

Trumpet Weekly

JUNE 10, 2016

Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Vice Chancellor and Economy and Energy Minister Sigmar Gabriel with German Chancellor Angela Merkel.



Is Germany About to Side With Russia Against America?

Richard Palmer and Josué Michels | June 9

KEY GERMAN LEADERS WANT TO END SANCTIONS AGAINST Russia. Such a decision might seem like a minor piece of economic news, but it could be the beginning of a major break between Europe and America and the separation of Germany from the Western security alliance.

European sanctions on Russia are up for renewal in July. The European Union and the United States imposed the sanctions after Russia invaded Crimea in March 2014. The plan was to keep the sanctions in place until the Minsk Protocol, a protocol aimed at ending the fighting in Ukraine, was fully implemented.

But with little progress on the Minsk agreement, some leaders

in Germany want to end the sanctions. On May 31, German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier suggested ending the sanctions “step-by-step,” rather than waiting for Minsk to be completed.

German Vice Chancellor Sigmar Gabriel holds the same opinion. Reporting on a speech that Gabriel gave to German and Russian business leaders recently, *Spiegel* wrote:

He says that Russia has recently shown that it can be a reliable partner and mentions the nuclear deal with Iran as an example. He says that Russia and the world are dependent on each other—and that the time has come for a

step-by-step easing of sanctions.

Spiegel also reported that, “behind the scenes,” the German 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.”

Gabriel and Steinmeier are on the political left of Chancellor Angela Merkel. But the right has also been making the same call. Last year, Bavarian State Premier Horst Seehofer, leader of Ms. Merkel’s sister party, the Christian Social Union (CSU), demanded the end of European economic sanctions and called for a better relationship with Russia. “The question needs to be asked: Do we want to continue the sanctions for an unlimited period of time?” he said. “Or is it time to talk about it?” (*Trumpet* translation throughout).

Seehofer, along with Honorary CSU Chairman Edmund Stoiber, has visited Russian President Vladimir Putin despite the sanctions.

Nor is Germany the only nation thinking this way. Other nations have also taken an economic hit due to the sanctions. “It’s no secret that several countries within the EU are skeptical,” Steinmeier said. Countries like Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Italy also support an easing of sanctions.

Despite the sanctions, Germany has been improving its relations with Russia in important ways. The two nations are building a second gas pipeline under the Baltic Sea—despite opposition from America and most of the EU. Once built, Germany will be able to transport 80 percent of Russia’s Europe-bound gas. Germany’s business relationship with Russia has continued in other ways as well.

The current sanctions regime is not working for Germany; its economy is affected both directly (in terms of lost business with Russia) and indirectly (the countries in the eurozone that Germany sells to are poorer because their economies are also hurt by the sanctions). The German economy depends on exports, so the sanctions have hit it where it is most vulnerable.

An escalation in conflict with Russia is also more likely. “The European Union is sufficiently fragile to frighten Germany,” wrote George Friedman for *Geopolitical Futures*. “A confrontation between Europe and Russia would likely shatter the EU.”

In addition to all this, Russian and German interests overlap in every major crisis facing Europe. Russia has deep links to Cyprus and Greece and could dramatically help, or hinder, Europe’s approach to its financial crisis. Its links to Syria and the Assad regime give Russia a huge influence in the migrant crisis.

The trouble is, as Friedman explained, ending the confrontation with Russia would put Germany at odds with America. He pointed out that “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.”

Friedman believes that a compromise between Russia and America is highly unlikely. Russia wants U.S. forces out of the area and a guarantee that Ukraine will not be drawn into the Western security alliance. But America does not trust Russia to stick to an agreement once American troops are gone. “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,” wrote Friedman.

“[T]he only other option for Germany is to find another means to balance the Russians and Americans,” he continued.

If Germany sticks to its usual post-war role and takes a back seat to America, then the hostility with Russia will continue. “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,” wrote Friedman.

He continued:

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.

As Germany mulls breaking from America over sanctions, Europe is seriously considering a European defense union, a NATO without America. NATO sources have been complaining to the press that France is losing interest in NATO while it tries to set up its own European defense alliance. The *New York Times* wrote, “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.”

Germany supports France’s push for this new alliance. Such an alliance would be essential if Germany were to break with America over Russia. To draw closer to Russia without alienating Poland, the Baltics or other central European states nervous about Russia’s rise, Germany needs some way of reassuring these countries.

French President François Hollande has been explicit about his goal to end Europe’s military dependence on America. “Let’s not rely on another power, even a friendly one, to do away with terrorism,” he told Germany’s *Bild* newspaper.

Of course, a German end to the sanctions is not a forgone conclusion. Chancellor Merkel is one of the most Russo-skeptic leaders in Germany. Despite what her lieutenants are saying, she has given no sign that she’s in favor of scaling back the sanctions. But leaders on both her left and right are pro-Russian. It may require a new chancellor, but an open rapprochement between Germany and Russia is coming.

The fact that Germany’s leaders are considering a break with the U.S. at the same time that Europe is working on an American-free defense union is significant. In an August 2008 article, Stratfor highlighted there is potential for major change here (emphasis added):

All of this is not to say that Berlin is about to flip on the West. It has time to mull its decision. The point is that *Germany is not the solid rock of NATO and the European Union that the West assumes it is*. Russia’s recent actions mean that history is catching up with the Germans and that a choice will eventually come. Everything depends on Berlin’s choice between maintaining its dependence on the United States or flipping the entire balance structure in Europe by striking a deal with Russia. Berlin has been itching to reassert itself as a real and unbound power on the Continent once

again. ... Berlin's choice will shape the future of Europe and possibly the world.

The easing of sanctions and talk of a European defense union are still in the early stages, but we could be seeing the beginning of this geopolitical shift.

One reason Great Britain and the U.S. promoted the formation of the European Union was in order to provide a counterbalance to Soviet Russia. But if the EU allies with Russia, the whole idea will have backfired. Otto von Bismarck once revealed the key for a successful Europe: "The secret of politics? Make a good treaty with Russia." Dr. Srdja Trifkovic, foreign affairs editor of *Chronicles* magazine, explained in an interview:

The only ones who are chronically terrified of a German-Russian understanding are invariably the maritime powers. In the 19th century, the British tried to prevent the rise of an emerging superpower on the Continent, such as

a German-Russian alliance. Looking at the British Empire and its naval bases, one is struck by how the Eurasian heartland was effectively surrounded.

Prior to Bismarck, Napoleon Bonaparte tried to ally himself with Russia to cut Britain off from supplies. Later, the Hitler-Stalin Pact was made to bring an axis victory to the wars in the West during World War II.

America may simply follow along with whatever Germany wants, even scaling back sanctions in order to prevent a breach. A skillful German leader may be able patch up things with Russia, while delaying a break with the U.S. But a German-American schism is coming.

For more on the future of German-Russian relations, read *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry's article "[Watch Germany!](#)" And for more on Germany's relationship with America, read "[The Significance of Germany's Break From America.](#)"

 Follow [Richard Palmer](#)

MIDDLE EAST

TrumpetDaily

RADIO SHOW

[WILL BREXIT FIX BRITAIN? | JUNE 9](#)

[TRUMP ON AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM: 'I NEVER LIKED THE TERM' | JUNE 8](#)

[THE DARK AGE OF SCIENCE | JUNE 7](#)

[INTRODUCING THE NEW POWER BROKERS IN IRAQ | JUNE 6](#)

Iran's Chess Game

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



IRAN'S EFFORTS TO DESTROY ISRAEL BOTH FROM WITHIN AND without its borders are painfully obvious. What's not so apparent is how those efforts have a strong connection to Iran's actions in Iraq and Syria, as Caroline Glick wrote June 3:

Israel's strategic environment will be determined in great part by the results of Iran's actions in Iraq and Syria. ...

[When the United States deposed Saddam Hussein in 2003 and installed a Shiite government in Baghdad, it] set the conditions for the rise of the Islamic State in the Sunni heartland of Anbar province on the one hand, and for Iran's control over Iraq's Shiite-controlled government and armed forces on the other.

Today, ISIS is the only thing checking Iran's westward advance. Ironically, the monstrous group also facilitates it.

ISIS is so demonic that for Americans and other Westerners, empowering Iranian-controlled forces that fight ISIS seems a small price to pay to rid the world of the fanatical scourge.

Glick then explained how Iranian-controlled militants currently fighting the Islamic State in the Anbar province would be "well placed to threaten Jordan and Israel from the east" following a victory in Anbar. She continued:

The battle for Fallujah is a clear indication that Iran, rather than the U.S., is calling the shots in Iraq. According to media reports, the Pentagon wanted and expected for the forces to be concentrated in Mosul. But at the last minute, due to [Quds Force Comm. Qassem] Suleimani's intervention, the Iraqi government decided to make Fallujah the

offensive's center of gravity.

The Americans had no choice but to go along with the Iranian plan because, as [former U.S. naval analyst J.E. Dyer] noted, Iran is increasingly outflanking the U.S. in Iraq. If things follow their current course, in the near future, Iran is liable to be in a position to force the U.S. to choose between going to war or ceasing all air operations in Iraq. ...

To date, commentators have more or less agreed that U.S. operations in Iraq and Syria make no sense. They are significant enough to endanger U.S. forces, but they aren't significant enough to determine the outcome of the war in either territory.

The only way America's actions make sense is if they are placed in the context of the liberal ideology of the Obama administration, chiefly, the president himself and his Deputy National Security Adviser, Ben Rhodes. "Against this strategic shift," wrote Glick, "the U.S.'s minimalist campaigns in Iraq and Syria against ISIS make sense." She continued:

The U.S. forces aren't there to defeat ISIS, but to conceal Iran's rise.

When ISIS is defeated in Anbar and in Raqqa in Syria, its forces are liable to turn west, to Jordan.

The U.S. is currently helping Jordan to complete a border fence along its border with Iraq. But then ISIS is already active in Jordan.

And if events in Iraq and Syria are any guide, where ISIS leads, Iran will follow.

Caroline Glick concluded:

In this new strategic environment, Israel must stop viewing Gaza, Judea and Samaria, the Golan Heights and Lebanon as stand-alone battlefields. ...

The name of the game today is chess. The entire Middle East is one great board. When a pawn moves in Gaza, it affects the queen in Tehran.

And when a knight moves in Fallujah, it threatens the queen in Jerusalem.

How exactly Jerusalem will be threatened by Iran and other forces is thoroughly explained in our free booklet *Jerusalem in Prophecy*.

The Six-Day War's Forgotten Legacy

THIS WEEK MARKED THE 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIX DAY War, in which Israel fought Egypt, Syria and Jordan and captured the Sinai Peninsula, the Golan Heights and the West Bank. Geopolitical Futures' [George Friedman](#) wrote on June 7:

[T]he Israelis established a reputation for military invincibility that remains today. It uses this reputation to shape the psychological framework of the region. Israel's performance in the war was an extraordinary military achievement. It was also the last time Israel either maintained control at the beginning of a war or achieved its intended strategic outcome.

The 1967 war did not end hostilities. In 1969, the Egyptians imposed the War of Attrition along the Suez. Then, in 1973, only six years after Israel's destruction of the Egyptian Army, Egypt (along with Syria) struck Israel in a stunning assault. ...

[I]t was on the Golan Heights that the most threatening battle for Israel was fought. During the first night, the Syrian Army almost recaptured the Golan Heights, opening the door for an invasion of the Galilee. The Army was stopped that night by a handful of tanks—all that was available since Israel was taken completely by surprise and hadn't mobilized.

The Israelis held on [to] the Golan by the sheer will of its defenders. Protecting the homeland by will and courage, rather than by a capable and appropriate military force, is obviously dangerous.

In the Sinai desert, ... Israel went on the offensive there, but only after a massive American airlift of supplies It

was [an Israeli] victory that required foreign assistance. ...

For the past 43 years, Israel's military has performed well, but nowhere near the brilliance shown in 1967, nor in 1956 when it took the Sinai. Yet, Israel has retained a reputation for military omnipotence.

"The most important consequence of this has been the paradox built into the Israeli self-conception," wrote Friedman. That paradox is that while Israel is a small nation surrounded by enemies, it's militarily strong enough to fight them. "From this," continued Friedman, "they draw the strategic conclusion that their only option is to use their military to guarantee their security. The assumption is that their military is not simply a tool at Israel's disposal, but a guarantor of its security."

That couldn't be true, considering how volatile the Middle East is. Friedman concluded:

All armies have weaknesses, but Israel assumes its army is invincible. ...

The Israelis have a fine military. But regardless of what it achieved in 1967, its other victories were flawed, as are most victories. Therefore, assuming that the Israel Defense Forces can guarantee the security of Israel in a sea of enemies is dangerous.

Israel is a small country with a good army. It cannot always succeed and should not only pursue a military solution. But Israel's strategy assumes it will always perform as it did in 1967. The legacy of that war is not only the current borders of Israel, but a concept of Israel's military power that endangers its national security.

Trumpet editor in chief Gerald Flurry wrote in *Jerusalem in Prophecy*:

The people of biblical Israel talk a lot about God but don't believe and obey Him. That is the real source of all our problems today. The nations of Israel will fall because of that faithlessness.

THE JEWISH NATION WAS BORN AND SUSTAINED BY GODLY MIRACLES. BUT IT STILL REFUSES TO TRUST GOD! ... So little trust in God—so much trust in their enemies [and weapons, we could add]!

[Israel's] real wound is spiritual—a lack of faith in God. ... They were strong when they trusted God. Even recent history proves that truth.

TW IN BRIEF

Saudi Arabia's pursuit of confederation: Saudi Arabia is expanding its anti-Iran strategy beyond its allies in the Middle East. Reuters reported on Sunday that the Saudi kingdom is seeking more anti-Iran allies from countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Experts say this move is in part because of the Iran nuclear deal, which normalized Iranian relations with much of the international community. A senior diplomat in Saudi Arabia said the Saudis "understand [that] the old international order is dead and they have to take responsibility."

At least three Israelis killed in terrorist attack: At least three people were killed and seven wounded in a shooting that took place Wednesday at a food and shopping center in Tel Aviv, Israel. Reports said the gunmen were Islamic terrorists disguised as ultra-Orthodox Jews, complete with prominent black hats. After the attack, one of the shooters was captured and

arrested. The other was hospitalized for bullet wounds sustained during the attack. Palestinians celebrated the news of the dead Israelis by lighting fireworks and cheering in the streets. The Hamas terrorist group tweeted praise of the Islamists who carried out the savage attacks, calling them heroes.

Shiite revenge in Sunni Fallujah?: Sunni authorities in Fallujah have asked the Iraqi government to investigate allegations of torture of civilians by Shiite militants. Iran-sponsored Shiite militants have been leading the battle to retake the predominantly Sunni city of Fallujah from the Islamic State. The Shiite militants have been accused of torturing more than 600 civilians captured during the battle. Authorities say that those released showed visible signs of torture. Four of them died from their injuries. There are fears that Shiite heavy-handedness in the Sunni city might lead to more sectarian conflict.

EUROPE

TrumpetHour

THE NEWS THAT MATTERS: IN GERMANY, IRAN, CHINA, RUSSIA, ISRAEL AND AT HOME | JUNE 10

SECRET TALKS WITH KHOMEINI, U.S. MILITARY WASTE, AND STUDYING SHAKESPEARE | JUNE 8

T What's the Bilderberg Agenda? Andrew Müller | June 9

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



A SECRETIVE GROUP OF TOP POLITICIANS, BANKERS AND BUSINESSMEN convened this week for their 64th annual conference. Since its inaugural meeting in May 1954, the Bilderberg Group has been an annual forum that allows a select group of leaders from across Europe and North America to discuss important issues away from the eyes and ears of the press.

According to the group's official website: "Every year, between 120-150 political leaders and experts from industry, finance,

academia and the media are invited to take part in the meeting."

This year's meeting convenes from June 9-12 in Dresden, Germany. According to a press release, topics for discussion include: Europe's migrant crisis, American politics, cyber security, energy geopolitics and the predicament of the middle class. It's been speculated that Britain's June 23 referendum on EU membership will also be discussed.

The chairman of Bilderberg 2016 will be French count and

insurance tycoon Henri de Castries, who likes to spend his weekends at his castle in Anjou.

Other noteworthy guests include: former European Commission President José Manuel Barroso, former United States Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, U.S. Sen. Lindsey Graham, International Monetary Fund Director Christine Lagarde, German Defense Minister Ursula von der Leyen, German Interior Minister Thomas de Maizière, German Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble and King Willem-Alexander of the Netherlands.

The meetings are held under the Chatham House Rule, meaning participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker may be revealed.

Due to the secrecy surrounding Bilderberg discussions, the conference has become a popular target of conspiracy theorists. The Internet is full of blogs detailing how Bilderberg members are in league with the Illuminati, the Freemasons and/or a secret cabal of shape-shifting lizards founded by the sorceress Semiramis.

Despite the conspiracies, it's an established fact that the Bilderberg Group was cofounded by two controversial figures: Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands and Polish political adviser Józef Retinger.

Prince Bernhard, the former German prince of Lippe-Biesterfeld, was an SS Intelligence officer attached to the Nazis' main industrial supporter, I.G. Farben. The prince was also a member of the Nazi Party until 1934, when he resigned to marry Princess Juliana, the future queen of the Netherlands.

Józef Retinger was thought to be an agent of the Vatican. According to British political commentator Rodney Atkinson,

he was expelled from the Allied countries during World War I on suspicion of helping the superior-general of the Jesuits, Włodzimierz Ledóchowski, plot the creation of a Central Europe Catholic federation. Retinger founded the European Movement in 1946, leading to the establishment of the Council of Europe in 1949.

Prince Bernhard and Józef Retinger teamed up to found the Bilderberg Group primarily to drum up transatlantic support for the idea of a United States of Europe. Richard J. Aldrich, professor of international security at the University of Warwick, revealed in 1997 that the three organizations most responsible for the modern-day European Union are: the Bilderberg Group, Retinger's European Movement and Jean Monnet's Action Committee for a United States of Europe.

Belgian viscount and former Bilderberg Chairman Étienne Davignon bragged that the Bilderberg Group helped create the euro in the 1990s. Belgian Prime Minister Herman Van Rompuy was promoted as a candidate for the first president of the European Council at a dinner hosted by the Bilderbergs in 2009.

While the Bilderberg Group may not be the world shadow government of conspiracy lore; it's still one of the most influential groups in the world. Set up primarily to benefit transatlantic megacorporations, such as Rockefeller's Standard Oil and former Nazi industrial giant I.G. Farben, the Bilderberg Group is an enemy to democracy and the concept of the sovereign nation state.

While many Bilderberg supporters have legitimate concerns about the need for a transatlantic alliance to counter the rise of Russia and China, Bible prophecy reveals America's love affair with the European Union will end badly!

The World Wants A German Military

GERMAN TANKS CROSSED INTO POLAND THIS WEEK FOR THE FIRST time in 70 years. The event underscores an important point—the world does not fear Germany, and instead wants Germany to rearm. The *New York Times* reported on this June 6 in an article titled, “[In a Reversal, Germany's Military Growth Is Met With Western Relief](#)”:

You know times have changed when the Germans announce they are expanding their army for the first time in 25 years—and no one objects.

Back when the Berlin Wall fell, Britain and France in particular feared the reemergence of a German colossus in Europe. By contrast, Berlin's pledge last month to add almost 7,000 soldiers to its military by 2023, and an earlier announcement to spend up to €130 billion, about US\$148 billion, on new equipment by 2030 were warmly welcomed by NATO allies.

It has taken decades since the horrors of World War II, but Berlin's modern-day allies and, it seems, German leaders themselves are finally growing more comfortable with the notion that **Germany's role as the European Union's de facto leader requires a military dimension.**

Perhaps none too soon. The United States and

others—including many of Germany's own defense experts—want Germany to do even more for Continental security and to broaden deployments overseas. ...

As a July NATO summit meeting in Warsaw approaches, Germany, Europe's largest economy, is now key to how the alliance will face the twin perils that have transformed the strategic situation in Europe: a more menacing Russia and the Islamic State's expansion beyond individual acts of terrorism like executions to seizing territory.

In Europe, where NATO's easternmost members, particularly Poland and the Baltic States, have clamored for permanent deployment of Allied troops to deter Russian meddling, Germany looks set to take command of a brigade in Lithuania, joining Britain and the United States in leading the effort to marshal a robust presence on Russia's borders.

Under Chancellor Angela Merkel, Germany is also playing a part in NATO programs to pool resources of member states for greater collective security. Defense experts hold up increased German-Dutch cooperation as a model. ...

But whether on its own or with others, Germany is showing signs of growing more comfortable with embracing a bigger military role, a gradual but distinct shift away from an instinctive pacifism that took hold starting in 1945, and a

post-Cold War tendency to shrink the nation's military.

The shift started becoming publicly apparent in 2014, when Germany's president and foreign and defense ministers all urged an increased global security role for the country

Since then, Germany has responded by helping to build a NATO rapid response force in Eastern Europe, leading the diplomacy efforts in Ukraine, and training and arming Kurdish Peshmerga battling the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

Now, a new government strategy document ... is likely both to bolster Germany's role on the world stage—beyond its traditional sphere of activity in Europe—and to talk explicitly of military contributions. ...

Polling shows that “the general public is not very comfortable with the military dimension,” said Sylke Tempel, the editor of *Internationale Politik*....

The policymaking elite, on other hand, know that “strategic thinking includes the notion that you have to build a force in order to be taken seriously, and that you have to spend on this dimension,” Ms. Tempel said.

Meanwhile, *EU Observer* reports on the military exercises that bring the German Army to Poland in an article titled “[NATO in Show of Strength Ahead of Warsaw Summit](#)”:

NATO has begun three military exercises—Anaconda-16, Baltops and Iron Wolf 2016—designed to show it is ready to defend its eastern allies from Russia. The Anaconda-16 war game in Poland is the largest of its kind since the end of the Cold War. ... It will also see, for the first time since World War II, German tanks cross the border into Poland.

Will the EU Be Stronger After Brexit?

THE EUROPEAN UNION WILL EMERGE STRONGER THAN EVER AFTER Britain's referendum on its place in the EU, regardless of which way the nation votes, Guy Verhofstadt, leader of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe and former prime minister of Belgium, told *EU Observer* in an interview published June 3:

Verhofstadt is one of the few EU politicians who openly calls for the creation of a single superstate. ... He is optimistic because, he said, the Brexit vote will, either way, lead to new talks on the EU treaty.

“The whole discussion and referendum around British membership is an opportunity,” he said.

“Why? Because if it is a ‘No,’ we need to start negotiations. That's Article 50 in the [EU] treaty. If it is a ‘Yes,’ we agreed with [British Prime Minister David] Cameron to translate the special status for Britain into the treaty ... and he promised not to make obstacles for the deepening of the union.”

The “special status” is Cameron's new deal on British opt-outs from various aspects of EU integration, such as the euro or closer political union.

No matter what the result of the British referendum on 23 June, it will lead to changes in the European architecture, Verhofstadt said.

Either the British stay in the EU but let the rest of it become a real union, he explained. Or it exits the EU, letting it become a real union. ...

He said that if the UK had a “special status” or “associated membership” then pro-EU capitals could continue “deepening the union.”

He also pointed out that the type of federal state could only happen on Germany's terms:

With the Brexit vote marking a crossroads in European history, Verhofstadt said German leadership is needed more than ever.

“I think it is important that Germany involves itself more in European affairs. It is fundamental now,” said the liberal leader.

“Let's be honest, the union does not exist ... and we have to make a fundamental shift to a federal union,” he said.

“That is now on the table. We are talking about a separate budget and treasury for the eurozone, a real defense community. We need to make this shift and we need Germany for that.”

Islamist Terrorists in Germany

A LARGE ISLAMIC STATE TERROR CELL IS OPERATING IN Germany, according to a June 8 *Wall Street Journal* article titled “[Signs of Bigger Islamic State Cell in Germany Emerge](#)”:

A man who was detained in France and exposed an Islamic State terror cell in Germany told authorities that the cell contained many more people than the three arrested last week, according to officials familiar with his testimony.

The revelations, part of new details emerging about the arrested suspects, add to concerns that the extremist group could be poised to strike again in Europe.

Authorities ... are examining testimony from Saleh A., who walked into a police station in the north of Paris in February claiming that he was part of an Islamic State sleeper cell of between 10 and 20 people, officials familiar with the investigation said. Based on his testimony, German police

last week arrested three suspected Islamic State members who arrived in the country among Syrian asylum seekers on suspicion of preparing an attack in the western German city of Düsseldorf. ...

The incomplete dismantling of a cell could be a hazard in itself. Belgian police, for instance, say there is evidence the March arrest of Salah Abdeslam—the sole surviving member of the group that attacked Paris on November 13—in Brussels persuaded his still-at-large accomplices to accelerate their plans for an attack. ...

Last week's arrests have heightened concerns ... that Islamic State could have smuggled hundreds of fighters among the 1.2 million refugees who have arrived in Germany since the start of last year, and that some could have Europe's most populous country in their sight.

Germany continues to monitor a large number of subjects. Last week authorities announced they were monitoring 499 suspected Islamic extremists who pose a potential terror threat.

ASIA

T **Hiroshima and America's Dangerous Amnesia** Stephen Flurry | June 10

UNITED STATES PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA BECAME THE FIRST sitting U.S. president to visit Hiroshima. Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe gave what he called a “wholehearted welcome” to Mr. Obama's May 27 visit to the memorial of the world's first atomic bomb attack, in what many view to be another “apology tour.”

“Mr. Obama's predecessors had good reasons to avoid Hiroshima,” the *New York Times* wrote May 25. “None wanted to be seen by American voters as apologizing for a decision that many historians even today believe, on balance, saved lives.”

Mr. Obama stayed away from explicit statements like *I'm sorry the U.S. bombed Hiroshima*. But the tone of the speech was certainly apologetic—saying, for example, that the bombing shows “[h]ow easily we learn to justify violence in the name of some higher cause.”

Mr. Obama and those like him have forgotten, or are ignoring, the key facts surrounding America's use of the atomic bomb. This historical amnesia has some serious implications.

In all of Mr. Obama's almost-apologies, the fact that Japan started the war was ignored. Too many today don't want to assign blame. Each side in a war is considered equally immoral. Wars are written off as either the fault of both sides, or accidents.

Mr. Obama's visit to Hiroshima is broadly interpreted as an

endorsement of Abe's campaign to reinterpret Japan's Constitution and lead Japan away from its guilty past into the world arena of global conflict. America's pacifism is awakening the samurai.

The war in the Pacific was so horrific that the world was in jubilation in August 1945—not because atomic bombs killed 100,000 people, but because it finally brought that nightmare to an end. The world on Aug. 9, 1945, was cheering at the end of what had been the worst war of human history.

Jesus Christ said the world war just before His return to Earth would be so bad, if not for God's intervention, man would destroy himself. That wouldn't even be possible were it not for nuclear weapons. Can't we see where this is heading? The last world war ended with the use of two atomic bombs. Think about a world war that starts with nuclear bombs. This is exactly what Jesus Christ described in Matthew 24.

In his implicit apology, and in insisting that the world is better today than ever before, Mr. Obama overlooks the most important lessons from Hiroshima. Mankind now has the power to obliterate every human being on Earth!

It's important for us to understand that God is allowing all of this to happen so that mankind will consider his ways and turn to God.

 Follow Stephen Flurry

Moscow Violating New START Arms Treaty

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



RUSSIA HAS ATTEMPTED TO DECEIVE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR arms inspectors about reductions to its nuclear missile arsenals. *Washington Free Beacon* reported on Thursday:

U.S. nuclear arms inspectors recently discovered that Russia is violating the New START arms treaty by improperly eliminating SS-25 mobile missiles, American defense officials said. The violations were discovered during an

on-site inspection carried out in Russia in April

... U.S. technicians found critical components of SS-25s—road-mobile, intercontinental ballistic missiles—had been unbolted instead of cut to permanently disable the components.

Additionally, American inspectors were unable to verify missiles slated for elimination had been destroyed. Instead, only missile launch canisters were inspected.

As a result, inspectors were unable to determine if the missiles were properly eliminated as required by the 2010 arms treaty

“Russia will meet their treaty elimination goals by using empty launchers from retired and retiring missile systems,” said one official. “They’re basically cutting up launchers that don’t carry missiles anyway.”

The New START Treaty requires the U.S. and Russia to reduce their nuclear arsenals to 700 deployed water- and land-based missiles and heavy bombers, 800 non-deployed launchers and bombers, and 1,550 deployed warheads.

Analysts say the Russians are attempting to deceive the U.S. because they reckon the current American administration will not take serious action against such moves. House Armed

Services Committee Chairman Mac Thornberry said the U.S.’s inability to verify that Russia has been in compliance with the START treaty is part of a broader problem of the Obama administration declining to press Moscow to adhere to its treaty obligations.

“Whether it’s Russian violations of the Open Skies Treaty, the Biological and Chemical Weapons Conventions, or multiple violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, this administration has proven singularly unconcerned with arms control compliance,” Thornberry told the *Free Beacon*. “Never having been made to pay a price, why wouldn’t Putin conclude that violations of the New START Treaty would go unpunished as well?” he said.

We should expect Russia, China and other nations to increasingly push against American weakness as they attempt to rebalance global power.

Taiwan Rejects ‘China-centric’ Education, Tells Beijing not to Fear Democracy

TWO WEEKS INTO ITS RULE, TAIWAN’S NEW GOVERNMENT IS PUSHING against China. The [Hong Kong Free Press](#) reported on June 1:

Taiwan’s new government has repealed controversial changes to the high school curriculum that led to widespread protests last year over what critics said was “China-centric” education. The order to overturn the changes comes less than two weeks since the China-skeptic Democratic Progressive Party was sworn in

... Ties have rapidly cooled since [Tsai Ing-wen] won the presidency in January vowing to restore Taiwanese pride. Education Ministry officials said the decision on the curriculum, made late Tuesday, had been taken in response to public sentiment.

Meanwhile, on June 4, Tsai took to social media to tell China that democracy is nothing to fear. Reuters [reported](#):

Tsai Ing-wen said in a Facebook post on the 27th anniversary [of the Tiananmen Square massacre] that Taiwan could serve as an example to China. “[T]here’s nothing scary about democracy. Democracy is a good and fine thing,” wrote Tsai China sent in tanks to break up the demonstrations on June 4, 1989. Beijing has never released a death toll, but estimates from human rights groups and witnesses range from several hundred to several thousand. The subject remains all but taboo in China, where President Xi Jinping is overseeing a broad crackdown on rights groups and activists.

Ties between Taiwan and China have been icy for as long as the two have existed as separate nations. That separation was the result of a bloody civil war that started in 1927 between the Communist Party and a party called the Kuomintang. By 1949, the Communists had defeated the Kuomintang, forcing its members to flee to Taiwan. Ever since, China has actively claimed ownership of Taiwan, and has often vowed to use force to dominate it.

For decades, Taiwanese have lived in fear of invasion from Chinese forces. But this island has stayed independent thanks to military equipment and political support from the United States.

Recently, however, America’s support for Taiwanese independence has diminished. In 1998, Bill Clinton became the first American president to publicly oppose Taiwanese independence. *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry said this signaled that Taiwan would soon come under China’s rule. “These ... people are going to be forced into the Chinese mold; and it is going to happen for one reason: because of a pitifully weak-willed America” (*Trumpet*, August 1998).

When that was written, the idea of Taiwan becoming assimilated into China may have seemed likely only in the distant future. But, now, with Taiwan’s Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) back in power and pushing a pro-independence agenda, it could happen quickly.

After the election, China’s official Xinhua news agency said “the DPP’s return to rule poses grave challenges to cross-strait relations.” If the DPP decides to stay tough against China, it could prompt Beijing to react with force and swallow Taiwan. If that happens, as Mr. Flurry said, “it is going to happen for one reason: because of a pitifully weak-willed America.”



Matthew 24 Unlocks the Seven Seals

Gerald Flurry,
The Key of David | June 12

In Matthew 24, Christ unlocks the meaning of the seals of Revelation. Do you understand the meaning of those seven seals?



Radical Australian Prisons

Callum Wood | June 8

PRISON MAY NO LONGER BE THE SAFEST PLACE TO SEND AUSTRALIA's terrorists. Recent reports indicate that Muslim radicals are using penitentiaries to garner new converts. Through intimidation, violence and coercion, the Islamic State has managed to gain a foothold in prisons across the nation, sparking fears that newly converted extremists will be released into the community with a dangerous new mind-set and agenda.

According to the *Australian*, 8 to 9 percent of prisoners in Victoria and New South Wales currently identify as Muslim, compared to the 2 to 3 percent of the Australian public that identifies as Muslim. The newspaper speculated that any New South Wales prison might see as many as four conversions per month. While perhaps small individually, there are at least 35 correctional centers throughout New South Wales—varying in size. If Islamic converts come out of only half of those, it still equates to a substantial number. And this is just one state.

Some argue that the Muslim religion is peaceful. But Muslim inmates at Australian prisons are not incarcerated because they practice a religion of peace, so their new disciples will be cut from similar cloth.

Public Service Association Corrections Branch Chairman Steve McMahon told the *Daily Telegraph* that the forced conversions to Islam were “very concerning” and “most likely extremist related.” He continued, “The Muslims in jail are not upstanding citizens These people are clearly doing it for some reasons other than their devotion to the faith, and it is concerning in light of how dangerous some of these individuals have become.”

In other words, imprisoned radicals are using prison conversions to expand terror-related activity in the nation.

The *Daily Telegraph* published an article stating that authorities had uncovered plots to behead those who refused conversion, including guards and staff. One entire yard apparently had been converted to Islam, except for six Christians. The Muslim inmates planned to behead one Christian, film it on a phone, and post it on the Internet as propaganda for the Islamic State.

There have already been murders. The stabbing of an Adnan Darwiche gang member in September last year was believed to be religiously motivated. Men have been stabbed for shaving off their beards before parole hearings, a sign that they had reneged

on their religious commitments.

THE RELIGIOUS VIOLENCE IS A HARBINGER OF THE NEW WAR IN AUSTRALIA'S PENAL SYSTEM.

In a situation where being part of a gang is often necessary for survival, conversion by the fist is an effective recruiting technique. The pool from which the recruiters fish also carries plenty of young men looking for protection, purpose and justification for their actions.

A glimpse into where this crisis is leading can be seen in the example of Bourhan Hraichie. At just 18 years old, Hraichie was a self-professed radical. He was caught numerous times sending graphic beheading photos to other inmates at Goulburn, Australia's highest-security prison, as well as making Islamic State flags and carving the Islamic State symbol on a prison wall.

Through a terrible prison staff blunder, Hraichie was placed in a cell with a former Australian soldier suffering from post traumatic stress disorder. It was only a number of hours before tragedy struck.

Hraichie choked and then whipped the soldier repeatedly. Then the 18-year-old poured boiling water over his face and carved “E4E” (representing “an eye for an eye”) into both the front and back of the former soldier's head.

THIS IS THE ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH RADICAL GROWTH IS BEING FOSTERED.

Prisoners are mingling with convicted terrorists in the general population—men like Mohammed Elomar and Abdul Hasan, both convicted of plotting terror attacks in Sydney back in 2004 and 2005.

Australia has been conducting raids and police stings across the nation in an attempt to crack down on people leaving the country to join the Islamic State. But as it turns out, those caught and convicted have plenty of opportunities to teach, train and convert within the prison system.

The radical Islamic element of Australian society has been near-dormant for years, but the rise of the Islamic State has fostered insurrection.

It has started now in the penitentiaries. And as prisoners convert and return to society, or get transferred to other prisons, radical Islam is going to go with them.

U.S. Taxpayers Funding Iran's Military

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



THE UNITED STATES STATE DEPARTMENT ADMITTED LAST WEEK 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 admitted that the Obama administration lied about its secret talks with Iran.

Now it has been revealed that the Obama administration wired \$1.7 billion to Iran last January during delegate prisoner swap negotiations. Iran's Guardian Council wired this same sum of money to the Iranian military.

In an article for Bloomberg News, "[U.S. Taxpayers Are Funding Iran's Military Expansion](#)," Eli Lake writes:

One of the unexpected results of President Barack Obama's new opening to Iran is that U.S. taxpayers are now funding both sides of the Middle East's arms race. The U.S. is deliberately subsidizing defense spending for allies like Egypt and Israel. Now the U.S. is inadvertently paying for some of Iran's military expenditures as well.

It all starts with \$1.7 billion the U.S. Treasury wired to Iran's Central Bank in January, during a delicate prisoner swap and the implementation of last summer's nuclear deal to resolve a long-standing dispute about Iran's arms purchases before the revolution of 1979.

For months it was unclear what Iran's government would do with this money. But last month the mystery was solved when Iran's Guardian Council approved the government's 2017 budget that instructed Iran's Central Bank to

transfer the \$1.7 billion to the military.

Saeed Ghasseminejad, an associate fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, spotted the budget item. He told me the development was widely reported in Iran by numerous sources including the state-funded news services. "Article 22 of the budget for 2017 says the Central Bank is required to give the money from the legal settlement of Iran's pre- and post-revolutionary arms sales of up to \$1.7 billion to the defense budget," he said.

Already, the U.S. is paying China almost \$27 billion a year in interest payments on the debt Washington owes Beijing. This amount of money represented almost a quarter of China's total military expenditures in 2013. Now, U.S. taxpayers are also directly funding Iranian-sponsored terrorism in the Middle East via what amounts to ransom payments to the mullahs in Tehran.

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.

Just How Vulnerable Is the U.S. Military to Cyberattack

AS EARLY AS 1995, *TRUMPET* EDITOR IN CHIEF GERALD FLURRY warned, "Computer dependence is the Western world's Achilles heel, and within a few years this weakness could be tested to the full." Since then, technology has evolved at a fast and furious pace, and the United States, together with the rest of the world, has grown ever more dependent on computers and networking.

Andrew Poulin pointed out this strategic vulnerability in an article for [Real Clear Defense](#) this week:

"During a conflict, the Defense Department assumes that a potential adversary will seek to target U.S. or allied critical infrastructure and military networks to gain a strategic advantage." Those ominous words are from the 2015 [Department of Defense] Cyber Strategy. In fact, cyberattacks are not just a future threat but something that the military faces on a daily basis. Cybercrimes like the theft of intellectual property, the probing of government and military networks, attacks against U.S. infrastructure, and the laying of trapdoors and logic bombs within U.S. networks,

make this an incredibly potent danger.

This threat is further exacerbated by the level of dependence that the military has on the Internet and other vulnerable online networks. In his book [Cyber War](#), Richard Clarke details that, "Logistics, command and control, fleet positioning, everything down to targeting, all rely on software and other Internet-related technologies. And all of it is just as insecure as your home computer, because it is all based on the same flawed underlying technologies and uses the same insecure software and hardware." This is an astonishing liability underlying the most powerful military in the world.

It is especially troubling because for even a modest investment in cyber technologies, a foreign nation or non-state actor could limit the effectiveness of U.S. military equipment or gain access to supposedly secure systems. For instance, in 2009, insurgents in Iraq used \$26 software to hack into and monitor the video feeds from predator drones via an unencrypted communications link. Imagine if the signal that was compromised was jammed instead,

thus making the drone ineffective and forcing its return to base before mission completion; the result would have been that a \$4 million piece of U.S. equipment was countered by less than \$100 of software and a junior cyberhacker. The cyberworld is a great force equalizer that will surely be a significant factor in any future large-scale conflict.

There are many reasons to be alarmed by this report, especially if you live in the United States, the nation most prone to cybercrime. Cybercrime is a threat to us personally, administratively and economically.

Most vitally, cyberwarfare is a threat to our military. Just as [Gerald Flurry](#) warned in 1999: “We could lose the next war before we even begin if somebody breaks *our* military codes.” Mr. Flurry based that forecast on a prophecy in Ezekiel: “Moreover the word

of the Lord came unto me, saying, also, thou son of man, thus saith the Lord God unto the land of Israel; An end, the end is come upon the four corners of the land. ... They have blown the trumpet, even to make all ready; but none goeth to the battle: for my wrath is upon all the multitude thereof” (Ezekiel 7:1-2, 14).

Notice, as nation-threatening dangers pile up and the call to arms goes out, “none goeth to battle.” Is that because America experiences a massive cyberattack? An attack so deadly it destroys vital U.S. infrastructure, making it impossible to muster the military and sustain trade and commerce, and ultimately thrusting the nation into chaos and anarchy? Twenty years ago such a scenario would have been surreal, impossible, the plot line of an epic science-fiction movie. Yet here we are in 2016 listening to America’s defense analysts speaking seriously and candidly about the potential of a catastrophic cyberattack on the United States.

Research Reveals Vital Details Regarding Women Who Are Virgins When They Marry

A NEW REPORT BY THE INSTITUTE OF FAMILY STUDIES SAYS THAT women who get married as virgins are less likely to get divorced than those entering into marriage with sexual history. The Blaze [reported on June 7](#):

A new study has found that women with between zero and one sexual partner are the least likely to divorce later on, with women who had 10 or more partners emerging as the most likely to see their marriages end, according to the Institute for Family Studies.

Using data from the National Survey of Family Growth that was collected in 2002, 2006–2010 and 2011–2013,

researchers observed these trends, with the potential ties emerging between the total number of sexual partners and matrimonial dissolutions.

“Earlier research found that having multiple sex partners prior to marriage could lead to less happy marriages, and often increased the odds of divorce,” Prof. Nicholas Wolfinger wrote in a blog post that announced the analysis. ...

In the end, after analyzing the data, the professor concluded that those with fewer partners are less likely to see their marriages end in divorce. Thus, marrying as a virgin left women in a better situation when it came to their chances for future divorce.

TW IN BRIEF

Bernie Sanders wants socialism in Democratic platform: With the votes from this Tuesday’s Democratic Presidential Primary now counted, Hillary Clinton has enough delegates to secure the Democratic presidential nomination. Despite this fact, her primary competitor for the Democratic nomination, Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, isn’t withdrawing from the campaign. He is still raising money and scheduling appearances. He has vowed to take his campaign all the way

to the Democratic Convention, which will be held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, July 25-28. Sanders’s official position is that he can still win the nomination if he can persuade unpledged superdelegates to switch their vote before the convention. Political analysts are also pointing out that Sanders wants to keep his Democratic Socialist ideology in the limelight by getting his political views enshrined in the Democratic Party’s official platform at the convention.



Scoffers in the Last Days

Stephen Flurry,
Trumpet Daily | June 10

Follow [Stephen Flurry](#)

