

Trumpet Weekly

JUNE 3, 2016

European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker.



Is Europe Finally Ready for an Army?

Richard Palmer | June 5

EUROPE IS SECRETLY PLOTTING TO CREATE A EUROPEAN ARMY, SOME British newspapers have been proclaiming over the last week. “Britain Will Be Forced to Join an EU ARMY Unless We Leave, Says Armed Forces Minister” read a headline on the *Express*. Meanwhile, other news outlets have been quick to discredit the idea. “[I]s there a serious, imminent chance of this happening?” asked Guardian Unlimited. It answered its question in just one word: “No.”

It’s easy to see why they are so dismissive. Leaders of the European Union have been talking about forming a European army for over half a century, and it’s still not here.

But none of these articles examine *why* the subject of an EU

army has come up again. A look behind the headlines reveals why Europe might actually make some real progress toward a combined military this time.

The latest push for an army goes back to the November 2015 Paris terrorist attacks. After the attacks, French President François Hollande invoked the EU’s self-defense clause—not NATO’s. This was a remarkable shift, as *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry [explained at the time](#):

By invoking the EU’s collective defense clause rather than turning to NATO, ... Hollande was declaring that Europe

is more than just a junior partner in America's defense arrangement. EUROPE IS ITS OWN POWER. It has its own foreign relations, its own interests and its own goals. Most people didn't recognize the significance of France's decision. But it is a choice that will have a terrible impact on America—as well as Britain and the Jewish state of Israel.

This pivot made another turn toward Europe after the terrorist attacks in Brussels, Belgium.

For the last six months, Hollande has been speaking to European leaders, trying to raise support for military integration so that Europe can collectively defend itself.

Most importantly, he reached out to Germany. On April 6, the day before an important meeting between French and German officials, an interview with Hollande was published by Germany's *Bild*: "Our two countries must agree to a budgetary effort on defense," he said. "And to act outside Europe. Let's not rely on another power, even a friendly one, to do away with terrorism."

This clearly articulated what his actions had revealed since November: France doesn't trust America and wants Europe to be able to act independently. "The nation that benefits the most from France rejecting America is Germany," Mr. Flurry wrote after the November attacks. "Germany has dominated the EU for years. France's move will bring the European armies together in a way that the EU founders only dreamed of."

France was looking to Germany for this military: "[F]or the French, building a European military force around France and Germany is the necessary precondition for any solution to Europe's growing challenges," wrote George Friedman of Geopolitical Futures. "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."

Friedman expected Germany to oppose this call to arms, saying it would become yet another point of contention between France and Germany. However, Germany appears to have embraced it. A few weeks later, a German government paper was leaked to *Süddeutsche Zeitung* and the *Financial Times* calling for an EU army. The *Financial Times* described the paper:

Germany is to push for progress towards a European army by advocating a joint headquarters and shared military assets, according to defense plans Although Berlin has long paid lip-service to forming a "European defense union," the white paper is one of the most significant for Germany in recent years

The paper stated that "Germany is willing to join early, decisively and substantially as a driving force in international debates ... to take responsibility and assume leadership" in forming this EU army.

"In this and other areas, its tone reflects Germany's growing clout and confidence in pursuing a foreign policy backed by elements of hard power," wrote the *Financial Times*.

"This is the time of a new Germany," said Jan Techau, director of the Carnegie Europe think tank. "This is probably the first time a German defense white paper is something like important."

The paper called for "the use of all possibilities" that are

allowed by EU treaties to work more closely together on defense. It wanted an EU military headquarters, a council of defense ministers, and for EU nations to produce and share military equipment.

It is in this environment that EU officials are working on a "Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy." On May 27, the *Times* published some details on this policy paper which were leaked to them. The text emphasized that "security and defense is where a step change is most urgent."

"The EU can step up its contribution to Europe's security and defense," the draft said, according to the *Times*. "Our external action must become more joined up across policy areas, institutions and member states. Greater unity of purpose is needed across the policy areas making up our external action."

EU Foreign Policy Chief Federica Mogherini has been working on this for 18 months. Her regular talks with EU leaders have clearly been affected by this new push for a combined military.

Just like the German paper, this document relies on the Lisbon Treaty's allowance for Europe to form a defense union. Even if some nations, like Britain, are against it, the treaty allows a group of at least nine nations to push forward.

On May 31, the *Express* reported:

A well-placed NATO source said Paris was concentrating its diplomatic efforts on creating the pan-European force, over which it believes it would wield more control than the existing North Atlantic military alliance. ...

The Belgium-based NATO source told Express.co.uk [that] French officials were directing their energy towards an EU army at the expense of its existing military obligations.

The *New York Times* also reported that "France is reverting to its traditional skepticism toward the alliance, which it sees as an instrument of American policy and an infringement on its sovereignty."

In a separate push, Europe is also moving ahead with plans to create an armed border and coast guard force. "EU institutions are fast-tracking plans to establish a European border and coast guard (EBCC) agency," reported *EU Observer* on May 31. The European Parliament's Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs approved and expedited the proposal the day before.

"The legislative process has been fast by EU standards," *EU Observer* wrote. "The commission presented its proposal in December 2015. EU ministers rubber-stamped it in April."

The Paris attacks and the migrant crisis have caused this haste. Before these crises, work was progressing in a much more leisurely fashion. Eighteen months ago, one source told *EU Observer* that it thought the EU Border Agency would open around 2030 to 2035. Now, the EU wants to have it operational by the end of summer. That's an ambitious goal and may well be missed. But it shows the EU's radical new sense of urgency.

This border agency would mark a huge change for Europe. *EU Observer* also reported that "MEPs endorsed a clause which gives the council the right to send teams even to a member state that does not want the help. The country's objections can be overruled by a qualified majority of the other member states." In other words, the European Union would be legally allowed to send soldiers to another EU country, even against that country's will.

Finally, Germany is also moving forward with its own efforts

to create a multinational army. It has absorbed the core of the Dutch Army into the German Army and unveiled plans to set up a multinational panzer division in the coming years.

Put all these news stories together, and it's clear that the push for an EU military has new momentum. The only reason there hasn't been more discussion on the topic is Britain's June 23 referendum concerning its EU membership. Few things could turn Brits against the EU more quickly than the threat of a European army.

Talk on this subject has been deliberately delayed until after the referendum. The German defense paper will be published after the vote. The European paper will be sent to EU governments on June 24; currently only a small circle of EU ambassadors have access to it. Then on June 28, EU leaders will discuss the issue at a summit.

A spokesman for Mogherini said the plans "in no way aim to set up the EU army." In the short term, that is correct. The main focus is on ensuring Europe can act as a major power on the world scene. Thus far, when European nations work together, that cooperation has been managed through NATO. Europe will have to create a separate management structure that excludes America.

The EU also aims to build the capacity to act without America. Europe will evaluate its military strengths and weaknesses as a whole, rather than on a country-by-country level, and look to address these issues as a whole. For example, when Europe launched its military mission in Mali, it had to hitch a ride from the American Air Force—it lacked the transport and logistical capacities to deploy to Mali alone. The EU will look for ways to fix these gaps.

European nations will begin relying more and more on each other. In doing so, they may not "aim to set up the EU army," but they'll be taking a major step in that direction.

Herbert W. Armstrong forecast for decades that European nations would form a military union. In May 1953, he wrote, "This time, 10 powerful European nations will combine their forces." In 1978, he warned:

EUROPEANS WANT THEIR OWN UNITED MILITARY POWER!
They know that a political union of Europe would produce a

THIRD MAJOR WORLD POWER, as strong as either the U.S. or the USSR—*possibly stronger!*

We see the same forces at work in Europe today. But Mr. Armstrong also saw that this unification would not come easily. "The nations of Europe have been striving to become reunited," he wrote in 1979. "They desire a common currency, a *single combined military force*, a single united government. They have made a start in the Common Market. They are now working toward a common currency. Yet, on a purely political basis, they have been totally unable to unite" (emphasis added).

Even now, military union will not come easily. Friedman points out, for example, that the leaked documents show no signs that the hard questions—like who will pay for a combined EU headquarters—have been addressed.

But Europeans are already under considerable pressure. The terrorist attacks in Paris and Brussels, the migrant crisis, and Russia's aggression in Ukraine are all forcing this push for a combined military. That is why this push must be taken seriously, despite all the failed rhetoric in the past.

None of these pressures are going away. If Europe's efforts stall, it will only be a matter of time before one or more of these forces begin pushing Europe again.

These crises are putting Europe under a strain that it has not faced in decades—this is why it is finally time for a European army to begin to emerge.

Every indication is that American leaders will be happy to help Europe unify its armies. But distrust of America is at the core of this push. Europe has not been able to project power outside of the Continent without U.S. help since the Suez Crisis in 1956 (if you count the United Kingdom as part of Europe; since World War II if you do not). The arrival of an independent military force would be a truly radical development. At the same time, Germany is emerging as a clear leader in this drive to form an army. For more on where this will lead and why it is dangerous, read Gerald Flurry's article "[The Terrorist Attacks That United Europe](#)."

 Follow [Richard Palmer](#)

MIDDLE EAST

TrumpetDaily
RADIO SHOW

[AMERICA AND THE ISLAMIC STATE ARE BOTH CONCEALING IRAN'S RISE AS KING OF THE MIDDLE EAST | JUNE 3](#)

[STATE DEPARTMENT ADMITS TO LYING AND THE SHOCKING TRUTH ABOUT IRAN'S TREATMENT OF U.S. SAILORS | JUNE 2](#)

[A PROVERB FOR DOUBTERS: THAT WHICH GOD HAS SPOKEN SHALL BE DONE | JUNE 1](#)

[IRAN CHOOSES HARD-LINER TO LEAD ASSEMBLY; AMERICA LASHES OUT AT ISRAEL FOR HARD-LINE GOVERNMENT | MAY 31](#)

[IS 'BREXIT' THE CURE FOR BRITAIN'S SICKNESS? | MAY 30](#)

Libya, the Islamic State and Europe

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



IN AN INTERVIEW WITH FRANCE 24, GERMAN DIPLOMAT AND United Nations special envoy to Libya, Martin Kobler, called on Libyans to unite and fight against the Islamic State instead of fighting each other.

When asked about the likelihood of outside intervention, Kobler said, “This is not the time to ask for foreign intervention.” However, the envoy said he foresees a time in the future when the international community might provide more support if Libyan authorities requested it. Already, Libyan forces need “better weapons,” and if they united, Kobler will push for the UN to lift its five-year arms embargo on Libya.

Despite the UN-backed unity government that was recently formed in Libya, the nation still has multiple armed factions. The biggest of those factions, headed by Gen. Khalifa Haftar, has said that he won’t work with the new government until the militias aligned to it are disbanded.

Meanwhile, the Islamic State is getting stronger and more ambitious. According to a UN report obtained by Al Jazeera, the Islamic State is losing in Iraq and Syria but [gaining ground in Libya](#).

In “[ISIS on Europe’s Doorstep](#),” CNN reported:

isis [another name for the Islamic State] is trying to infiltrate this [migrant] trade to get their people to Europe from the chaotic and near-failed state of Libya, as the route from Turkey to Greece becomes more heavily policed.

“Exploitation of migrant smuggling networks by isis in North Africa has only been a matter of time ... the U.S. and Europe need to act quickly, and together,” a Western diplomat told CNN. ...

A senior Libyan military intelligence official in Misrata, Ismail Shukri, said that isis militants sought to disguise themselves by traveling with “their families, without weapons, as normal illegal immigrants.”

“They will wear American dress and have English-language papers so they cause no suspicion.”

European officials insist they’re trying to be better prepared. A senior EU counterterrorism official told CNN there were more Europol officers working at potential “hotspots” of entry for migrants.

Still, the prospect of such an influx is a nightmare for Europe.

For more information, read “[The Next War in Libya](#).”

Iraq Continues to Fall to Iran

IN THE EARLY 1990S, WE INFORMED OUR *TRUMPET* READERS WHY Iraq would fall to its archenemy and neighbor, Iran. Then, in the early 2000s, we explained exactly *how* it would all happen. Six years into the 2010s, we continue to provide insight about why and how Iraq is falling to Iran—but so too does the regular daily news report.

One such report was written for Reuters by Prof. Mohamad Bazzi, who explained that the recent battle in Fallujah, Iraq, is merely “the latest example of how Washington has looked the other way as Iran deepened its [military involvement in Iraq](#) over the past two years.”

Professor Bazzi continued:

In recent weeks, thousands of Iraqi soldiers and Shiite militia members supported by Iran assembled on the outskirts of Fallujah for the expected attack on the Sunni city. In the lead-up to the assault, Gen. Qassem Suleimani, commander of [Iran’s] Quds Force ... met with leaders of the Iraqi coalition of Shiite militias known as the Popular Mobilization Forces.

[T]he battle over Fallujah highlights Iran’s growing military and political influence over Iraq, a country wracked by a

complex civil war that leaves it open to outside manipulation.

If there is one regional player that gained the most from America’s gamble in Iraq, it is Iran. With its invasion in 2003, the United States ousted Tehran’s sworn enemy, Saddam Hussein, from power. Then Washington helped install a Shiite government for the first time in Iraq’s modern history. As U.S. troops became mired in fighting an insurgency and containing a civil war, Iran extended its influence over all of Iraq’s major Shiite factions.

Today, the Iranian regime is comfortable taking a lead role in shaping the military operations of its Iraqi allies. There is no one to restrain Tehran

A former U.S. commander with extensive Iraqi experience said, “Tehran has more influence on [Iraqi Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi’s] focus, whether on Fallujah or anywhere else, than Moscow, Washington and Ankara combined.”

Following their victories throughout the conflict, Iran-backed militants in Fallujah graffitied walls to express themselves. One graffitied phrase says it all: “Thank you, Iran.”

That has been [the Trumpet’s message](#) for over two decades!

Iran's Marriage of Convenience With the Taliban

ONCE AGAIN, OBSERVERS ARE FOCUSING THEIR ATTENTION ON the covert, convoluted ties between once-enemies Shiite Iran and the Sunni Taliban. According to various reports, Mullah Akhtar Mansour, the Taliban leader slain in a United States drone strike on May 21, had just returned from Iran when he was killed.

"Mansour Sahib would enter Iran en route to Afghanistan to supervise organizational matters," said a Taliban source. "He would travel to western Afghanistan using unfrequented routes in the Iranian border regions."

While the Taliban is up front about these visits, Iran denies them. But the Islamic Republic can't deny the ties it has with the Afghan terrorist group. [The Long War Journal](#) wrote:

Iran has a long history of backing the Taliban's insurgency against U.S. and allied forces in Afghanistan. Indeed, the relationship between the two former foes is one of the most misunderstood and oft-overlooked aspects of the 9/11 wars.

Iran and the Taliban nearly went to war in 1998 after

senior Taliban commanders slaughtered Iranian diplomats and other Shiites in Mazar-i-Sharif. But by late 2001 ... the situation changed dramatically. Outwardly, the Iranians acted as if they just wanted to help rebuild Afghanistan. Western diplomats have praised Iran for its role in the December 2001 meetings in Bonn, Germany, where a post-Taliban government was established. But there is much more to this story. Just before the American-led invasion of Afghanistan two months earlier, the Iranians cut a secret deal with [long-time Taliban leader and founder] Mullah [Mohammed] Omar's representatives.

Since the emergence of the Islamic State in Afghanistan in 2014, Iran's ties with the Taliban strengthened. As we reported in June last year, Iran has been [training, funding and recruiting Taliban fighters](#). "In providing some minimal support to the Taliban," wrote Al-Monitor, "Iran is likely trying to compete with Saudi Arabia and Pakistan for the group's affections, as well as hedging about the durability and reach of the Kabul government."

TW IN BRIEF

Did the Obama administration pay a ransom to Iran?: A new bill in Congress is set to demand that the Obama administration explain whether it paid Iran a \$1.7 billion settlement as a ransom payment for American sailors. The bill comes two weeks after a member of the House Armed Services Committee said Americans would be shocked if classified information about the January incident were made public. The Obama administration says it was coincidental that the settlement was made one day after the sailors were captured.

No Mecca hajj for Iranians: Iran canceled its participation in this year's pilgrimage (hajj) to the Saudi Arabian city of Mecca.

The pilgrimage to Mecca is required for every Muslim at least once in a lifetime. Iran's culture minister told state television on Sunday that disagreements with rival Saudi Arabia led to the cancellation. Iran's pilgrimage organization specifically blamed the cancellation on what it called "Saudi sabotage." It said, "Despite all the Islamic Republic's efforts, the Saudis ignored the absolute right of the Iranians to perform the [pilgrimage] rituals." Saudi Arabia blames Iran for the impasse. The Saudis said Iran was demanding the right to hold demonstrations and to have other advantages for its Shiites, which Saudi Arabia said would have created chaos during the pilgrimage.

EUROPE

Trumpet Hour

AMERICA AND THE ISLAMIC STATE ARE BOTH CONCEALING IRAN'S RISE AS KING OF THE MIDDLE EAST | JUNE 3

VIOLENCE IN AMERICAN POLITICS, A NEW EUROPEAN ARMY?, DESIGNING THE TRUMPET MAGAZINE, AND MORE | JUNE 1



The Danger of Deploying the German Army at Home

Josué Michels | June 2

CALLS TO DOMESTICALLY DEPLOY THE BUNDESWEHR ARE GROWING louder in Germany. Many question: *Why can't Germany do what other countries can?* In light of recent terrorist attacks in

Europe, the German Defense Ministry wants to change the Basic Law, which prohibits the Bundeswehr from being deployed inside of Germany; it also bans it from combining with police forces.

On May 23, after much dispute in the German coalition, it was decided that the Constitution would not change as German Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble, Defense Minister Ursula von der Leyen and others had hoped. However, the coalition did decide to allow the Bundeswehr to practice with the police for emergency cases. The decision to allow the military to train with the police represents a significant victory for the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and Christian Social Union (CSU). It brings them one step closer to attaining their larger ambitions.

For some Germans, just the thought of seeing the Bundeswehr on streets alongside the police causes horror. They fear the German Army could be used against its own people in protests and demonstrations, as has happened in Germany's past. During the Weimar Republic era, soldiers were repeatedly used to shut down opposition. This action was legalized by Article 68 of the Constitution of the German Empire. Then, during the time of national socialism, because the police and Army were not clearly separated and shared many responsibilities, it made persecution of the opposition and Jews possible. The police became a part of the Army. Furthermore, Adolf Hitler used the SS paramilitary units against the German population to maintain his power.

After the Nazi regime was defeated, the founders of post-World War II Germany worked to prevent a repeat scenario. A paragraph was written in the German Basic Law that restricted the Bundeswehr to external security missions. In 1968, this law was undermined for the first time, causing an emergency law to be added.

Schäuble attempted another constitutional change in the 1990s but was unsuccessful. He brought it up again unsuccessfully in 2006, when he saw a need to provide more security in the World Cup soccer stadium. When Germany's highest court issued a ruling on Aug. 18, 2012, allowing the military to be used

against threats in the country, [we wrote](#):

While the breaking of this taboo does not exactly give the German government dictatorial powers as some are claiming, it does show that government officials are growing more comfortable with the use of military power. As the euro crisis intensifies and domestic unrest increases across Europe, expect Germany to rise up as the dominant military power in Europe.

In a speech at the 5th Munich Security Conference, Federal President Joachim Gauck said, "I would like to request that ... we too place our trust in this fundamentally reformed country of ours. The post-war generations had reasons to be distrustful—of the German state and of German society. But the time for such categorical distrust is past."

The belief that Germany has changed is allowing the current government to cast aside many of the restrictions placed on the nation after World War II. The German stigma is fading as it becomes like any other country. The world is falling in love with Germany and is even promoting these striking changes. It was once said that Germany would never be able to start a war again. Today, Germany is encouraged to be the peacekeeper of the world.

America and Britain should be alarmed by the striking changes Germany is making, but they too [trust Germany](#). The world will be caught by surprise when it sees another dark Germany rise in Europe's midst. But longtime *Trumpet* readers will not be caught off guard by these events, which were prophesied thousands of years ago. For more information on how Germany has been burying its past and why you should be alarmed, read "[Germany's Dramatic and Alarming Foreign-Policy Pivot](#)."

Will Germany Side With Russia Against America?

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



GERMANY IS SHOWING SIGNS THAT IT WANTS TO END SANCTIONS against Russia. This small shift could be the beginning of an earthshaking trend—the splitting off of Germany from the Western security alliance.

German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier launched speculation that Germany would end its sanctions on Russia, which are up for renewal in July. Janosch Delcker wrote an article titled "[German Foreign Minister: Ease Russia Sanctions 'Step-by-step'](#)" for Politico:

... Steinmeier believes easing EU sanctions on Russia—provided it fulfills certain conditions—is an important element in the hunt for a solution to the fighting in eastern Ukraine. ...

[A] backlash is growing in some countries—particularly those whose exports have been hit hard, such as Germany itself, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Austria and

Italy—against plans to extend the strict sanctions regime without changes. "It's no secret that several countries within the EU are skeptical," Steinmeier said.

Spiegel Online noted a similar trend in "[Step-by-step Rap-prochement: Germany Considers Easing of Russia Sanctions](#)," published on May 30. It describes how German Economics Minister Sigmar Gabriel has also called for a step-by-step reduction in sanctions.

Spiegel writes that "behind the scenes," Germany's government "has long since developed concrete plans for a step-by-step easing of the sanctions against Russia and that the process could begin as early as this year." It continues:

Thus far, the message has been that the trade and travel restrictions will only be lifted once all the provisions

foreseen by the Minsk Protocol have been fulfilled. One hundred percent in return for 100 percent. Now, however, Berlin is prepared to make concessions to Moscow—on the condition that progress is made on the Minsk process

Spiegel notes that many European nations are shifting to Germany's point of view. And a compromise could be in the works for those who still wish to impose sanctions on Russia:

Meanwhile, Great Britain, Poland and the Baltic countries are leading the opposition to any relaxation of the sanctions in place against Russia. But a possible compromise is in the works. Poland and the three Baltic countries ... could agree to a step-by-step easing of the sanctions were more NATO troops to be stationed in those countries. Such an arrangement would allow both camps to save face.

Meanwhile, Germany has continued certain key economic relationships with Russia even while the sanctions are in place. The two are working together to build a second pipeline under the Baltic Sea, connecting Russia to Germany. Once built, it would give Russia the capability to send 80 percent of the gas it sends to Europe through Germany.

George Friedman pointed to the potential importance of this budding rapprochement in an article for *Geopolitical Futures* titled "[Germany Looks to Ease Russian Sanctions](#)." He wrote:

Since the Russians have not capitulated to sanctions to this point, it is unlikely that they will. Therefore, it is in Germany's interest to defuse the confrontation with Russia, and to do that, they must at least loosen the sanctions, or ultimately eliminate them.

There is a basis for a compromise in Ukraine. The Russians want a neutral Ukraine. Kiev may maintain whatever economic and political relations it wishes, but it must not become part of the Western defense system. What Russia cannot tolerate is Western forces on the Ukrainian-Russian border. That would represent an existential threat to Russia.

Of course, on the list of other things—far more important than eastern Ukrainian autonomy—that Russia would

want to revise is the growing U.S. presence in the Baltics, Poland and Romania. ...

The Russians would certainly ask for a removal of forces based on NATO's eastern front. And now we come to the heart of any settlement over Ukraine. The Russians, having seen a force of any significant size to their west, will not trust the West's commitment to neutralization. The Americans will not trust the Russians to respect Ukrainian neutrality without a U.S.-led force providing a deterrent in the region. The Russians will not believe that force will respect Ukrainian neutrality.

And this is the dilemma the Germans face. The Ukrainian crisis has drawn the U.S. military into their neighborhood. The Germans, along with other European countries, want to end sanctions. The U.S. deployment of troops in the region has made getting rid of sanctions far more difficult and has turned the sanctions into a side issue. ...

The normal strategy for Germany is to do nothing. But doing nothing, in this case, means allowing a set of destabilizing forces to undermine core German interests. While the Americans and Russians pursue their interests in Europe, Germany cannot yet act on its century-long strategy of building its military power to protect its interests.

Taking that as a given for now, the only other option for Germany is to find another means to balance the Russians and Americans. ...

At the moment, the Germans worry about the Americans more than they worry about the Russians. ... Given German economic vulnerability at the moment, the Americans can destabilize the foundations of Germany. Therefore, it makes sense for Germany, playing the balance of power in Europe as Britain did in the 19th century, to reach out to Russia. Russia can counterbalance the Americans and would welcome German economic activity in the country, given its weakened economy.

With Germany leading Europe against Russian sanctions, while America continues to support sanctions, a break between Berlin and Washington could happen soon. For more on what this kind of break with America could look like, read *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry's article "[The Armies of Armageddon](#)."

French Jews Under Worse Persecution Since World War II

"French Jews are in the most difficult situation they have experienced since World War II," said Francis Kalifat, the newly elected president of CRIF, an umbrella organization for Jewish groups living in France. In an article titled "French Jews Experiencing Worst Situation Since 1945," the *Jerusalem Post* wrote:

His presidency, which will become effective next month, comes at a time of record emigration by Jews from France, partly because of anti-Semitic violence that included hundreds of anti-Semitic incidents annually in recent years,

and dozens of physical assaults. Since 2012, attacks on Jewish targets by French Islamists in France and Belgium claimed the lives of 12 people. Last year, roughly 8,000 French Jews left for Israel—the highest number on record for any year, which made France for the second year straight Israel's largest provider of newcomers.

"I think all of our force needs to be united to fight against this anti-Semitism in all its forms, because we see this new anti-Semitism advancing under the guise of anti-Zionism," added Kalifat

China May Deploy Air Defense Identification Zone in South China Sea to Contain 'U.S. Aggression'

THE SITUATION IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA COULD SOON GROW EVEN more tense. In a defiant and strange statement on Wednesday, China said it might set up an Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ) in the area in an effort to combat the aggression of the United States.

Writing for the *South China Morning Post*, Minnie Chan said:

Tensions between China and neighbors Vietnam, Malaysia, Brunei and the Philippines over sovereignty in the South China Sea have risen since Beijing embarked on major land reclamation work on disputed islands and reefs in the area. ... A report ... said Beijing had defined the area of the ADIZ in the South China Sea, and the timing of the announcement would be a political decision.

Chan quoted a source in the People's Liberation Army as saying:

"If the U.S. military keeps making provocative moves

to challenge China's sovereignty in the region, it will give Beijing a good opportunity to declare an ADIZ in the South China Sea."

The move comes more than two years after China announced a similar zone, in effect, for the East China Sea. That ADIZ included the Senkaku Islands, uninhabited territory controlled by Japan but claimed by both Tokyo and Beijing. Japanese commercial airlines took the announcement seriously. Hours after it was issued, they were on the phones with Chinese authorities filing flight plans and making sure they were in compliance with Beijing.

If Beijing deploys a second ADIZ, it would represent another bold display of Chinese power. It would also allow Beijing to expose the weakness of America's will to use its power. The Chinese seem to recognize the U.S.'s shattered will. And they may well be preparing to put those tatters on display for the whole world.

Japanese Up in Arms Again Over U.S. Military Presence

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



IN OKINAWA, JAPAN, MORE THAN 2,000 PEOPLE ASSEMBLED TO protest the presence of the U.S. military on the island. The protests were in response to the arrest of an American man for the rape and murder of a 20-year-old Japanese woman. The man was a civilian employee of a U.S. military base in Okinawa.

Japan Times reported on the situation when the arrest was made on May 21:

The civilian employee of a U.S. military base in Okinawa Prefecture who was arrested Thursday over the death of a Japanese woman has admitted raping her before strangling and stabbing her to death and transporting her body in a suitcase, investigative sources said Saturday.

Kenneth Franklin Shinzato, a 32-year-old former U.S. Marine employed by Kadena Air Base, was arrested on suspicion of dumping the woman's body, a procedural step common in suspected murder cases.

The victim was identified as Rina Shimabukuro, a 20-year-old office worker from the city of Uruma.

She had gone missing on April 28, when she went out for a walk.

The *Times* said the incident was injecting new urgency into the long simmering Japanese misgivings about the presence of U.S. troops on Okinawa:

... Defense Minister Gen Nakatani lodged a protest with

the commander of U.S. military forces in Okinawa over Shinzato's arrest. In Saturday's meeting with Lt. Gen. Lawrence Nicholson, Nakatani demanded that the U.S. military in Okinawa enhance discipline and take measures to prevent such incidents from recurring. "This is outrageous and unforgivable," Nakatani said during the meeting at a Defense Ministry office in Okinawa. ...

Nakatani lodged a similar protest when he summoned Lt. Gen. John Dolan, commander of U.S. forces in Japan, to Tokyo on Thursday. Both he and Okinawa Gov. Takeshi Onaga attended Shimabukuro's funeral on Saturday.

Efforts by government officials to control damage to U.S.-Japan relations ahead of Obama's visit did not stop angry residents from protesting in front of Kadena Air Base on Friday. About 250 people attended an anti-base rally, shouting slogans such as "Get out of Okinawa" and "We don't accept U.S. bases."

On May 30, the *IB Times* said that, as a result of the rising tensions, [a drinking ban and curfew were put into effect for U.S. troops in Okinawa:](#)

U.S. military officials have reportedly canceled all parties, festivals and celebrations after a former Marine was arrested on suspicion of [murdering] a Japanese woman. Locals have been calling for greater disciplinary rules and supervision of the 30,000 U.S. workers in Okinawa.

The protests reached their peak on May 22, but some demonstrators have continued protesting even into this week—calling for an end to the American presence. Another mass demonstration is scheduled for June 19. The locals hope it will bring

together even more protesters than the 85,000 who assembled in the 1995 demonstrations after a Japanese girl had been abducted and raped by three U.S. servicemen.

Indignation After Duterte Says He Backs Murder of Philippine Journalists

THE PHILIPPINES' PRESIDENT-ELECT HAS UNLEASHED ANOTHER firestorm of outrage after he said he supported the idea of killing journalists who do not report events in ways that he deems appropriate.

Agence France-Presse reported on [June 1](#):

Media groups expressed outrage Wednesday at Philippine president-elect Rodrigo Duterte's endorsement of killing corrupt journalists, warning his comments could incite more murders in a nation already one of the world's most dangerous for reporters.

Duterte, who won last month's elections in a landslide after pledging to kill tens of thousands of criminals, told reporters on Tuesday there was justification for killing journalists who took bribes or engaged in other corrupt activities.

"Just because you're a journalist, you are not exempted from assassination, if you're a [expletive]," Duterte said when asked how he would address the problem of media

killings in the Philippines after a reporter was shot dead in Manila last week.

The National Union of Journalists of the Philippines described the comments as "appalling." It conceded there were corruption problems in the industry but said these did not justify murdering reporters. "He has also, in effect, declared open season to silence the media, both individual journalists and the institution, on the mere perception of corruption," the [National Union of Journalists of the Philippines] NUJP said in a statement. ...

"Most of those killed, to be frank, have done something. You won't be killed if you don't do anything wrong," said Duterte, who will be sworn into office on June 30.

Already, the Philippines is among the world's most dangerous countries for journalists. In the last 30 years, at least 175 journalists have been murdered. With Duterte soon coming to the helm, the situation is certain to grow even bleaker.

TW IN BRIEF

Russia imprisons people for Facebook likes: Russia is imprisoning citizens who post items on social media that are critical of the government of President Vladimir Putin. Reports on Wednesday said that even if an individual likes or retweets a critical post, he could still face incarceration or lesser penalties. At least 54 Russian citizens have been imprisoned in recent months for sharing or liking antigovernment social media posts. Almost 200 others were convicted for such charges but faced less severe penalties.

North Korea says Trump is a wise choice for president: A North Korean propaganda website showed support for United States presidential candidate Donald Trump on Tuesday. The column was written on DPRK Today, and it described Trump as a "wise politician" who can liberate Americans. It said Trump was a right choice for U.S. voters. Donald Trump has said he is prepared to talk to North Korean leader Kim Jong-un in order to stop the North's nuclear program. Trump's Democratic opponent, Hillary Clinton, was described as "thick-headed" on the website. She has suggested the use of sanctions against the North, similar to those used against Iran and its nuclear program. The website also backed Trump's proposal to remove American troops from South Korea, saying the move would help unify the Korean Peninsula.

Meeting over North Korean issues: Delegates from the United States, South Korea and Japan met in Tokyo on Wednesday to discuss North Korean issues. The meeting came a day after North Korea's alleged failed missile launch; if confirmed, the missile launch would be the fourth in a series of high-profile

failures. Japan's director general of Asian and Oceanic Affairs said the biggest challenge now is to implement the UN sanctions against the North to urge the country to take a meaningful action toward denuclearization. The U.S. special representative for North Korea policy told reporters he hoped China would play a leading role in putting pressure on Pyongyang.

China launches satellite: China launched its second high-resolution geological mapping satellite into orbit on Monday. The satellite is tasked with offering services to the country's land-resources surveys and monitoring, natural-disaster prevention, agricultural development, water-resources management, ecological environment improvement, urban planning and construction. The second satellite has a higher definition than its predecessor, which was launched back in 2012. It can take pictures of objects from over 300 miles away, and it can also measure the height of objects from space.

Russia to retaliate against U.S. missile shield: Russian President Vladimir Putin warned that he will have no choice but to retaliate if both Romania and Poland continue to allow parts of the U.S. missile shield to be installed in their countries. At a joint news conference in Athens, Greece, he stated, "If [they] do not know what it means to be in the crosshairs, then today we will be forced to carry out certain measures to ensure our security." Already, Poland has started working on the northern wing of the antiballistic missile shield; Romania is working on rocket batteries to the south. Putin said he was only responding to moves by

Washington that threaten Russia. He continued, “We won’t take any action until we see rockets in areas that neighbor us.”

Chinese state media releases rap song praising Karl Marx: As China’s economy hits a rough spot, Chinese President Xi Jinping is trying to keep the country ideologically united using Marxist economic philosophy. In the government’s latest effort to promote Marxist ideology to Chinese youth, state media is promoting

a new rap song praising Karl Marx, the 19th-century father of communism. Called “Marx Is a Post-90s,” the lyrics describe how a Chinese young person discovers an interest in Marxism after learning his teachings. A television show is expected to be launched soon to expose young audiences to Marxism. The ruling Chinese Communist Party’s newspaper, *People’s Daily*, said that the song indicated how Marx continued to appeal to the younger generation and that communism will “never completely go out of style.”

AFRICA/LATIN AMERICA

TW IN BRIEF

Violence in Venezuela: An armed group in Venezuela killed 11 people this week as the nation continues to descend into violence. The armed men forced the people out of their homes into a courtyard where they were shot dead. The victims of the attack were adult males ages 18 to 76. Three teenagers were also killed,

ages 15, 16 and 17. Venezuela is the most violent nation in the world that is not at war. In 2015, there were 17,778 cases of homicide reported throughout the country. One non-governmental observer believes the homicide rate is 50 percent higher than the officially reported numbers.

ANGLO-AMERICA



The America-Europe Financial Crisis Gerald Flurry, *The Key of David* | June 5

The financial crisis in Greece is a small example of what will happen in America and Britain.



T State Department Admits to Lying About the Iran Nuclear Deal Stephen Flurry | June 2

THE UNITED STATES STATE DEPARTMENT ADMITTED WEDNESDAY that it intentionally deleted an eight-minute exchange between a Fox News journalist and then-State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki on a video that was posted Dec. 2, 2013. During the exchange, Psaki essentially admitted that the Obama administration had lied about having secret talks with Iran.

“Is it the policy of the State Department, where the preservation or the secrecy of secret negotiations is concerned, to lie in order to achieve that goal?” the reporter asked. Psaki offered this response: “I think there are times where diplomacy needs privacy in order to progress. This is a good example of that.”

Several months before this exchange, another State Department spokeswoman, Victoria Nuland, emphatically stated that there had been no secret “government-to-government” negotiations with Iran. When Psaki contradicted that statement later that year, someone in the State Department quickly scrubbed the confession from the record.

The video edit wasn’t discovered until a few weeks ago, at

which point the State Department lied, blaming the deletion on a “glitch.” On Wednesday, the State Department came clean.

“This wasn’t a technical glitch. This was a deliberate request to excise video,” spokesman John Kirby said. He called the cut inappropriate but said he wasn’t sure who gave the order to make the cut.

The State Department’s confession comes weeks after aspiring novelist Ben Rhodes, President Barack Obama’s top aide and speech writer, bragged to the *New York Times* about *manufacturing* the narrative needed to garner support for the Iran deal. Part of the false narrative was that the White House only entered into negotiations with Iran *after* Hassan Rouhani became president in 2013; he was much more “moderate” than Mahmoud Ahmadinejad—and ready to make a deal.

The truth is, the Obama administration started negotiating with Iran *long* before Ahmadinejad left office. And to garner support for the deal from Congress and the American people, they manufactured a false narrative. To paraphrase Psaki, they had

to lie in order to make progress on the deal. The end justified the means.

Speaking of our time today, the Prophet Isaiah said that no one calls for justice or pleads for truth—"they trust in vanity, and speak lies" (Isaiah 59:4). This is God's assessment of human government. Man is utterly incapable of administering righteous rule. Of course, ruling elites don't believe this. They promise

justice. They claim to be honest and transparent. Their intentions are always good and right.

But what man really desires is the "freedom" to be left alone to do whatever he wants! He wants anarchy (Judges 21:25). This is why man is simply not qualified to rule and administer the government of God on Earth!

 Follow [Stephen Flurry](#)

The Riots Against Donald Trump Are More Dangerous Than People Realize

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



FORTY-EIGHT YEARS AGO, REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE Richard Nixon beat Democratic rival Hubert Humphrey in the 1968 general election. In large part, this happened because the "silent majority" of middle-class Americans were frightened by far-left radicals who were staging riots across the country.

Today, political analysts are wondering whether or not this history will repeat itself. Far-left radicals are once again using violent methods in protest against the Republican presidential nominee. Will these violent riots scare people into putting Donald Trump in the White House?

USA Today journalist Cal Thomas asked this question in his article "[Trump Victory Road Paved by New Mexico Rioters](#)":

Though most national polls show Trump trailing Hillary Clinton, the presumptive Democratic presidential nominee, many who follow politics closely believe that outside events such as another terrorist attack or convention protests that get out of hand could change that dynamic. And the violence in Albuquerque is starting to turn that possibility into a reality.

It is easy to imagine more protests getting out of hand because they already have. Let's face it, when crowds are setting fires, throwing rocks, and destroying police cars, they are rioting, not protesting. ...

And images of unrest are spreading. May Day violence

by far-left demonstrators in Seattle and other cities that included attacks on police, along with anti-Trump demonstrations in Southern California and Fort Wayne, Indiana, that featured children waving Mexican flags, holding signs reading "brown pride" and giving the middle finger salute to passersby, can only further inflame already unsettled voters.

There is a growing sense among many Americans that the country is in trouble, and that no one seems willing to help fix, let alone acknowledge, what's wrong.

The violence in Albuquerque mentioned by Thomas refers to a protest against Donald Trump in New Mexico. Protesters waved Mexican flags, burned American flags, clashed with police, and racked up \$50,000 in damage to the neighborhood. Six city police officers sustained significant injuries at the hands of rock-throwing rioters. This incident is but the latest of dozens of violent riots against the Trump campaign.

Regardless of who becomes the next president, it is undeniable that a spirit of violence is replacing civilized political discourse in America. Increasingly, people seem to be abandoning the rule of law for the law of the jungle. This way of handling things will not bring peace or human rights; it can only lead to revolution and war. Many prominent leaders are deliberately fueling grievances for their own political gain. The problems that will result are far more dangerous than they realize.

What the U.S. Militia Movement Doesn't Understand About the American People

EVER SINCE THE BUNDY FAMILY TAKEOVER OF A FEDERAL WILDLIFE refuge in Oregon last January, the United States militia movement has been in the public eye. Sometimes called the Patriot Movement, the militia movement is a loose-knit array of antigovernment groups prepared to use violence to fight against federal overreach.

According to the Southern Poverty Law Center, a far-left organization that monitors extremism, there are now nearly 1,000 antigovernment groups operating in the U.S., including as many

as 276 armed militias. This number is likely inflated, due to the Southern Poverty Law Center's penchant for counting state chapters of a national organization as separate entities. Most political analysts would agree, however, that the number of antigovernment groups operational in the United States has increased since Barack Obama was elected president in 2008.

Last December, voters from Tennessee approved a man with connections to the militia movement, David Riden, to be a delegate to the Republican National Convention this summer. In an

interview with Josh Harkinson for [Mother Jones news organization](#), Riden explained that [U.S. leaders who violate the Constitution](#) might have to be eliminated or killed.

Here are Riden's comments, as published by Mother Jones:

"There's only one reason why the Founding Fathers put the Second Amendment If the federal government were to follow the path of all other governments, at some point it will turn to tyranny against the people. And at that point, when it stops to uphold and abide by the Constitution—and we're talking about the Supreme Court, Congress and the executive branch, all three are way off away

from the Constitution right now—the people have the right to assemble, bear arms, go to Washington, D.C., or wherever necessary, and go into military battle against the government and replace those in government with individuals that will uphold the Constitution. The Constitution should remain, but the people that are abusing it should be, the polite word is, eliminated. The harsh word is killed. And they're killed by American citizens with weapons. And if people have tanks, assault weapons, if they have bombs—they need to have the weaponry necessary to be able to overthrow the federal government.

Only One in Three U.S. Navy Fighter Jets Are Ready for War

THE UNITED STATES SPENDS A SHOCKING AMOUNT OF MONEY ON its military. Yet a disturbing percentage of this money is simply being wasted. Exactly *how much* is unknown because the Pentagon has never been audited, but the level of wasted funds amounts to at least tens of billions of dollars.

In a report for [War Is Boring](#), David Majumdar revealed that despite the trillions of dollars that America throws at its military, only one in three U.S. Navy fighter jets is ready for combat. He wrote:

The U.S. Navy's strike fighter squadrons are in dire straits with only one out of three Boeing F/A-18 Hornet airframes being ready for war at any given time.

In order to meet its operational requirements, the service is routinely raiding squadrons that are not deployed to secure enough jets for the air wings that are about to go to sea. ...

Within the Navy, only one out of four Hornets is fully mission capable. "That one in four is currently deployed," Capt. Randy Stearns, Commodore of Strike Fighter Wing Atlantic, told the committee. "The other three in four are the aircraft that are back in the maintenance phase or going through another [fleet response plan]."

America isn't just losing its will to fight. Increasingly, the United States is being plagued by a diminishing capacity to fight. The U.S. military spent around \$1.5 trillion to develop a fleet of F-35 fighter jets (about the same amount of money spent on the Iraq War). Yet the F-35 is commonly criticized for being overly complex. A single unnecessary system—one designed to make it easier to order spare parts—leaves the entire program so vulnerable to hacking that a cyberattack could ground the entire fleet.

America used to produce cutting-edge military technology at good prices. God blessed America, but no longer. The *curse* described in Leviticus 26:20—directed to the ungodly modern-day descendants of ancient Israel, of whom America is chief—well applies: "And your strength shall be spent in vain"

When America was blessed, God said He made it so that "ye shall chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the sword" (verse 7). One way He did that was by blessing the nation with skilled innovators and manufacturers, allowing the nation to have a technological edge. America still has an edge, but too few in the military take the potential for a major war seriously. The result is a bloated system that hemorrhages money and leaves this apparently invincible nation dangerously insecure.



Man's Incomplete Mind

Stephen Flurry, Trumpet Daily | June 3

Why is mankind incapable of solving the world's evils?

[Follow Stephen Flurry](#)

