

# Trumpet Weekly

APRIL 15, 2016

Army Deputy Chief of Staff Reinhard Kammerer (center), new commander of the DSK Eberhard Zorn (right), and former commander of DSO Joerg Vollmer mark the integration of Dutch forces in Stadtallendorf, Germany.



## Germany Is Taking Over the Dutch Army

Richard Palmer | April 14

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



**H**UGE PORTIONS OF THE DUTCH MILITARY ARE BEING MERGED with the German Army, a process that many want to see rolled out across the whole Continent. Two of the Netherlands' three combat brigades have officially begun the process of joining the Bundeswehr.

The 11th Airmobile Brigade came under German command in 2014. Then on March 17, the 43rd Mechanized Brigade officially became part of the German 1st Armored Division. The Dutch Army now has only the 13th Mechanized Brigade, plus special forces, support and headquarters staff under its own command.

This is a revolutionary change, not just for the Netherlands, but for Europe and, in time, the world. It is paving the way for a newly capable German-led military force.

There have been so many token efforts at forming multinational forces that it is easy to gloss over what has just happened. But the Dutch aren't just doing training maneuvers with Germany. Lt. Gen. Mart de Kruif, commander of the Royal Netherlands Army, called the collaboration "unique in the world, both in the way and the level in which we integrate."

He's right. Other multinational forces are on a much smaller

scale. The German-Dutch Corps is probably one of the most advanced military collaborations, but it is only 400 strong, including civilian personnel. The 5,000-strong Franco-German brigade has existed since 1987. But every time it has gone to war, it has been divided into its separate, national armies—parts of the brigade were finally deployed together to Mali in 2014.

But this time, the Netherlands is committing its fast-response forces and its only tank unit to Germany.

The two nations are also extending this partnership to the sea. Germany and the Netherlands will share the Dutch Navy's largest and most expensive ship, the Karel Doorman. The ship is designed to play a few roles, but most importantly, it can transport and land troops. It can land heavy equipment and has space for helicopters. The German sea battalion—about 800 soldiers specializing in naval protection, mine-clearance and boarding ships—will be absorbed into the Dutch Navy. And the two countries are examining having a German air defense unit join a Dutch unit.

These deals help Germany quickly expand the capability of its military, while the Dutch cut costs. Until recently, the German military was designed with one purpose—to prevent Russia from invading central Europe. That doesn't involve storming many beaches, so Germany didn't have any real amphibious landing capability. Now that the German Army is considering military missions across the Mediterranean, it needs this kind of capability quickly.

Meanwhile the Karel Doorman was so expensive that the Dutch haven't been able to use it properly. So the Germans help the Dutch pay for it, and the Germans get an instant and dramatic expansion of their amphibious landing capabilities.

From the Dutch point of view, this kind of money constraint has been the reason behind all their cooperation with Germany. Their military spending has fallen from around 2.5 percent of their economic output to 1.2 percent. Back in 2011, the Dutch Army phased out all its tanks. Since then, they've decided they still need tanks, but they don't want to pay for them. So the Dutch have decided that having their tank battalion commanded by Germany is better than having no tanks at all.

The German Sea Battalion is under Dutch command, so this cooperation goes both ways to a certain extent—though it is clear Germany is the senior partner. Even so, the German troops commanded by the Netherlands will be unable to deploy without the approval of the German parliament. Germany's constitutional court has ruled that the German military can only be deployed with the permission of the Bundestag. This applies to German units stationed in other forces.

"In all previous collaborations was agreed that troops operations continue to be subject to checks by the national institutions and procedures," wrote *Sächsische Zeitung*. "The Sea Battalion of the German Navy could thus be involved, for example, only after approval of the Bundestag on a foreign deployment of the Dutch Navy" (*Trumpet* translation throughout).

Germany sees this unprecedented cooperation as only the start. It has begun preparations for similar arrangements with Poland. The Czech Republic has asked Germany several times for a similar arrangement to what the Dutch now have—it also wants one of its armored brigades absorbed into the German Army.

German Defense Minister Ursula von der Leyen said she wants to build a European army this way. In February she announced, "We will set up a multinational panzer division next year."

"This should create a unit with up to 20,000 active soldiers, which should be operational by 2021—which would be the nucleus of a European army," wrote *Die Welt*.

In February, von der Leyen called their cooperation a "prime example for the building of a European defense union." Last month, Lt. Gen. Dieter Warnecke gave a speech where he held up the Dutch-German military partnership as a model for deeper integration among all European armies.

The German press sees this too. "Laboratory for an EU Army" was *Die Welt's* title for an article on this subject. It had another article titled "How von der Leyen Is Driving the European Army."

It wrote, "Von der Leyen and [Dutch Defense Minister Jeanine] Hennis-Plasschaert were playing the role of pioneers on their way to an EU army in Amsterdam."

Right from the start, Germany made no secret of the fact that a [European army is the ultimate goal](#) of this bilateral cooperation. The *Trumpet* described this thinking back in 2013. Even back then, the plan had been clearly articulated by Germany's defense establishment. Efforts to create a European army had consistently failed. So Germany was taking a new approach. It would form deep military relationships with just a few countries. Gradually more nations would be added to this cooperation, until the nucleus of a European army was formed.

"If Germany can prove that integration can work with the Netherlands and Poland—and they can save a lot of money doing so—other nations will want in. Once Berlin brings a few more countries on line, this project will gain critical mass," we wrote. "The result would be an EU army, or a very closely coordinated group of armies, centered on Germany."

With Germany planning a multinational panzer division, this process is well under way.

It says a lot about Germany's position in Europe that it—not France, Italy or any of the Continent's other powers—is at the center of this push for a European army. More importantly, it says a lot about Germany's ambitions.

Germany's economic dominance means that just about any kind of European army will be dominated by Germany. Writing on France's calls for Germany and France to work together on defense, George Friedman wrote:

Collaborating on defense budgets, with each nation contributing based on economic size, would mean that Germany would be both the leading economic and military power in Europe. Within the EU, Germany is first among equals. Creating a substantial military force would cement that.

The rise of a Europe capable of fielding a powerful military force, independent from the United States, would be one of the biggest geopolitical events of the 21st century so far, revolutionizing the balance of power around the world. Europe has already shown that it's willing to use its considerable economic power against U.S. interests—siding with China against the U.S., for example, in the case of the Asian Infrastructure and Investment Bank. How much more independently would it behave with a powerful military?

Europe's history warns that the world should be wary of the rise of this new military power. For more on this, read our free book [The Holy Roman Empire in Prophecy](#).

 Follow [Richard Palmer](#)

# TrumpetDaily

## RADIO SHOW

CHICAGO POLICE UNDER FIRE, RUSSIAN AIRCRAFT BUZZES U.S. SHIP,  
AND WHAT BRITISH MUSLIMS REALLY THINK | APRIL 14

IRAN VIOLATES NUKE DEAL, PROMPTING U.S. OFFICIALS TO STOP USING THE  
TERM 'VIOLATE' | APRIL 13

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE EARTH ARE 'OUT OF COURSE' | APRIL 12

IS THIS REALLY TELEVISION'S GOLDEN AGE? | APRIL 11

## T Egyptians Unhappy With Sisi's Decision to 'Sell' Red Sea Islands

Brent Nagtegaal | April 15

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



EGYPTIAN PRESIDENT ABDEL FATTAH AL-SISI IS UNDER FIRE AT home after agreeing to cede control of two Red Sea islands to Saudi Arabia. The announcement, made during Saudi King Salman's state visit to Egypt over the weekend, concerns two islands of important strategic value.

Located at the southern tip of the Sinai Peninsula, the uninhabited islands of Tiran and Sanafir are important because they could virtually control access to Israel's Red Sea Port of Eilat from the Indian Ocean.

For this reason, the two islands figure prominently in the Israeli-Egyptian peace agreement signed in 1979, which promises safe passage to Israeli civilian and military ships through the narrow waterways of the Straits of Tiran. The Egyptian blockade of the waterway to Israeli shipping in 1967 was one of the reasons for Israel's preemptive strike against the Egyptian Air Force at the start of the Six Day War.

Yet, astoundingly, it is not Israel that is upset by the move; the major criticism has come from the Egyptian public.

As soon as the announcement was made, thousands of

detractors took to social media to lambaste the decision in a public display of outrage against the government reminiscent of the start of the Arab Spring.

The idea that Egypt was selling off the islands was renounced by both the Saudi and Egyptian governments, saying that the islands were actually claimed by Saudi Arabia all along and that Egypt was simply returning them to Saudi jurisdiction. "History and documents of both countries have not shown any disagreement on the Saudi identity of both islands. But some are trying to fish in troubled waters," Saudi Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir claimed.

While that may be the case, the Egyptian public is not buying a word of it. The Egyptian people smell a rat. And it's unlikely the stench will go away anytime soon.

As the *Nation* reported, giving away the islands "has the potential to provoke much more widespread opposition to the regime." Public pressure for Sisi's departure, as well as the barrage of [international pressure](#) to loosen his grip on power, indicate that another revolution may soon shake the Egyptian political landscape.

## T Western Media Calls to End U.S.-Egypt Alliance

Callum Wood | April 8

IT IS 2011 ALL OVER AGAIN IN EGYPT. WESTERN MEDIA IS ONCE again calling for revolution in the Arab nation, risking a resurgence of the Muslim Brotherhood.

When the Egyptian Arab Spring ousted President Hosni Mubarak in 2011, it instated Muslim Brotherhood candidate Mohamed Morsi as supreme ruler. Tyranny ensued—until Abdel Fattah al-Sisi's military coup in 2013.

But has Sisi become the new Mubarak/Morsi?

Under his watch, Egypt has increased its harassment of non-government organizations and anyone critical of the current administration. Cultural centers and media outlets have been targeted.

Western media suggest it's time for another revolution.

The *New York Times* editorial board opined: "The time has come to challenge them and to reassess whether an alliance that has long been considered a cornerstone of American national



security policy is doing more harm than good.”

Further on it stated, “Administration officials who have cautioned against a break with Egypt say its military and intelligence cooperation is indispensable. It’s time to challenge that premise. ... Over the next few months, the president should start planning for the possibility of a break in the alliance with Egypt.”

Another prominent voice calling for a revolution is the Washington, D.C.-based Egyptian Working Group. Back in 2011, the organization threw its weight behind United States President Barack Obama’s decision to cut off Mubarak.

Author and journalist Caroline Glick had a few choice words for the Egyptian Working Group: “[I]t is hard to accept the credibility of those who refuse to learn from their mistakes. It is

harder still as well to listen to the ‘moral calls’ of those who refuse to accept that because their past advice was heeded, thousands have died, and if their current calls are heeded, millions of lives will be imperiled.”

Glick’s article is a response to the Working Group releasing an open letter to President Obama, calling for tougher action against Sisi.

Egypt’s economy is still reeling from the effects of the last revolution. Can it really survive another one? It’s teetering on the brink of collapse, and the U.S. could either cooperate with a dictatorial regime or push it over the edge and see what happens. The U.S. has already demonstrated that it is capable of either option. Regardless of which is taken, [Egypt’s days of turmoil](#) are not over.



## President Obama’s ‘Worst Mistake’

Anthony Chibarrirwe | April 14

**D**URING THE LIGHTNING ROUND OF HIS INTERVIEW WITH UNITED States President Barack Obama on Sunday, Fox News host Chris Wallace asked what the president considered his “worst mistake.” His response wasn’t intervening in Libya; it was intervening in Libya *without* a plan for the aftermath.

In his own words, President Obama said his worst mistake was “probably failing to plan for the day after what I think was the right thing to do in intervening in Libya.”

It’s only recently that the Obama administration has publicly acknowledged its failures in Libya—now that the reality is painfully clear for all to see. When the U.S.-led intervention in Libya resulted in the deposition and eventual death of Muammar Qadhafi in October 2011, the administration wasn’t soul-searching for a “day after” plan for Libya—it celebrated. Then Secretary of State Hillary Clinton considered the intervention one of her biggest accomplishments. Speaking of Qadhafi, she joked to CBS News: “We came. We saw. He died.”

The administration wasn’t lamenting its lack of a plan in Libya immediately before and after the Benghazi attack in September 2012. Neither did it decry its legacy in Libya when the U.S. was compelled to evacuate from its Benghazi consulate and from its [Tripoli embassy](#) in July 2014. A month later, a coalition of Islamist militants, Libya Dawn, hosted a [pool party](#) at an evacuated

residential annex of the United States Embassy in Tripoli.

Libya has been a failed state for years. It has two rival governments based in two different cities.

It has been only recently—after the Islamic State steamrolled into Libya to take advantage of the lawlessness—that President Obama acknowledged what a “mess” the country is. In fact, privately, he called Libya a “[expletive] show.” But in a recent interview with the *Atlantic*, the president heaped much of the blame for the Libyan chaos on the “free riders” in Europe who were not “invested in the follow-up.”

Speaking during a BBC interview, President Obama said, “That’s a lesson I now apply when we’re asked to intervene militarily. Do we have a plan for the day after?”

This doesn’t mean that the United States should not intervene in the world’s hotspots, because it *has been* American intervention that has helped preserve peace in our chaotic world over the years.

But today, the United States faces a debilitating leadership crisis and a dangerous lack of willpower to see through world problems. Intervention or no, every geopolitical mistake the United States makes will have huge consequences. In the Middle East, the ultimate consequence of these mistakes will be a dramatic rebalancing of power in the region, as our article [“What Happens After a Superpower Dies?”](#) explains.

## Al Qaeda: Enriched by Yemeni War

**W**HEN IT COMES TO TERRORIST HAVENS, YEMEN IS BECOMING the new Iraq. The war in Iraq bolstered al Qaeda in Iraq—the terrorist group that has since become the Islamic State. The war in Yemen, reported Reuters on April 8, has similarly bolstered al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP).

In [“How Saudi Arabia’s War in Yemen Has Made al Qaeda Stronger—and Richer,”](#) Reuters reported:

Once driven to near irrelevance by the rise of Islamic State abroad and security crackdowns at home, al Qaeda in Yemen now openly rules a mini-state with a war chest swollen by an estimated \$100 million in looted bank deposits and revenue from running the country’s third-largest port.

AQAP’s base of operations is Mukalla, Yemeni’s southeastern Yemeni port city. The group appears to have ripped out pages for

itself from the Islamic State's governance book. In Mukalla, AQAP looted \$100 million in bank deposits and extorted \$1.4 million from the local oil company. The group earns \$2 million every day from levying taxes on residents and businesses. It also produces propaganda videos that parade its humanitarian efforts within the community. It even has a "Robin Hood" strategy of demanding money from state-owned companies and using it to win the favor of local residents

Reuters continued:

Its emergence is the most striking unintended

consequence of the Saudi-led military intervention in Yemen. The campaign, backed by the United States, has helped al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula to become stronger than at any time since it first emerged almost 20 years ago.

The al Qaeda franchise was responsible for the *Charlie Hebdo* attacks in Paris last year. It has also tried to down U.S. airliners; its most notable attempt being the "underwear bomber" in 2009. AQAP's emergence bears a striking resemblance to what we wrote about the Islamic State in "[The World's Newest Most Radical 'State'.](#)"

### Iran's Missile Tests: Violation or Inconsistency?

**I**RAN WAS IN CLEAR VIOLATION OF THE RECENTLY IMPLEMENTED nuclear deal when it decided to test-fire ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads. The Obama administration was well aware of Iran's breach of the agreement but decided to use more ambiguous terms to describe Iran's actions in order to preserve the deal. Instead of saying that Iran *violated* the deal, the Obama administration advised its representatives to simply say Iran's actions were *inconsistent with* the deal.

*Washington Free Beacon* reported that this development is creating more friction between Congress and the Obama

administration. "Congress is now pursuing an inquiry into what lawmakers describe as the Obama administration's efforts to mislead lawmakers about the terms of the nuclear deal," it reported.

"This week, [Iranian] Foreign Minister [Javad] Zarif asserted that Iran's missile program was 'not open to negotiation,'" said Rep. Mike Pompeo. "While the Iranians are obstinate, the Obama administration debates semantics for weeks—ignoring the frightening reality that Iran tested ballistic missiles."

The implications of this [willful oversight](#) will prove deadly.

## TW IN BRIEF

**I**taly's business deals with Iran: Italy and Iran signed deals potentially worth billions on Tuesday when Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi visited Tehran seeking a strong Italian foothold. Three months ago, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani made Italy his first stop in Europe as he sought to drum up investment in the Iranian economy. Iran rejoined the global trading system in January following a deal to lift crippling sanctions in exchange for limiting its nuclear activities. "The end of sanctions is a historic step not only for Iran but for the whole region," Renzi told reporters in Tehran. Business delegations from other European countries are expected in Tehran in coming weeks, but Italy is well positioned to win contracts that could deliver a much needed

export boost for its chronically sluggish economy.

**T**aliban to launch spring offensive: The Taliban announced on Tuesday that it would begin a spring offensive dubbed Operation Omari. The offensive was named for the late Taliban founder Mullah Mohammed Omar. The terrorist group said in a statement that it would launch large-scale attacks on the strongholds of the Afghan government. The statement said that "Jihad against the aggressive and usurping infidel army [was] a holy obligation upon [their] necks." It also said that the group would do everything it could to "bog the enemy down in a war of attrition that lowers the morale" of foreign armies.

## EUROPE

# Trumpet Hour

PUTIN'S PRIVATE MILITARY, EGYPT'S POLITICAL UNREST, EUROPE'S BUILDING ARMY, AMERICA'S CASINO STOCK MARKET AND MORE | APRIL 15

A BODY BLOW TO THE EU, RELIGION IN RUSSIA, MEXICO IN CRISIS, THE BATTLE FOR THE NORTH POLE, AND MORE | APRIL 8

## France Wants Military Cooperation With Europe, but Not America

**I**N THE WAKE OF THE BRUSSELS ATTACK, FRANCE IS LAUNCHING A renewed push for a combined European military force, and President François Hollande is making it very clear that he does not want to rely on the United States. George Friedman described the latest efforts in his article for Geopolitical Futures on April 8, titled [“France Confronts Germany on Defense”](#):

One day before a joint meeting of French and German officials on April 7, French President François Hollande said in an interview with the German newspaper *Bild*, “Our two countries must agree to a budgetary effort on defense. And to act outside Europe. Let’s not rely on another power, even a friendly one, to do away with terrorism.” This is a statement that requires serious consideration. ...

The attacks in Paris and Brussels have posed a fundamental question for France. It cannot simply accept this threat, but must do something about it. ... For the French, building a European military force around France and Germany is the necessary precondition for any solution to Europe’s growing challenges. ...

Hollande specifically said that France and Germany could not depend on a third power, no matter how friendly, to fight their battles. He clearly was referring to the United States. Collaborating on defense budgets, with each nation contributing based on economic size, would mean that Germany would be both the leading economic and military power in Europe. Within the EU, Germany is first among equals. Creating a substantial military force would cement that. And that raises for Germans the specter of a return to what must never be again.

In another article, this time published at Mauldin Economics on April 11, [“Europe and NATO,”](#) Friedman described how Europe is being scared into action by America’s retreat:

This year, a major topic at Globsec will be NATO. The choice of topic has to do partly with Donald Trump’s statements that Europe isn’t paying its “fair share” and, further, that it would be fine if NATO broke up. Such remarks by U.S. presidential candidates are regarded with great care and concern in Eastern Europe. On a broader scale, Russia and the Middle East both present national security issues for all of Europe. Europe has no integrated military capability except for NATO, and NATO is now, to my mind, a shambles. It is a military alliance, but Europe has allowed its military capability, limited to begin with in the wake of World War II, to weaken dramatically.

As Europeans come to realize that Russia has not gone away and the United States has not actually overreacted to Islamist terrorism, Trump’s words on NATO are raising

alarm. ... Many Europeans see NATO as the guarantor of their national security. In other words, they depend on the United States ... the only NATO member with a global military capability. ...

The Europeans celebrated a concept called soft power, which involves the use of sanctions, the mobilization of public opinion, and other strategies that avoid military action. They wanted an option that cost less than becoming a global power costs. Frankly, from my point of view, their embracing soft power was simply a way to evade reality. As the Russians loomed larger and the Middle East spilled over into Europe, the Europeans discovered that soft power was ... soft. And that they needed hard power, which the United States had (and to a far lesser extent Britain and France), but no one else did. Suddenly the world seemed out of control to the Europeans, since they lacked the hard power to shape events. ...

The total population of the European Union is just over 508 million people. The population of the United States is about 320 million people. The GDP of the European Union is \$18.45 trillion. The GDP of the United States is about \$18.3 trillion. In other words, Europe and the United States are equal in wealth, while Europe has almost 200 million people more than the U.S. does.

There is therefore no reason why the Europeans should not have a military capability equal to or even greater than that commanded by the United States. Though Europe was understandably the junior partner in the 1950s, neither demographics nor economics show the Continent to be a junior partner now. ...

The structural problem is that the European Union lacks a defense dimension. European unification is a complex quilt of relationships, and defense rests in the hands of individual sovereign states. The largest state, Germany, which should be devoting the most to a European defense force, devotes little even to its own force. ...

Now, the Russians are reasserting their place in history, and the Islamic State is targeting European capitals. It is not clear how the threats they pose are to be countered, but the challenge will demand military force in some capacity.

Friedman, however, believes that nothing will come of this, that the Europeans will be unable to make the tough choices necessary, and that French and German positions are too far apart to form a united force. There is a lot of truth here. Becoming a military power again is a big change for Europe and for Germany, and not one they will make lightly. But with terrorists planning more and bigger attacks, these are changes Europe will be forced to make in time. For more on how this will come about, read *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry’s article [“The Terrorist Attacks That United Europe.”](#)

## More Turmoil Heading to Ukraine?

**U**KRAINE’S EMBATTLED PRIME MINISTER STEPPED DOWN ON TUESDAY, as the entire Ukrainian government is mired in corruption

scandals. The discontent building against this government could lead to more instability for Ukraine, as Lev Golinkin wrote in *Foreign*

Policy on April 13 in [“The Toxic Coddling of Petro Poroshenko”](#):

The man at the center of Kiev’s problems, President Petro Poroshenko, still refuses to combat the endemic corruption that infuriates Ukrainians and strangles their economy. And thanks to the West, which continues to back him, Poroshenko is more deeply entrenched in power than ever before. ...

The legacy of the Poroshenko-Yatsenyuk government is a sordid record of resisting reforms in ways big and small. As U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland stated in her March 15 Senate testimony, they leave behind the very real risk that Ukraine will begin “sliding backwards once again into corruption, into lawlessness, into vassal statehood.” It’s hard to imagine a Poroshenko-Groisman (read: Poroshenko-Poroshenko) government would do any better. ...

In the fall of 2013, pent-up anger at Viktor Yanukovich, a corrupt Russian-backed oligarch who flouted the rule of law, erupted onto the streets of Kiev. Replacing corruption with the rule of law is part of what fueled the Maidan uprising, drove millions to endure freezing conditions and the billy clubs and bullets of riot police. Three years later, hints of that anger are once again surfacing in news and social media—except this time they’re directed at Poroshenko, a Western-backed oligarch.

While the West is distracted by U.S. elections and the migrant crisis, Ukraine is turning into a 45 million-person,

Texas-sized pressure cooker in the middle of Europe. With every new scandal, with every editorial comparing Poroshenko to his overthrown predecessor, with every reformer resigning in frustration, the pressure grows. Sooner or later, Poroshenko, or someone in his circle, will do something so unforgivable and outrageous that it’ll ignite a new wave of protests.

The difference between Ukraine in 2013 and 2016, however, is two years of war, nearly 10,000 casualties, and over 2 million refugees and internally displaced persons. Ukraine is flooded with weapons, has a hostile population in the southeastern regions, a disillusioned military, an economy fresh from teetering on the brink of collapse, and, most importantly, heavily armed battalions of far-right fighters. Another uprising is likely to push the country toward disintegration.

One telling bit of news that emerged from the Panama Papers leak is that Ukraine’s constitution does not have a process for impeaching the president. Indeed, in a nation with such abysmally low trust in the government, no such process is needed: Any impeachment proceedings will take place in the streets, as in 2004 and 2014, amid burning tires and screams of *gan’ba!* (shame!). Neither Ukraine nor Europe can afford for this to happen now. ...

Syria and Libya are straining Europe to the breaking point—imagine what a failed state of 45 million people in the middle of Europe will do.

## Is Germany at Risk of an ISIS Attack?

**S**ALAH ABDESLAM, ONE OF THE PLANNERS OF THE PARIS ATTACKS, may have been planning attacks on a nuclear facility in Germany, as the Local described in an article published on April 14, [“Paris Terrorist Was Eyeing German Nuclear Center”](#):

Salah Abdeslam had documents at his apartment about a nuclear research center at Jülich in North Rhine-Westphalia, raising concerns for authorities about what he may have been planning on German soil.

The documents included articles printed out from online sources about the research facility, as well as photos of the center’s head, Wolfgang Marquardt, newspapers under the publishing group Redaktionsnetzwerk Deutschland (RND) reported, citing members of a parliamentary panel.

Meanwhile at least 29 German soldiers have traveled to Syria and Iraq, and some have joined the Islamic State. In an article

titled [“German Soldiers ‘May Have Joined ISIS in Syria’”](#) the Local writes:

The internal report from the military counterintelligence service MAD, seen by DPA, also showed that 65 active soldiers are currently under investigation on suspicion of having Islamist sympathies.

Since 2007, the Bundeswehr (German Army) has identified 22 soldiers in its ranks as Islamists and relieved 17 of them from their duties. ...

That overall figure has increased by four cases since the first report on Islamists in the Army in 2015. ...

“Just like other fighting forces, the Bundeswehr can be attractive for Islamists who want to acquire weapons training,” [M.P. Hans-Peter] Bartels said. “But to my knowledge there is so far no systematic push by Islamist organizations to infiltrate the Army.”

## **Is Hungary Right About Europe Having Hundreds of No-go Zones?** **Kieren Underwood | April 13**

**O**N APRIL 1, THE HUNGARIAN GOVERNMENT LAUNCHED A WEBSITE that claimed Europe contained 900 “no-go areas” where migrants had caused “the norms of the host society [to] barely prevail.” It was created, no doubt, to sway public opinion concerning

an upcoming referendum: Hungary will be the first country in the European Union to vote on whether it should halt the reallocation of migrants at its border.

Right-wing politicians, such as United States presidential

candidate Donald Trump and British M.E.P. Nigel Farage, have long claimed such areas exist—only to be ridiculed by other politicians and officials.

Similarly, Hungary's claim of Europe's 900 no-go areas was shot down by a number of news sites that claimed the sources used were unreliable. These back-and-forth arguments reveal the large dichotomy between the media's left- and right-wing views of no-go zones: The right latches on to every claim of radicalized areas, while the left pretends that no such areas exist.

Middle East historian Daniel Pipes explains how a no-go zone depends, essentially, on who you are and what you are doing:

My visits establish that non-Muslim civilians can usually enter majority-Muslim areas without fear. But things look very different from the governmental point of view. On a routine basis, firefighters, ambulance workers and even social workers meet with hostility and violence. For example, days after I visited the Marseille [France] slum, its residents shot at police preparing for a visit by the prime minister of France. Thus does it and its ilk represent a no-go zone for police, a place which government representatives enter only when heavily armed, in convoys, temporarily, and with a specific mission.

The Rotherham, England, child sex scandal is an undeniable example of Hungary's claim that areas exist in which "the norms of the host society barely prevail." An official inquiry found that for 16 years (1997–2013), a ring of Muslim men sexually exploited—through abduction, rape, gang rape, trafficking, prostitution, torture—at least 1,400 non-Muslim girls as young as 11 years old. Police were aware but chose not to interfere in the area out of concern for political correctness.

Yet, as the argument continues, the balance of opinion over migrants in some European countries has already tipped. The results of a tri-national study by IFOP (a French international marketing firm) in Paris showed that 72 percent of the French population wants to return from the passport-free Schengen borders to national borders with border guards. Two thirds of the German population (66 percent) and a majority of Italians (60 percent) also want their federal governments to terminate the Schengen treaty.

Each new event involving migrants in Europe is likely to spawn new claims about no-go zones, along with equivalent denials of their existence. Nevertheless, a large number of Europeans have already begun leaning toward the previously radical-right policies on migrant issues. Read "[Cologne Has Changed Everything](#)" to see just how quickly a single event can change public opinion.

## ASIA

### **T** New 'Praetorian Guard' Seals Putin's Hold on Power Andrew Müller | April 15

#### WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



THE PRAETORIAN GUARD OF THE ROMAN EMPEROR BECAME INFAMOUS as one of the ancient world's most brutal military forces. Equal parts secret service, riot police and imperial bodyguard, this *corps d'élite* became a permanent force only after Caesar Augustus made himself sole master of the Roman world.

These handpicked soldiers were loyal first and foremost to the emperor. After the fall of Rome, the legacy of this imperial force inspired would-be emperors from Napoleon Bonaparte to Czar Peter the Great to create private armies.

A modern-day imperial strongman is resurrecting this idea once again!

During a televised appearance last week, Russian President Vladimir Putin made a surprise announcement. He was overhauling Russian law-enforcement operations to create a domestic army that would answer to him personally. This paramilitary force will be called the National Guard and will be led by former KGB agent Victor Zolotov, a judo-sparing partner of Putin's who once served as the president's bodyguard.

The basis of this National Guard will be 170,000 riot police and counterinsurgency units poached from the Ministry of Internal Affairs. This force will be supplemented with special police forces and military personnel until it becomes a paramilitary force of up to 400,000 servicemen (roughly four times the size of the British military).

According to Putin's official televised announcement, this new paramilitary force will be responsible for fighting terrorism, organized crime and illicit drug trafficking. In close cooperation with the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the National Guard will also perform the functions currently carried out by Russian riot police units.

The creation of a paramilitary force that answers personally to Putin is an indication that the Russian leader may be growing skeptical of the loyalty of his cabinet officials. The Ministry of Internal Affairs will be severely weakened by this reform. Russia doesn't have a decentralized system of local law-enforcement officers like the United States. Interior Minister Vladimir Kolokoltsev, who is not a member of Putin's inner circle, runs most of Russia's nationalized, domestic police operations. Now, whenever Kolokoltsev needs muscle to put down civil unrest that goes beyond routine law enforcement, he will have to ask Putin's National Guard for help.

There are also indications that Putin is growing increasingly concerned that Washington may try and stage a new Russian revolution against him. The new National Guard is being equipped with its own intelligence service and investigative powers. This intelligence service would report directly to Putin, via Zolotov, and not to the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation.

At a time when economic stagnation is making civil unrest



more likely, there are legitimate concerns that Putin's new National Guard will be even more authoritarian than the old Internal Troops. The number of National Guard personnel will exceed 15 percent of the Russian military. This paramilitary police force has also been granted the rights to make arrests without introducing themselves and to fire without warning "in special cases."

As president, Putin is combining Stalin's idea of a unitary state model with imperial policies from Russia's czarist era. Like the Byzantine emperors and Russian czars, Putin is using the Russian Orthodox Church as a de facto state religion to unify his empire. If this Orthodox-dominated unitary state isn't enough to secure his power base, Putin now has a 400,000-strong Praetorian Guard to do his bidding!

---

## China and India Begin New Era of Cooperation in Outer Space

**D**URING HIS VISIT TO INDIA LAST WEEK, WU YANHUA, DEPUTY Administrator for the Chinese National Space Agency (CNSA), announced that China and India would begin collaborating on a proposed satellite constellation for BRICS nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa). This announcement is part of an ongoing initiative to make BRICS members less dependent on United States technology and equipment in space.

An article in Sputnik News, titled "United in Space: China, India Pave the Way to BRICS Cooperation in Space," says the following:

The decision of China and India to work together on a joint system of satellites would allow the members of BRICS to be more independent and implement more complex engineering projects in space without having to depend on U.S. technology, Russian military expert Vasiliy Kashin told Sputnik in an interview.

Such cooperation represents a big break from the past when China and India were rivals in the Asian space race. The Sputnik article continues:

According to Kashin, China might be a bit more

advanced in space, but India "has its own distinct advantages." For example, China has more powerful missile-carriers and more experience in developing spacecraft. India, on the other hand, is better at developing space-related software and electronic components. ...

Meanwhile, Russia is currently working to start supplying rocket engines for future Chinese space launch programs. China, in turn, will provide electronic components for Russian satellites. The two countries also agreed to synchronize their satellite navigation system, GLONASS and Beidou, Kashin informed.

For half a century, America was the world's dominant superpower. But evidence abounds—in the nation's foreign policy, its economy, its military, its scientific establishment and elsewhere—that this period of dominance is ending. The realm of space technology is yet another arena in which America's decline has set in, and foreign nations are closing the gap.

This shift takes the world into dangerous new territory—but it is completely in line with trends the *Trumpet* has been forecasting for decades. For more information on the source of our forecasting, request our free book *The United States and Britain in Prophecy*.

---

## Africa's Place in China's Empire

**N**IGERIA'S PRESIDENT NEGOTIATED A \$6 BILLION LOAN AND A CURRENCY swap deal with China this week, as he continues to search for ways to revive a faltering economy. His four-day visit to China is a turn for Africa's biggest economy toward China, now its biggest trading partner.

In an article on the Journal of Diplomacy titled "Africa's Place in the 'China Dream,'" Samuna Thompson Wreh points to the geopolitical significance of China's increased involvement in Africa:

Western domination of global power is no longer uncontested. China's emergence as a major economic player in the late 20th century is nothing short of amazing. In the past several decades, China has lifted its people into a middle-class economy and become an undeniable global economic powerhouse. In its growth, China's need for natural resources has turned investors towards the Middle East and Africa.

According to Zhao Changhui, the chief country risk analyst at Export-Import Bank of China, the central government, including state-owned banks, will provide US\$1 trillion of financing to Africa through the year 2025. At the 2013 Africa Investment Summit in Hong Kong, Changhui said, "Africa for the next 20 years will be the single-most important business destination for many Chinese mega corporations."

Beyond economic cooperation, however, China is stepping up its military presence in Africa, Wreh continues:

China's interests in Africa go beyond natural resources. President Xi Jinping's "China Dream" slogan embodies China's quest for a "new type" of relations in which it would engage U.S. and other power players on equal footing. It was Deng Xiaoping who said, "Build a powerful navy with

the capability of fighting a modern war.” China’s strategy in Africa is also military.

In Africa, Chinese military diplomacy initiatives have included the circumnavigation of the African continent, the [People’s Liberation Army Navy’s] bilateral training with Nigeria, Cameroon and Namibia, and even China’s assistance combating Ebola.

Perhaps more telling of China’s ambitions in Africa was the 2015 announcement of China’s first military base in Djibouti. The outpost breaks with Beijing’s long-standing policy against emulating the United States in building military facilities abroad.

Three power groups are presently vying for control of Africa’s vast basket of natural resources: China (with Russia in support), Germany under its European Union cloak and Iran. Against

these, fighting a rearguard action, the United States is struggling to devote more of its already too-strained budgetary resources to its campaign to “democratize” Africa.

“In Africa, as in many other parts of the developing world, China is redrawing geopolitical alliances in ways that helps propel China’s rise as a global superpower” (*Wall Street Journal*, March 29, 2005). From rebuilding oil-rich Nigeria’s railroads, paving Rwanda’s main roads, operating a major timber outfit in Equatorial Guinea and Zambia’s largest copper mine, to inroads into supermarket and textile companies in Lesotho, China’s African penetration is aggressively on the increase. Further, the Chinese are active in widespread searches for oil and gas throughout the continent, in addition to rebuilding neglected electricity grids and telecommunications infrastructure. In short, the Chinese are looking to use African resources in their push for global power.

## TW IN BRIEF

**Russian planes buzz U.S. ships:** Russian attack planes flew close to a United States Navy destroyer in the Baltic Sea multiple times Monday and Tuesday, coming within an estimated 30 feet from the ship and twice passing below the ship’s navigation bridge, U.S. officials said Wednesday. The Russian SU-24 planes appeared unarmed but on Tuesday flew what the commander of the USS Donald Cook deemed to be a simulated attack profile. The U.S. commander judged the actions unsafe and unprofessional, but the ship took no action beyond trying unsuccessfully to communicate with the aircraft by radio. White House press secretary Josh Earnest said the incident was part of a pattern of unsafe Russian aircraft action.

**Ukraine’s prime minister resigns:** Ukraine’s embattled prime minister has announced he is resigning, opening the way for the formation of a new government to end a drawn-out political crisis. In a televised address broadcast on Sunday, Arseniy Yatsenyuk

said his resignation would be formally submitted to parliament on Tuesday. Yatsenyuk’s cabinet survived a no-confidence vote in February. But two parties left the governing coalition in protest, depriving the coalition of its majority in Ukraine’s parliament.

**John Kerry’s ‘gut-wrenching’ tour of Hiroshima:** United States Secretary of State John Kerry became the highest-ranking U.S. government official to visit Hiroshima Peace Park Memorial and Museum in Japan. Following a two-day summit on nuclear disarmament and counterterrorism, Secretary Kerry paid his respects to the victims of the first-ever atomic bomb strike, which occurred during World War II. Kerry said the displays at the museum were “stunning” and “gut-wrenching” and encouraged others to visit, including United States President Barack Obama. For decades, the U.S. has avoided sending envoys to Hiroshima to avoid any appearance of an apology for the wartime strike.

## ANGLO-AMERICA



### Dead Faith

Gerald Flurry, *The Key of David* | April 15

As society struggles with anxiety and depression, learn to discern living faith from dead faith.



## Holy Bible—‘Most Objected To’ Book

THE BIBLE IS ONE OF THE MOST OBJECTED TO BOOKS AT PUBLIC schools and libraries, according to the Associated Press. In an article titled “Holy Bible on List of ‘Challenged’ Books at Libraries,” (April 11), AP notes that it made the list due to the “sex and

violence it contains,” but also because opponents of the Bible say schools and libraries should not stock it due to issues relating to the separation of church and state. It is interesting to note that the Koran did not make the list. AP reports:

"You have people who feel that if a school library buys a copy of the Bible, it's a violation of church and state," says James LaRue, who directs the Office for Intellectual Freedom for the American Library Association [ALA], which released its annual 10 top snapshot of "challenged" books on Monday, part of the association's "State of Libraries Report" for 2016. ...

The ALA also favors including a wide range of religious materials, from the Koran to the Bhagavad Gita to the Book of Mormon. **LaRue added that the association does hear of complaints about the Koran, but fewer than for the Bible.**

The Bible finished sixth on a list topped by John Green's *Looking for Alaska*, which has been cited for "offensive language" and sexual content. The runner-up, challenged for obvious reasons, was E.L. James's raunchy romance *Fifty Shades of Grey*.

*I Am Jazz*, a transgender picture book by Jessica Herthel and Jazz Jennings, was No. 3, followed by another transgender story, Susan Kuklin's *Beyond Magenta*. The list also includes Mark Haddon's *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time*, Alison Bechdel's *Fun Home*, Craig Thompson's *Habibi*, Jeanette Winter's *Nasreen's Secret School: A True Story From Afghanistan* and David Leviathan's *Two Boys Kissing*, with one objection being that it "condones

public displays of affection."

The AP also highlighted a related and disturbing trend in America's schools.

Discussing recent events, LaRue said he was concerned by legislation that Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe recently vetoed forcing schools to warn parents if their children will be assigned books with sexually explicit content. A Fairfax County mother had protested the use of Toni Morrison's Pulitzer Prize-winning *Beloved* in her son's high school senior class. The 1987 novel set in the post-Civil War era includes scenes depicting sex, rape and bestiality and has appeared occasionally on the ALA challenged books list.

"We see the danger of censorship moving from the school library into the English classroom," LaRue said

As a parent, it is your duty to know what your children are being taught. It has nothing to do with censorship. And many parents would probably be shocked to learn that schools are teaching students about bestiality and having them read books about rape—and that their governor vetoed a law requiring schools to inform said parents.

---

## Charlie Munger: The Stock Market Is a Casino and Too Many People Want to Get Rich Quick—It Will End in Disaster

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



**“W**ARREN BUFFETT'S RIGHT-HAND MAN GAVE A DARK WARNING About American Finance," reported Business Insider on April 11. According to Berkshire Hathaway vice chairman Charlie Munger, America has developed "a vast gambling culture, and people have made it respectable." But could this mentality give rise to a modern-day Hitler?

You all see what goes on in finance: the craziness, the promotions, the fuzzy accounting, the crazy trading cultures .... It's very bad for all of us that we have this huge overdevelopment of finance. And yet it's very hard to do anything about it.

What happened: If you look back to, say, Edwardian England or the First World War, maybe 300 people, males, owned half the land in England. They had nothing to do. I mean, their under-butlers had under-butlers. What did they do, they went down to the clubs in London and sat around the card tables and gambled with one another for high stakes. **That's what human nature does when people have a lot of leisure.** Fade in, fade out, and multiply the wealth per capita of the world by 30 or so, and now we got all kinds of people who are like the lords of England who had all that time to play cards against one another and

enjoy the thrills and things of gambling.

**So we have a vast gambling culture, and people have made it respectable.** Instead of betting on horses or prize-fights, we can bet on the price of securities or the price of derivatives relating to securities, and we can bet on athletic contests. We have a huge amount of legalized gambling. And of course the public market, which operates every day with transactions, is an ideal casino. And there are a whole bunch of people who want to own a casino and make a lot of money without losing money on inventories or credit ... and many other irritating parts of business. Just to sit there every night and go higher and higher. Who doesn't want to be croupier in a casino? And very respectable people get drawn into it. They see other people getting rich.

There's way, way too much of that in America. And too much of the new wealth has gone to people who either own a casino or are playing in a casino. And I don't think the exaltation of that group has been good for life generally, and I am to some extent a member of that group.

I'm always afraid I'll be a terrible example for the youth who want to make a lot of money with and not do much for anybody else and who just want to be shrewd about buying little pieces of paper. Even if you do that very honestly, I

**don't consider it much of a life. Just being shrewd about buying little pieces of paper, shrewder than other people, is not an adequate life. It's not a good example for other people. ...**

And I hate to agree with Elizabeth Warren on this subject, but she's right. And I don't see any way of stopping it except with some big legislative change. And you'd say, what difference does it make? Well, what happens is—as the cyclical of gambling in securities and other goes on—what happens is the big busts hurt us more than the big booms help us.

When a billionaire Republican agrees with Democratic socialists who want to redistribute the wealth, it probably pays to pay attention.

The truth of the matter is that ... Elizabeth Warren doesn't agree with me on many subjects, and I wouldn't agree with her on many subjects, but she is basically right when she says that American finance is out of control and that it isn't good for the rest of us. Both Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders are not two of my favorite people on

Earth, but they are absolutely right [about finance].

For Americans, Munger says the danger is that our casino mentality could lead to the same kind of economic conditions that have given rise to dictators in the past. **He is not just talking about the destruction of the dollar, but the economic demoralization of a whole generation of people.**

We saw that when the Great Depression ended in the rise of Adolf Hitler. A lot of people think that Hitler rose because of the great Weimar inflation. Well you know Germany recovered pretty well from that Weimar inflation. What they did is they destroyed the currency, and they just issued a new currency. It's very interesting. They got rid [of] the mortgages and inflation, and they put the mortgages back and they [issued] a new Reichsmark. And that worked pretty well, just like it works fairly well in Argentina.

What really enabled Hitler to rise was the Great Depression. You put on top of the Weimar inflation the Great Depression, and people were just so demoralized that they were subject to being snookered by a guttersnipe like Adolf Hitler. So I think this stuff is deadly serious ....

## TW IN BRIEF

**Peabody Energy—destroyed by debt:** Peabody Energy, the largest and most storied coal company in United States history, announced Wednesday that it was filing for Chapter 11 bankruptcy. The company survived the Great Depression, multiple stock market crashes, both world wars and the 2008 Wall Street meltdown. Its founder, Francis Peabody, began selling coal from the back of a mule-drawn wagon in Chicago in 1883. It wasn't until 1949 that the company was listed on the New York Stock Exchange. By the 1970s it became the world's largest publicly held coal company. At one point, its shares were worth more than \$100. In 2011, the company was valued at \$20 billion. Less than five years later, its shares are worth pennies. The company cited an "unprecedented industry downturn," an economic slowdown in China, low coal prices, and "overproduction of domestic shale gas." Other analysts also blamed the Environmental Protection Agency's war on coal for requiring utilities to switch from coal to natural gas. But what was not mentioned in Peabody's bankruptcy announcement was the real canary in the coalmine, the real reason this historic

company fell apart so quickly. That reason is debt—mountains of it. As Peabody noted, all of its current mining operations are profitable, even in the current low coal price environment. The problem is that it is not making enough money to pay back more than \$10 billion in loans that are due this year and next. It is a sad end to a company that helped build America.

**Researchers: Sugar addiction should be treated as a form of drug abuse:** New research from Australian scientists says sugar addiction should be treated as a form of drug abuse. Researchers from Queensland University of Technology say excessive sugar consumption affects the brain in a way similar to cocaine or morphine. It causes dopamine levels to surge and eventually reduces the brain's natural dopamine levels. As a result, people addicted to sugar need to consume ever-greater quantities in order to reach the same reward levels and to avoid depression. The researchers said going "cold turkey" from excessive sugar consumption can be as difficult as quitting certain illegal drugs.



### The Sin of Self Righteousness

Stephen Flurry, Trumpet Daily | April 15

The most difficult sin to see

[Follow Stephen Flurry](#)

