BALANCE | MARCH 25

LAY SIEGE TO YOUR ONE BIG PROBLEM | MARCH 24

BRUSSELS ATTACKS: THE NEW NORMAL | MARCH 23

THE HISTORICAL ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES | MARCH 22

THE SIN OF ESCAPISM | MARCH 21

U.S. Indicts Seven Iranians in Cyberattacks on Banks and a Dam

New York Times | March 24



THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ON THURSDAY UNSEALED AN INDICTment against seven Iranian computer specialists who regularly worked for the country's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, charging that they were behind cyberattacks on dozens of American banks and that they attempted to take over the controls of a small dam in Rye, N.Y.

The indictment, while long expected, is the first time that the Obama administration has sought action against Iranians for a wave of computer attacks on the United States that began in 2011.

The indictment does not say that the attacks were directed by the Revolutionary Guard. But it referred to those who were charged as "experienced computer hackers" who "performed work on behalf of the Iranian government, including the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps." ...

The indictment also cited attacks on the New York Stock Exchange and AT&T.

All of those attacks were "distributed denial of service" attacks, often called DDOS attacks, in which the target's computers are overwhelmed by coordinated computer requests from thousands

of machines around the world. The result is often that the targeted networks crash, putting them out of service for some number of hours.

But in the case of the Bowman Dam in Rye, a suburb of New York, there was an effort to take over the dam itself. The effort failed, but in some ways worried American investigators more because it was a different kind of attack, aimed at seizing control of a piece of infrastructure.

None of the named Iranians live in the United States, and it is doubtful that they will ever make it to an American courtroom. ...

The indictment comes only eight months after the nuclear deal reached between Iran and six other nations, including the United States, appeared to be putting Tehran and Washington on a track toward a more productive relationship, after 35 years of enmity. But the Iranian missile launches in recent months—also organized by the Guard—have led to calls in Congress for new sanctions. ...

RELATED: "AMERICA'S ACHILLES HEEL"

Iran to Build a Statue of Captured U.S. Sailors

Telegraph | March 18

RAN'S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD IS PLANNING TO BUILD A STATUE of the U.S. sailors who were captured in Iranian waters earlier this year, a senior officer said. ...

Cmdr. Ali Fadavi, the head of the Guard's naval forces, said the monument of the surrendering Americans would be a "tourist attraction."

"There are very many photographs of the major incident of arresting U.S. Marines in the Persian Gulf in the media, and we intend to build a symbol out of them inside one of our naval monuments," he told Iran's Defense Press news agency.

The capture of the 10 U.S. sailors in January was hailed by hard-liners in Tehran as a victory over the U.S. and presented as proof that Iran was still resisting America despite the nuclear deal.

Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, Iran's supreme leader, said the arrest of the sailors was "God's deed" and presented medals to the Iranians involved. ...

The monument could feature as a stop for travelers on the Rahian-e-Nour, a semi-mandatory pro-regime pilgrimage that takes visitors to historical spots from the Iran-Iraq War and extols the virtues of the Iranian military.

Commander Fadavi is head of the Revolutionary Guard's own naval force, which is separate from the main Iranian Navy. As well as a military force, the Guard owns a vast economic empire inside Iran.

The Guard report directly to the supreme leader and not to the elected president.

Europeans Ignored Danger, Criticized Israel Instead: Minister

Agence France-Presse | March 22

A N ISRAELI MINISTER ON TUESDAY SUGGESTED EUROPEANS HAD ignored the danger of "Islamic terror cells" and focused on criticizing Israel instead, in a statement in response to the Brussels attacks.

While offering condolences over the deadly bombings, Science, Technology and Space Minister Ofir Akunis also hit out at Europe over its labeling of products from Israeli settlements in the occupied territories.

"I will repeat: Many in Europe have preferred to occupy themselves with the folly of condemning Israel, labeling products, and boycotts," Akunis, an ally of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, said on his Facebook page.

"In this time, underneath the nose of the Continent's citizens, thousands of extremist Islamic terror cells have grown. There were those who repressed and mocked whoever tried to give warning. There were those who underestimated.

"To our sorrow, the reality has struck the lives of dozens of innocent people, powerfully and fatally," the minister from Netanyahu's right-wing Likud party said.

Opposition leader Isaac Herzog slammed Akunis, accusing him of being "condescending" on his Facebook page. ...

TW IN BRIEF

ezbollah threatens America: Hezbollah militants in Iraq have threatened to attack United States troops in the country. The Iranian-sponsored terrorist group said in a statement on Sunday that it had vanquished American occupation in the past and that it would continue doing so if American reinforcements arrive. The group accused the U.S. of supporting the Islamic State. Hezbollah's threats came as the U.S. announced it would send a group of Marines to reinforce the existing forces fighting the Islamic State in Iraq. The U.S. did not say how many were sent, but two U.S. officials said it is between 100 and 200. The announcement to send American reinforcements was made one day after an Islamic State rocket attack killed a U.S. Marine. He

became the second American killed by the Islamic State.

Tan to annex Bahrain: A commander in Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps has demanded that Iran annex the small Persian Gulf nation of Bahrain. According to Iran's Tasnim News Agency, Gen. Saeed Qasemi said on Sunday that "Bahrain is an Iranian province that was detached from the Islamic Republic of Iran due to ... Western colonialism." He added that "Iran must make efforts to bring Bahrain back into Iranian territory and transform it into a part of [its southwestern province.]" Qasemi announced that "a front for the support of revolutionary groups in Bahrain has been established in [that province.]" Iran declared Bahrain its 14th province in 1957.

EUROPE

TrumpetHour

EUROPE'S RESPONSE TO BRUSSELS ATTACKS, CHINESE AGGRESSION, AMERICA'S PAINKILLER ADDICTION, AND MORE | MARCH 25

BRUSSELS TERROR ATTACK, OBAMA IN CUBA, BRAIN HEALTH AND MORE | MARCH 23

Belgian Attack Is a Result of Western Weakness

March 25



THE SHOCKING ATTACK ON BRUSSELS IS THE RESULT OF BRITAIN and America's failure to confront the Islamic State and radical Islam—a fact noted by several journalists across the world. In a piece for his *Spectator* blog titled "The West Won't Even Defend Its Own Values. How Can It Be Expected to Defeat ISIS?", Brendan O'Neill wrote:

Here's a sobering fact for you: Yesterday in Brussels, ISIS sympathizers killed five times as many civilians in one hour as British airstrikes have killed or injured ISIS fighters in Syria since December. At the last count, in late February, British airstrikes over Syria had killed or hurt just seven ISIS fighters in

three months. Seven. Not even 10; seven. In Brussels, a small gang of 1818 fanboys killed 35 civilians. ...

And yet there's no doubting the chasm that now exists between our leaders' rhetoric about ISIS and the action they're willing to take against it. They describe ISIS as a colossal, existential threat to Western values, yet they send no men, no ground troops, to wage war against it. Just the occasional manned flight or some flying robots. ...

This is the defining feature of the ISIS era: The West has the military might to fight ISIS, but not the moral conviction. It has the machinery, the men, but it lacks the thing every warrior needs: a deep belief

in what he's fighting for, in this case the idea that our enlightenment values, our free, open societies, are superior to their backward way of life. We in the West agree that we hate ISIS, but we don't agree that the Western way of life is something worth defending, or even something we should be especially favorable about anymore.

Roger Cohen described America's failures in this war in a piece for the *New York Times* titled "In Brussels, Europe Is Struck at Its Heart." He wrote:

It is not working. President Obama's slow-butsteady strategy to defeat the Islamic State is clawing back a little territory in Syria and Iraq but is doing nothing to dent the charismatic appeal of the militant group, disrupt its propaganda, or prevent it from killing Europeans. ...

The message [of the Brussels attack] was clear: We can still hit you at will. Nothing that Western governments have done since Paris has changed that.

Since the Paris attack, Obama has insisted that an anti-Islamic State coalition with European and other allies is getting the job done. ... The president has suggested that more radical military action to crush the militants—essentially the deployment of infantry—would drag the United States into another Middle Eastern war and increase the appeal of the Islamic State. His argument has been: Defeating the Islamic State is militarily feasible, but then what?

This is a very high-risk policy—too high in my view. It allows the Islamic State to strut its pure evil in and from Raqqa. The Obama approach posits that the Islamic State can be beaten before European and American societies are undermined. ...

The Islamic State effect is powerful in psychological and political terms. Europe and the United States already bear scars. A united Europe ... is in imminent danger of fraying. The latest attack will play into the hands of anti-European rightist politicians like Marine Le Pen, the leader of the French National Front. It will increase calls for borders to be reinstituted and the Schengen accord allowing free movement among more than two dozen European countries to be scrapped. It will challenge Europe's liberties. ...

The San Bernardino, Calif., rampage by Islamic State sympathizers has already happened. The question raised most urgently by the Brussels attacks, so soon after Paris, is whether and why Raqqa can be tolerated when al Qaeda's Tora Bora sanctuary in Afghanistan was not. There are no easy answers. But today at least the West's ponderous wait-them-out approach to the murderous fanatics of the caliphate looks like capitulation.

These attacks are making it increasingly clear that the West's current approach to multiculturalism is not working. Douglas Murry mocked the standard platitudes that follow such an attack

in his *Spectator* blog "A Terrorist Attack Has Happened in Europe. Let the Standard Response Begin" He concludes by noting:

A decade ago, after every attack, the pundits used to point to places where mass immigration, integration and open borders were meant to have worked. After London people said, "What can we learn from France?" After Paris they said, "What can we learn from the Swedish model?" Nobody cites Sweden anymore. In fact, nobody looks to anyone else's model anymore. Because all of the "models" failed. So here we are—stuck with a problem our politicians have given us and to which they have no answers. Perhaps all this pointless chatter is just what people do to distract themselves before they have to face up to that fact.

His colleague Ed West noted some similar points in his piece "Europe, Islamism and Some Uncomfortable Home Truths":

Central Europe, chiefly Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, remain largely safe from the terror threat, despite the former in particular being a NATO player in the Middle East. It is precisely because the reasons for this are so obvious that they cannot be mentioned. Poland is 0.1 percent Muslim, most of whom are from a long-settled Tartar community, Britain is 5 percent, France 9 percent and Brussels 25 percent, and those numbers are growing.

For all the goodwill shown by the vast majority of people in Europe, Muslim and non-Muslim, and for all those things that shouldn't have to be said—that most Muslims hate this monstrosity—these statistics correlate to terrorism risk. That's not something people want to hear when they have a desperate urge to feel solidarity, but it is true nonetheless. It may well be that as the Muslim population increases in any European country, the radicalization risk grows exponentially, since such extremism thrives on ghettoization and isolation. Neither the French policy of integration nor the British model of multiculturalism can stop this. There is no sign of Islamism disappearing anytime soon. These problems will not go away. It is simply a facet of the multiethnic society we now inhabit. ...

Central Europeans have become the new target for liberal snobbery in the past couple of years, their antediluvian attitudes to Islamic migration making them the new hillbillies; low-status whites it's OK to mock on account of their views. But looking at what is happening in Brussels, London and Paris, is it not rather rational for them to look at Merkel's open-borders policy and the whole multicultural thing with some skepticism? I suspect those flags will be back at half-mast soon enough.

In September last year, *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry wrote:

Many foreign-policy experts credit the ascension

of the Islamic State to America's collapse in foreign policy. So Iran is publicly challenging America while the Islamic State snatches up more and more territory and assets—and it's all because of America's pathetic loss of will. But what these analysts can't explain is *why* America's will is broken. For the cause behind this Western weakness, read Mr. Flurry's article "America's Broken Will."

Germany Spends More on Its Military, but It's Still Not Enough March 25

GERMANY IS SPENDING MORE ON ITS MILITARY, BUT THE ARMY wants more cash, as the *Local* explains in an article titled "Extra Defense Spending Won't Be Enough, Soldiers Warn":

A planned €10.2 billion (US\$11.4 billion) increase in defense spending agreed by ministers on Wednesday won't be enough to modernize the German Army, soldiers have warned.

"This is about nothing less than maintaining Germany's ability to act on its security policy," André Wüstner, head of the Bundeswehrverband (Army union) said on Thursday.

Wüstner says that the Army needs at least \$20.6 billion over the coming four years, almost double what the cabinet agreed on Wednesday.

"The underfinancing of the Bundeswehr [German Army] is far from ended" by Wednesday's move from Chancellor Angela Merkel and her team, although it's a step in the right direction, he said.

Defense Minister Ursula von der Leyen, of Merkel's Christian Democratic Union (CDU), has said that she wants to spend \$145 billion on Germany's military over the coming 15 years to finally modernize the force and end its long-running equipment problems.

But even with the budget increase announced on Wednesday, Germany will remain far removed from the NATO target of spending 2 percent of gross domestic product on defense.

In fact, the Federal Republic will remain stuck at around 1.2 percent of GDP spent on its armed forces....

The Social Democratic Party (SPD), currently governing in coalition with the CDU, joined in the Army union criticism of the budget plans.

Adding just \$11 billion to the budget was "completely insufficient," Rainer Arnold, senior SPD M.P. on the German parliament defense committee, told *Die Welt* on Thursday.

ASIA



Putin's Approval Ratings Fall Back to 'Pre-Crimea' Level

Jeremiah Jacques | March 21



THE NUMBER OF RUSSIANS WHO "FULLY TRUST" PRESIDENT VLADimir Putin dropped by 10 percentage points over the last year, according to a new survey conducted by the Levada Center.

At this time in 2015, 83 percent of Russians said they "fully trust" the president. The new survey conducted over several weeks in February and March says the level has now fallen to 73 percent.

Levada Center deputy chief Alexei Grazhdankina says this means Putin's approval rating is back at "pre-Crimea" levels, a reference to the time before Putin annexed the Crimean Peninsula from Ukraine in March 2014. However, the current rate is "still much higher than it was at the end of 2013," Grazhdankina said.

The number of Russians who expressed sympathy for Mr. Putin also declined by 7 percentage points, while the number

professing to feel "indifferent" toward him rose from 10 to 15 percent. The number of those who are "wary" of him climbed from 5 to 8 percent.

Most Russians view Putin's intervention in the Syrian conflict favorably. Yet the economic hardships they are suffering at home are too significant to be entirely outweighed by excitement over Russian adventurism and Putin's bold foreign policy.

Even still, his popularity remains sky-high by Western standards. A separate Levada poll conducted last month showed that 65 percent of Russians would like Putin to serve another presidential term after his current term ends in 2018. "Election year is approaching," Grazhdankin said, "and no real, viable opponents have emerged."

Follow Jeremiah Jacques

Russia Weaponizes Crimea Into an 'Unsinkable Military Aircraft Carrier' March 25

KRAINE REMEMBERED THE SECOND ANNUAL ANNIVERSARY OF the illegal Russian annexation of Crimea this past Wednesday. During the week preceding this memorial, geopolitical experts from various countries met in Kiev on March 14 to assess the global strategic threats arising from Russia's aggressive foreign policy. This international conference was called The Militarization of the Occupied Crimea as a Threat to International Security.

In an article for the *Daily Kiev* titled "The Occupation of Crimea as a Global Threat," journalist Dmytro Kryvtsun explains:

Valentyn Badrak, director of the Center for Army, Conversion and Disarmament Studies, spoke about the military aspect of the Crimean occupation: "The militarization of Crimea has become a threat to security not only on a regional scale, but on the global scale as well. In two years, the number of Russian group has doubled, from 12,500 to 24,000," he said. "Russia plans to increase the number of Russian Black Sea Fleet to almost 50,000 people. 'Iskander-M' missile launch complexes have appeared on the Crimean territory, and they can fire missiles as far away as to the coasts of Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey. The Kremlin also plans to station Tu-22M3 long-range planes there. Russia, which has destroyed the global security system, is up to further confrontation against the civilized world." ...

Russian strongman Vladimir Putin has already used the newly militarized Crimean Peninsula as a base of operations to invade

Syria and threaten the Caucasus. Kryvtsun continues:

Badrak's statement was supplemented by that of Yurii Smiliansky, expert of Maidan of Foreign Affairs. He started as follows: "The group, which is planned to be stationed on the peninsula, will be up to 100,000-120,000-people strong. The occupants today are bringing back Crimea's status as an 'unsinkable military aircraft carrier.' Crimea is turned into a rehabilitation center for those fighting in the eastern Ukraine, military training camps for terrorists are established. The peninsula became the base center for the support of Russian-armed groups in Syria. The purposes of this military base are as follows: to pose a threat to Ukraine and its sea transport routes, which can lead to the loss of at least 25 percent of trade that goes via seaports; to pose a threat to NATO members and other countries of Southern Europe, the Caucasus, and the Black Sea; to intimidate Mediterranean and Persian Gulf countries."

Putin knows the West is weak. He invaded Georgia in 2008 and Crimea in 2014 to show the world how worthless promises of American protection are. Now he uses his newly conquered territory as a military base to pressure American and European leaders into capitulating to Russia's international demands. It is vital that we watch Europe's reaction to this aggressive posturing. In an attempt to avoid World War III, European leaders will eventually have to barter some sort of deal with Putin.

China Militarizes the World's Most Important Trade Routes March 25

THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT OF THE SOUTH CHINA SEA IS BEING transformed as China works to militarize one of the world's most important maritime trade routes into a springboard for global domination.

In an article for the *Jakarta Post* titled "Maritime Colonialism With Chinese Characteristics," journalist Rene L. Pattiradjawane explains:

One can identify two reasons behind Beijing's assertive behavior in the region. First, China is practicing "maritime colonialism" by rejecting calls to reduce tensions in the South China Sea, in a bid to dominate the world's busiest sea lane of communication. Second, China is improving its physical security to block external threats and interference. ...

China's "maritime colonialism" isn't just aimed at exerting hegemony over its Asian neighbors. It is primarily aimed at reshaping the world economic order by seizing control of global trade routes. Pattiradjawane continues:

A dispute between Washington and Beijing is playing out, the region of the South China Sea is penetrated by the great powers, and we are also seeing the establishment of a new world economic order, such as the 57-member Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, with strong backing of Western countries. Japan's new security posture in response to changes in the strategic environment on the Korean Peninsula, the rise of China, Russia and India, and the escalating tension in the East and South China Sea, are prompting Japan to seek stronger strategic cooperation. ...

Once China has control of the South China Sea, through which \$5 trillion of maritime goods transits each year, it will have the economic influence it needs to become a world superpower. Such a development would put America at serious risk of an economic siege should the European Union ever decide to support the BRICS economic alliance instead of the American reserve currency.

TW IN BRIEF

Russia warns U.S. about Syria: Russia on Monday warned the United States that it will start responding to ceasefire violations in Syria unilaterally starting Tuesday if the U.S. refuses to coordinate rules of engagement against violators. The Russian General Staff said that Russia will have to act unilaterally because the U.S. refused to coordinate a joint response in talks with Russia last week. Russian authorities said on the weekend that further delays were leading to civilian casualties, like in Aleppo, where 67 civilians reportedly have been killed by militant fire since the truce started. The Russian and U.S.-brokered ceasefire that began on February 27 has helped significantly reduce hostilities. The Islamic State and the al Qaeda-linked Nusra Front have been excluded from the truce.

criticized United States President Barack Obama after his meeting with President Raúl Castro of Cuba in Havana. "Rapprochement With Cuba Requires Renunciation of U.S. Arrogance," blared a headline in China's state news agency. Beijing has long had a special bond with Havana. China and Cuba are two of the few remaining Communist nations in the world, and in recent years, Beijing has become one of Havana's leading trade partners. Several Chinese commentators, officials and foreign-policy experts have expressed caution in response to Mr. Obama's promise of a "new day" of openness between Cuba and the United States on Monday.

AFRICA/LATIN AMERICA



Can Americans Finally Trust Communist Cuba?

Andrew Miiller | March 24

NITED STATES PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA MADE HISTORY ON March 20 by becoming the first sitting U.S. president to visit Cuba since Calvin Coolidge in 1928. During his two-day trip, Mr. Obama met with Cuban dictator Raúl Castro and gave a televised speech to the Cuban people. Both gestures were meant to symbolize the normalization of relations between America and Cuba.

Likening the United States and Cuba to long-estranged brothers struggling to reconnect, President Obama said in his televised address: "I have come here to bury the last remnant of the Cold War in the Americas. I have come here to extend the hand of friendship to the Cuban people."

He said: "Cuba has a one-party system; the United States is a multi-party democracy. Cuba has a socialist economic model; the United States is an open market. Cuba has emphasized the role and rights of the state; the United States is founded upon the rights of the individual. Despite these differences, on Dec. 17, 2014, President Castro and I announced that the United States and Cuba would begin a process to normalize relations between our countries. … From the beginning of my time in office, I've urged the people of the Americas to leave behind the ideological battles of the past. We are in a new era."

Before Americans "leave behind the ideological battles of the past," however, it might be prudent to ask whether the Cuban regime has actually changed.

Humanity came as close as it ever has to the horrors of nuclear war during the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. Ninety miles from the U.S. border, Fidel and Raúl Castro, the same two men who lead Cuba today, were stockpiling ballistic missiles equipped to carry Soviet nuclear warheads. For those like President Obama who believe this is ancient history with no bearing on the present, it might be necessary to highlight more recent events.

President Obama hasn't demanded that Cuba abandon communism, terrorism or dictatorial government. Instead, he has asked the peoples of America and Cuba to abandon the ideological battles of the past and accept that we have entered a new era. Cuban dissidents are furious with him for betraying their fight to free their homeland from totalitarian communism. American citizens should be deeply concerned that an unrepentant, terrorists-sponsoring Communist regime now has normalized relations with their country.

Trumpet editor in chief Gerald Flurry wrote in a recent editorial: "You need to beware of what is happening in Cuba. This is a dangerous world. America is like a silly dove walking right into a deadly trap. Cuba isn't dead. Communism isn't dead. And Cuba is reemerging as a clear and present danger to the very existence of the United States."

The Castro regime in Cuba has a half century of history of collaborating with Russia, Iran, Syria, North Korea and a myriad of authoritarian regimes that seek the downfall of America. Along with President Obama's nuclear agreement with Iran, the thawing of relations with Cuba will likely be remembered as one of the premiere diplomatic feats of his presidency!

Terrorism in Africa

March 25

Defense officials from 27 African and Arab countries met on Thursday and Friday in Egypt to discuss counterterrorism cooperation.

"The situation in the Sahel-Saharan states is very worrying,"

said Ibrahim Sani Abani, the secretary general of the Community of Sahel-Saharan States. "This phenomenon knows no boundaries and no state can protect only itself; it requires a coordinated and concerted response."

Al Qaeda appears to be the biggest terrorist threat in North and West Africa. In its March 15 article "Al Qaeda's Branch in Africa Makes a Lethal Comeback," the *New York Times* wrote:

Only a few years after French troops broke up its desert stronghold and scattered its fighters into the dunes, al Qaeda's branch in West Africa has regrouped and extended its reach, storming into new territory across three nations: [Ivory Coast, Burkina Faso and Mali]....

Almost four years ago, the group, known as al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb [AQIM], had reached its zenith, ruling over a remote stretch of northern Mali the size of Texas. But when it started creeping south toward the capital, Bamako, French troops rushed in, chasing the militants across the desert, where they were believed to have suffered catastrophic losses.

Now, the group is making a devastating comeback.

•••

"For AQIM, this is an evolution in terms of tactics and targeting," said Andrew Lebovich, a visiting fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations who has tracked the group for years. "It shows a broadening of the group's appeal and much more staying power than many people thought."

The group's latest attacks have put the entire region on edge. With each strike, extremists linked to al Qaeda seem to be checking off countries on the map. ... Western-friendly capitals known for religious tolerance are now especially fearful, wondering who will be next. ...

In "Al Qaeda Is Spreading Across West Africa," defense blog War Is Boring wrote:

[T]he recent spate of attacks in West Africa is aimed at exhausting France, the main Western enemy of the Islamists in this particular theater. Without a doubt, AQIM's leadership is banking on Paris doubling down on its military and diplomatic commitment to the region, thereby opening its military and citizens to even more attacks.

France won't take this lying down, of course, ... but the military approach to combating terrorism has limits, as the United States has discovered in Iraq and Afghanistan. ...

[O]ne doesn't have to be a fortune-teller to predict more attacks against French interests in the region. ...

Destabilizing the politics and economies of West Africa is beneficial to AQIM, as it relies on weak governments and badly governed spaces to operate. ...

We can expect France and other European nations to intervene against terrorist havens in Africa. On Monday, unidentified assailants attacked a hotel used by European Union military officials in Bamako, Mali.

ANGLO-AMERICA



The Ultimate Success Focus Gerald Flurry, The Key of David | March 25

These books of the Bible contain prophetic history, yet few study them and even fewer understand their significance for today.



Britain, Remember Your Past!

March 25

IN AN ARTICLE TITLED "NAPOLEON'S CHALLENGERS DIDN'T FEAR Brexit and Nor Should We," historian Andrew Roberts issues a stirring call for Britain to remember its history when it comes to the referendum on its place in the European Union.

Today "trade and economics have entirely taken the place of philosophical concepts such as 'dignity and liberty,' sovereignty and national independence," he wrote. "Yet it is worth considering what would have happened if our forefathers had lived according to our own modern-day priorities rather than theirs." Roberts has recently published a book on Napoleon, which is probably why he chose this time period to illustrate his point. In 1806, Napoleon offered Britain and Prussia a peace that would have left them economically better off. Yet both nations preferred war. As he explained, this is not the attitude of Britain today:

In a factory visit recently while campaigning for Britain to remain in the EU, David Cameron said: "Nothing is more important than protecting people's financial security." If that had been the view of prime ministers such as William Pitt the Younger and Lord Liverpool, Britain would undoubtedly have accepted France's repeated offers, made throughout the Napoleonic Wars, and sued for peace. Instead, because we refused, Napoleon set up the Continental System, a gigantic protectionist organization that cut Britain out of all European trade for nearly a decade. It was disastrous for British trade in the short run, and of course there were those in the city of London, larger business corporations and amongst the Radical Whigs in Parliament who clamored for the British government to capitulate to Napoleon, believing as they did that there was nothing more important than protecting people's financial security.

Successive Tory governments, however, belied Napoleon's sneer that Britain was merely "a nation of shopkeepers." Instead, they recognized that it was only by preserving national independence and sovereignty, and the supremacy of British laws that went with that, that national greatness could be pursued effectively in the long run. They were willing to absorb the disastrous short-term losses made by British trading companies—and even some serious runs on London's banks in 1812-13—in order to continue the struggle, which in 1815 came to a successful fruition with Napoleon's defeat at the battle of Waterloo. They were patriots in the dictionary definition of the term as being "zealous of their country's rights and liberties," which makes no mention of their country's GDP per capita, size of national debt or balances of trade.

If it turns out that Sir John Major, Michael Heseltine, Peter Mandelson and the other doomsayers are right in predicting that Britain would be worse of if she left the European Union—and I do not for one

moment believe they are—there are still some people in this country who would prefer to be poorer but free, as Britain was when fighting Napoleon, than better off but having their laws ultimately under the control of foreign jurists sitting in The Hague. The threats made by the doomsayers that we will be punished by the European Union if we have the temerity to leave might be cowing our present-day generation, but they would have had absolutely nil purchase on the ordinary Britons of the past, although it is interesting how the people who wanted to surrender to Napoleon's blandishments in 1806 were precisely the same kind of people who want to surrender to Brussels's similar blackmail threats 210 years later. To set against Major, Heseltine, Mandelson, Ken Clarke, Roland Rudd et al, therefore, one can set William Pitt, Admiral Nelson, the Duke of Wellington and all the other heroes who didn't fear being cut out of a European protectionist bloc, because they believed there were even higher duties of government than the (admittedly very important) one of protecting people's financial security.

Part of Britain's current weakness comes from the fact that it has forgotten too much of this history. As late *Trumpet* columnist Ron Fraser wrote:

Britain is at grave risk of losing all concept and memory of its rich and glorious God-given heritage. As [Peter Hitchens wrote in *The Abolition of Britain*], "A nation is the sum of its memories, and when those memories are allowed to die, it is less of a nation."

For an in-depth look at how Britain is forgetting its past and how that is making the nation weak today, read Mr. Fraser's article "Britain's Final Decline."

T

Danger: China Is Buying the Chicago Stock Exchange

Robert Morley | March 23



A N OBSCURE CHINESE COMPANY IS BUYING THE CHICAGO STOCK Exchange. The February 5 announcement stirred a tumult on Capitol Hill. Members of both parties of Congress denounced the takeover, calling for the Treasury Department to investigate the proposed sale.

Yet the founder of the Chongqing Casin Enterprise Group (Casin Group), which is buying the Chicago Exchange, assured regulators that his intentions were purely financial in nature. He planned on keeping the United States management team in place and said he would use information learned from the Chicago Exchange "to help develop financial markets in China over the longer term and to bring exciting Chinese growth companies

to U.S. investors."

So what's the problem?

The Casin Group is owned in part by the Chinese government. "This proposed acquisition would be the first time a Chinese-owned, possibly state-influenced, firm maintained direct access to America's \$22 trillion U.S. equity marketplace," wrote the members of Congress in a letter to the Treasury Department.

"Day after day, Americans read about new cyberattacks and state-sponsored espionage attempts [by China]," said Rep. Robert Pittenger. Does it make sense to give China direct access to our financial markets?

The stock exchange isn't the only piece of U.S. infrastructure

China is currently trying to buy. Chinese companies are buying up foreign businesses, including American ones, at a record rate.

In the first two months of this year, Chinese companies have already committed \$39 billion to purchase 36 American corporations. Last year, they spent a record \$17 billion to buy 114 companies. 2014 was also a record year.

Globally, Chinese businesses have spent a mind-boggling \$102 billion so far this year to snap up foreign companies. That exceeds all of 2015, itself a record year.

As Agence France-Presse reported, Chinese cash is "flowing faster than the Yangtze River."

What is going on? Why the spending spree?

First, it is a sign of the ascendancy of China. The fact that Chinese companies have the financial girth to make these acquisitions speaks volumes about how far China's economy has developed over the past decade.

But second, and more important, it may also be a sign of the precarious state of the global economy—including China's economy.

In China, any company that wishes to purchase a foreign company must receive government approval. If the acquisition doesn't fit within the politburo's plans—its social, economic or geopolitical outlook—it is canceled.

So the question is why. Why has the government sanctioned capital flight?

From Brazil to Russia to South Africa, nations that were once

flying high are falling from the sky like BRICS (pun intended). China, the world's second-largest economy, is falling too.

Amidst this slowdown, nations have resorted to currency devaluations in an attempt to capture a greater portion of the shrinking global economic pie.

China's corporate buying spree *may be a sign that China is set to devalue its currency again*—and, at the same time, hammer America and the world's manufacturing sector again.

Last August, China surprised the world by initiating the *greatest single-day devaluation of the yuan in its history.*

Over the course of eight hours, Chinese products became 2 percent cheaper than their rivals in America and elsewhere. During the course of a week, as the yuan continued to devalue, they became 4.8 percent less expensive.

It is no coincidence that the record yuan devaluation coincided with China's record corporate buying spree. China's Communist leaders *knew* the yuan was going to be devalued, so they not only helped Chinese companies purchase foreign assets but encouraged them to do so—before they devalued the yuan.

China shock devalued its currency once. Pressure is growing to do it again. If that is the plan, the Chicago Stock Exchange won't be the last Chinese takeover. The flow of American jobs and technology to China will become a flood.

Most dangerous of all, China's capital flight could quickly turn into a capitol fight—especially in an election year.

Follow Robert Morley

One Third of Houses in Vancouver Bought by Chinese March 25

In the latest sign that the global currency war is alive and well, money is fleeing China in an attempt to get out before Chinese central planners devalue the yuan. Bloomberg reported March 23 that one third of all houses purchased in Vancouver Canada during 2015 were bought by Chinese investors.

Chinese investors spent about C\$12.7 billion (US\$9.6 billion) on real estate in the western Canadian city in 2015, or 33 percent of its US\$29 billion in total sales, according to a note by financial analyst Peter Routledge on Wednesday. In Toronto, they made up 14 percent of purchases, or about US\$6.8 billion of the US\$4.7 billion in deals. ...

Vancouver has long been a target for housing critics who say offshore buyers, many of whom purchase

homes as investments and leave them empty, are pushing prices beyond levels locals can afford and creating ghost towns in neighborhoods....

The average price of a detached home in the city skyrocketed 30 percent to Us\$1.4 million in February from the prior year as sales jumped 37 percent, according the local real estate board. The price is much higher in certain neighborhoods, such as Vancouver West, where the average detached home will set a buyer back Us\$2.2 million

This hot money may be helping certain sectors of the economy, but after China devalues, or if the Chinese economy goes south, this money may just as quickly turn back—and leave a trail of destruction with it.

U.S.-China Trade Gap Is Biggest in World History

March 25

A MIDST ALL THE TALK ABOUT DONALD TRUMP STARTING A TRADE war—evidence has emerged that maybe America needs to take that risk. The *Washington Examiner* reports that a new analysis of U.S.-Chinese bilateral trade is not just at an historic high—but is the highest in world history for any nation.

According to the website Howmuch.net, the U.S.

exported \$116 billion to China in 2015, the same year China exported \$481 billion to the United States, producing that \$365 billion gap. ...

And it found that the gap is growing so fast that it will "almost quintuple" over the next 15 years.

The article goes on to say that U.S. exports have grown 30-fold

FDA's Attempts to Counter Drug Overdose Epidemic—Too Little, Too Late

March 25

THERE IS A DRUG ADDICTION EPIDEMIC IN AMERICA THAT MOST people are probably unaware of. It is not heroin, cocaine or marijuana—although it is just as destructive.

This drug addiction epidemic is addiction to medical drugs—particularly opioids. Opioids are opium-like drugs manufactured by the pharmaceutical industry as painkillers. They help relieve pain for people when no other types of drugs work. They act similarly to opium and include prescriptions oxycodone, hydrocodone and morphine.

These opioids are highly addictive—and deadly. Here are some quick facts:

- Tens of thousands of people each year in America die from opioid-usage-related issues.
- In 2014, almost 30,000 deaths in the United States were linked to these drugs.
- More Americans die from drug overdoses than vehicle crashes.
- · Around 36 million people abuse opioids worldwide.
- In the U.S., around 2.1 million people suffer from substance-use disorders related to prescription opioid pain relievers. That is four times as many as the estimated 467,000 people addicted to heroin.

This really is an epidemic.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) finally recognized

this week that there is a problem. Its solution is ordering safety-labeling changes to make it more obvious that using these drugs can lead to addiction and even death.

"Opioid addiction and overdose have reached epidemic levels over the past decade, and the FDA remains steadfast in our commitment to do our part to help reverse the devastating impact of the misuse and abuse of prescription opioids," said FDA commissioner Robert Califf, M.D. "Today's actions are one of the largest undertakings for informing prescribers of risks across opioid products, and one of many steps the FDA intends to take this year as part of our comprehensive action plan to reverse this epidemic."

Is changing a label really going to make much of an impact? It does nothing for those people who have already had their lives ruined.

Sadly, authorities have known about this major problem for years—yet they have done *nothing* about it. From this we can conclude:

- The drug lobby is incredibly powerful.
- The revolving-door relationship between the FDA and the pharmaceutical industry is not working in the best interests of consumers.

Consequently, many lives are unnecessarily being destroyed and damaged. The FDA's actions are too little, too late.

TW IN BRIEF

we Zealand votes to keep its traditional UK-rooted flag: The people of New Zealand voted to keep the country's traditional flag rather than switch to a new design. About 67 percent of the nation's population—or 2.1 million people—participated in the referendum. Reports on Thursday said 56.6 percent of those voters cast their ballot for keeping the traditional flag, which celebrates New Zealand's history with the United Kingdom. Prime Minister John Key had campaigned for the new Kyle Lockwood-designed silver fern flag. Key said he was disappointed by the outcome of the referendum, and that his government will not revisit the matter. The lengthy referendum process ended up

costing New Zealand an estimated \$26 million.

Preo cookie becomes Mexicanized: The maker of the Oreo cookie is laying off hundreds of workers from its Chicago factory as it moves operations to Mexico. Nabisco is expected to cut 277 workers this week—the first wave of about 600 employees who will lose their jobs. The company has built a brand-new \$130 million factory in Mexico where it will be hiring local workers. The company says it will save \$46 million per year by moving to Mexico where taxes, regulations and labor costs are all lower.



Follow Stephen Flurry

