



Today's Headline Out of Britain Was Written Over 40 Years Ago!

Trumpet Staff | June 23

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



B RITAIN WILL LOOK BACK ON THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 2016, AS A HISTORIC date. It's a tragically historic date fraught with ominous potential. That date marked the British citizens' rejection of the European Union.

Despite inclement weather in many areas across the United Kingdom, voter turnout was very strong. Voting closed at 10 p.m., and the ballots were counted through the night. In the early hours of Friday morning, media outlets began to project the victory of the Leave campaign with nearly 52 percent of the vote.

For decades, almost no one thought this day would come. [But one newscaster forecast the Brexit from the very day Britain first joined the European Community in 1973. His name was Herbert W. Armstrong.](#)

"Britain is going to look back on Monday, Jan. 1, 1973, in all probability, AS A MOST TRAGICALLY HISTORIC DATE—A DATE FRAUGHT WITH OMINOUS POTENTIALITIES! For that date marked the United Kingdom's entry into the European Community" (emphasis added throughout).

That statement by Mr. Armstrong was made in the March 1973 edition of the *Plain Truth*.

More than 40 years later, what do millions of Britons think about Jan. 1, 1973? Just ask the majority that elected a Conservative government on the promise of a referendum to leave the European Union. For them, Jan. 1, 1973, is a “tragically historic date.” It brought them into the European Economic Community and ultimately into the European Union, an experience that has leeched away Britain’s economic wealth, its military strength and its national sovereignty.

Today, the “ominous potentialities” Mr. Armstrong referred to have become *alarming realities*. But even more ominous realities lie ahead!

Britain and the EU

On Jan. 1, 2010, after decades of planning, the EU became an official global imperialist power, underpinned by a federal constitution that binds member countries to a supreme head in Brussels. For centuries, European rulers such as Napoleon Bonaparte and Adolf Hitler had been unsuccessful in their goal of dominating Britain. But on that first day of 2010, when the EU presidency and foreign ministry came into force under the Lisbon Treaty, the UK finally became officially subservient to Europe.

Many Britons were deeply concerned. “BRITAIN IS NO LONGER A SOVEREIGN NATION,” wrote British politician Daniel Hannan in the *Telegraph* the morning the treaty was enacted. “At midnight last night, we ceased to be an independent state, bound by international treaties to other independent states, and became instead a subordinate unit within a European state.”

The Lisbon Treaty “tramples [Britain’s] Magna Carta into the dust,” Ambrose Evans-Pritchard lamented in the *Telegraph*. “The founding texts of the English constitution—charter, petition, bill of rights—have one theme in common: They create nothing. They assert old freedoms; they restore lost harmony. In this, they guided America’s Revolution, itself a codification of early colonial liberties,” he wrote (Dec. 6, 2009).

Contrast this with the Lisbon Treaty/EU constitution. Evans-Pritchard correctly asserted that “insiders hijacked the process” of its creation. These insiders were unelected elites who worked for years seeking to enforce their undemocratic constitution on Europeans by the most undemocratic of means. And the Lisbon Treaty was a key part of those efforts.

In these maneuvers, Germany and France obtained mechanisms that gave them greater sway over Europe, while Britain’s power was diminished. The Lisbon Treaty, according to global intelligence company Stratfor, placed Germany and France in “key positions they can use to increase their influence over the European Union’s inner workings and important policy areas” and allows them to “take charge of the European Union’s functions” (Dec. 1, 2009).

Britain Playing Out

Europe blamed the financial fiasco that began in 2008 on the Anglo-Saxon model, which relies heavily on free-flowing credit. In response, the EU intensified its creation of a regulatory regime replete with laws, regulations and red tape designed to undermine and destroy London as the financial heart of Europe.

“The English are the big losers in this business,” said Nicolas

Sarkozy, president of France at the time. Economically, the people of Britain are indeed the big losers in the EU, but the losses are not limited to the banking sector. EU regulations now touch almost every level of every industry in Britain.

“If you want to build something, grow something, mince something, scrap something, recycle something, burn something, paint something, bake something, package something, or do a myriad of other things, there is a sheaf of densely typed regulations just for you,” said Matthew Elliott, coauthor of *The Great European Rip-off*. “In total, red tape from Brussels adds another £100 billion [US\$166 billion] of lost income, extra expenditure and forfeited economic growth to the bill.”

Elliott and other economists estimate that Britain’s total cost to be in the EU—factoring in all the harmful impacts of all the policies and regulations—is almost \$200 billion a year. That equals more than \$3,000 for each man, woman and child.

Although EU cheerleaders try to discredit any data that casts Europe in a negative light, the evidence proves that membership in the EU is a net cost for the Brits. What remained to be seen was how long Britain would continue to fight what was already a lost sovereignty battle and whether it would leave the European Union or be kicked out.

The referendum was held, and Britain made its choice!

Herbert W. Armstrong Was Right!

Today, there is little doubt that the “ominous potentialities” that Mr. Armstrong warned about are coming to pass. Politically, economically and judicially, Britain has found itself weakened by decades of subservience to the EU.

This is what Mr. Armstrong said would happen—decades ago. Mr. Armstrong concluded that 1973 article by writing, “Britain’s entry into the European Community *portends a tragic situation. Britain will be faced with a dilemma.*”

Britain faced that dilemma, just as Mr. Armstrong predicted.

How Did Herbert W. Armstrong Know?

But how did he know? He saw it clearly revealed in the prophecies of the Holy Bible!

For anyone familiar with Mr. Armstrong’s teachings, one prophecy stands out above the others; it could be considered his keynote prophecy.

That is the prophecy about a religious-political superstate that would emerge from Europe as the central power in end-time events. This empire, explained Mr. Armstrong based on a passage in the book of Daniel, would include five nations, or “kings,” from Eastern Europe and five from Western Europe.

Revelation 17 shows how this European empire will comprise 10 nations working under the direction of a false pagan church. Combined they form a revived “Holy Roman Empire.”

Mr. Armstrong recognized the beginnings of this prophesied empire at the establishment of the European Economic Community, the forerunner of today’s European Union.

In numerous articles, Mr. Armstrong made clear that Britain’s alliance with Europe would end. “The stage is all set!” he wrote in 1956. “All that’s lacking now is the strong LEADER—the coming FÜHRER! The Germans are coming back from the destruction of World War II in breathtaking manner. Germany is the economic and military heart of Europe. Probably Germany will lead and

dominate the coming United States of Europe.”

“But Britain,” he wrote, “will be no part of it!”

Why not?

There are multiple reasons, including the fundamental differences—political, religious and cultural—between Britain and Europe. But ultimately, it gets down to God’s will. God does not want Britain to be a part of the developing European superpower!

In fact, Bible prophecy reveals that God is going to use this German-led European power to *punish* Britain.

As Mr. Armstrong foretold, Germany is going to lead a resurrected “Holy Roman Empire” that Britain will not be a part of. So what does the Bible prophesy now? These same prophecies that informed Mr. Armstrong’s bold writings forecast that this German-led “Holy Roman Empire” will conquer, invade and put the British people—as well as the American people—into captivity!

Revelation 17 has some of the most descriptive prophecies about this. The Apostle John recorded this vision: “I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns” (verse 3).

An angel explained to John what the vision meant: “The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. ... And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as

kings one hour with the beast” (verses 9-12).

In Bible prophecy, a woman symbolizes a church and beasts represent governments. This vision shows a church-state combine that has risen and fallen repeatedly in history: the Holy Roman Empire. The last resurrection will be a confederation of 10 kingdoms, led by Germany and influenced by the Catholic Church. The European Union is already beginning to fulfill this prophecy.

Other related prophecies are found in Habakkuk 1 and Hosea 5 and 7. These show that this bloc of nations will attack the British and American people and put them into slavery.

Britain has now left the European Union, but it hasn’t turned back to God. Until Britain does repent and turn to God, its suffering will only escalate.

These prophecies will come to pass! This may be hard to believe, but it is true.

Mr. Armstrong explained from Scripture exactly what is in store for Britain in his most-requested book *The United States and Britain in Prophecy*. The publisher of the *Trumpet* newsmagazine prints this book, and we would like to offer you a free copy, totally without cost, obligation or follow-up. It will help you prove that these prophecies will happen as God has recorded.

Herbert W. Armstrong was right about Brexit, and the world will soon see he was right about what happens next!

 Follow [theTrumpet.com](https://www.theTrumpet.com)

MIDDLE EAST

TrumpetDaily

RADIO SHOW

BRITAIN ON THE WAY OUT—WHO COULD HAVE POSSIBLY PREDICTED THIS 60 YEARS AGO? | JUNE 24

RUSSIA'S PLAN TO DESTROY AMERICAN PRESTIGE, AND CHINA'S PLAN TO REMAKE THE WORLD | JUNE 23

ATTORNEY GENERAL: AMERICA'S MOST EFFECTIVE WEAPON AGAINST TERROR IS COMPASSION AND LOVE | JUNE 22

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF THE ‘MIGHTY MAN’ AND THE ‘MAN OF WAR’ | JUNE 21

CALLED TO BE TEACHERS | JUNE 20

EU Extends, Upgrades Libya Naval Mission

Brent Nagtegaal | June 26

THE EUROPEAN UNION DECIDED ON JUNE 20 TO EXTEND AND expand Operation Sophia, its Mediterranean naval mission off the coast of Libya.

The mission has been in effect for the past year, with naval vessels and aircraft patrolling waters just outside Libya in an attempt to disrupt human trafficking into Europe, the now-favored route of migrants from Africa. Sophia will be extended through July 2017.

EU leaders have also *expanded* Sophia’s goals to begin training Libyan naval forces as well as to enforce a United Nations arms

embargo. The bill was sold as an effort to reduce the access to arms for the Islamic State.

While the UN Security Council did support the mission in a unanimous vote, the Russian delegation was noticeably concerned there was more to the EU’s desire to upgrade Sophia. Moscow’s deputy UN ambassador, Vladimir Safronkov, even questioned the “real motives” behind Europe’s sponsorship of the deal and complained that the text didn’t stress the goal of establishing a united security force in Libya.

This latest upgrade to Sophia must be viewed in light of last month's decision by the UN, which was also pushed by the EU, to partially lift the arms embargo for the EU-backed and -brokered Libyan Government of National Accord (GNA). Don't be fooled by its name—the GNA hardly speaks for all Libyans. In fact, a powerful and *democratically elected* government still operates out of the eastern Libyan city of Tobruk. What's more, aligned with this eastern government is the Libyan National Army (LNA), currently the most effective force fighting the Islamic State in Libya.

According to last month's decision, however, the GNA will be the "sole legitimate recipient of international security assistance." All other groups, including the LNA, are deemed illegitimate and will not be getting help in the fight against the Islamic State.

Europe's ultimate goals in Libya go beyond merely fighting the Islamic State—the expansion of Operation Sophia better positions the Continent to dominate and control the southern Mediterranean.

German Defense Minister Ursula von der Leyen said her nation has an interest in creating "more order" along the border to Europe. To help create that order, Germany is working to expand its contribution to Sophia from the current 400 personnel to 950 through next year.

This latest addition to Operation Sophia is only phase one of the plan. According to a classified report obtained by WikiLeaks earlier this year, Operation Sophia's last two phases will see EU military operations *inside* Libyan territorial waters—and then, finally, European boots on the ground in Libya.

As *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry wrote in the July issue of the *Trumpet*, Germany and Italy once had a dream of dominating the southern Mediterranean and creating an [African empire](#). From 1941–43, they almost succeeded. Are they trying to realize that dream once again, starting with something as subtle as Operation Sophia?

 Follow [Brent Nagtegaal](#)

Bahrain Faces Renewed Uprising Callum Wood | June 27

BAHRAIN'S RULERS HAVE REVOKED THE CITIZENSHIP OF SHEIKH ISA Qassim, a prominent Shiite religious and political figure. The move has sparked outrage from Shiites both at home and abroad.

A Bahraini Interior Ministry statement accused Qassim of using his position to "serve foreign interests" and "encourage sectarianism and violence." But the government decision to terminate his citizenship may incite its own sectarianism and violence.

The revoke came just days after the government shut down the country's chief opposition party, al-Wefaq. The party boasted the largest number of seats in the parliament—18 of a possible 40—as well as the best turnout at the polls. Yet it has now been suspended and all its funds have been frozen.

Irrespective of numbers or popularity, the disbanding of the party shows that overall control still lies in the hands of Bahrain's royal family.

While the broad majority of Bahrain's population is Shiite, King Hamad bin Isa Al Khalifa and his ruling family is Sunni.

Though the king has made futile gestures to reconcile with the dissatisfied Shiite population, his heavy-handed crackdowns have ensured a destabilized political climate.

The revoking of Qassim's citizenship and the shutdown of al-Wefaq comes after the party's political leader, Sheikh Ali Salman, received an extension to his prison sentence.

Bahrain's actions have angered the UN, whose basic rulings allow all people the right to citizenship in a given country. The United States is also upset, releasing a statement claiming there is no proof to back allegations leveled against Qassim.

But the strongest response by far has come from prominent Iranian general Qassem Suleimani. He called the revocation a "red line, and passing this red line will create flames of fire in Bahrain and the entire region."

Suleimani also threatened a "bloody intifada" and promised "the toppling of the regime will only be a small part of the repercussions that will also include armed resistance."

A Cold War in a Hot Region

THERE'S AN ONGOING COLD WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST BETWEEN Shiite Iran and Sunni Saudi Arabia. No clear winner has emerged yet, but looking at each of the belligerents' successes on the different fronts of the war reveals the nature of the war and its immediate and long-term ramifications.

In "[Who's Winning the Middle East's Cold War?](#)", Robert Harvey wrote:

For the moment, the Iranians seem to be riding high. Following Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei's

decision to agree to an international deal limiting Iran's nuclear capability to peaceful purposes, Western sanctions have been all but removed. Now that it is once again acceptable to do business with Iran, its ailing economy is set for a rebound. Meanwhile, Iran's creeping de facto annexation of parts of Iraq—astonishingly, with American acceptance—continues because no one except the so-called "Islamic State" has the stomach to stand up to it. ...

This has left the Saudis feeling abandoned and vulnerable. They believe that their great traditional ally, the U.S.,

betrayed them by concluding the nuclear deal with Iran. Meanwhile, they fear that the chaos in neighboring Iraq has exposed them to chronic strategic risks. ...

Against this background, the kingdom is taking the fight to its enemies. ...

As minister of defense, [Prince Mohammed bin Salman] has continued the Saudi policy of backing anti-Assad rebels in Syria, in concert with Turkey, while unleashing a war on pro-Iranian tribesmen in Yemen (at an enormous humanitarian cost). He has also backed, if not instigated, an increase in domestic repression and has launched an economic offensive against Iran—the consequences of which have been seen, until recently, in plunging global oil prices.

[The kingdom has clearly expressed its] determination to use oil prices as a weapon against Iran and its ally, Russia. ...

The Saudi strategy is not without its costs. Gulf remittances of around \$10 billion a year to Egypt (itself under increasing economic pressure and a dizzying fall in tourist receipts after recent terrorist attacks) have been scaled back to around \$3 billion. And funding to Lebanon has been cut almost completely.

And yet the long-term outcome of this cold war is not hard to predict.

The *Trumpet's* predictions are based on the sure word of Bible prophecy, specifically [Daniel 11](#) and [Psalm 83](#).

The Iran-Boeing Deal

IRAN IS WELL KNOWN FOR USING PASSENGER AND CARGO PLANES to transport rockets and missiles to Syria and other hotspots in the Middle East. Boeing's \$25 billion deal with Iran Air for 80 jets would mean more of the same if it goes through.

The [Associated Press's](#) Bradley Klapper and Matthew Lee wrote:

[The Obama] administration used a technicality to drop [sanctions over Iran's military use of passenger planes] as part of last year's seven-nation nuclear deal. The agreement also allowed the Treasury Department to license American firms to do business in Iran's civilian aviation sector. The changes enable Boeing to sell up to 100 aircraft to Iran Air,

by far the most lucrative business transaction between the U.S. and Iran since the 1979 Islamic Revolution and U.S. Embassy hostage crisis.

Yet the deal is not without risk, something the administration acknowledges.

State Department spokesman John Kirby said that the sale and any possible follow future deals depend on Iran's good behavior.

For more information, listen to the [Trumpet Daily Radio Show](#) segment on this troubling development.

TW IN BRIEF

Terror plot foiled in Iran: Iranian intelligence officials said they foiled "the biggest terrorist plot" to ever target Tehran and other Iranian provinces. According to a state television report on Monday, Iranian authorities arrested several suspects and seized bombs and ammunition. Intelligence officials said the

suspects were apostate Muslims, indicating that they could be Islamic State militants. They said the plot was timed for the Muslim month of Ramadan. The plot comes as Iran is increasing its efforts to fight the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

EUROPE



Will Britain Be Part of a United Europe?

Stephen Flurry, *Trumpet Daily* | June 24

Follow [Stephen Flurry](#)



T Germany to Work With China on Economic Colonization

Richard Palmer | June 26

CHINA'S GLOBAL ECONOMIC COLONIZATION IS WELL KNOWN; IT IS buying up access to international resources at a rapid rate. Since 2010, state-owned China Development Bank and Export-Import Bank of China have loaned more money each year to developing countries than the World Bank has. Between 2004 and 2013, China's overseas investments rose from \$45 billion to \$613 billion.

Now, Germany wants to join China.

"[German Chancellor] Angela Merkel and [Chinese President] Xi Jinping are planning a new alliance," wrote *Handelsblatt* (June 14; *Trumpet* translation throughout). "In the future, governments and businesses together will be active in Africa's or Asia's third markets."

Merkel conducted her ninth state visit to China from June 12 to 14 the countries' fourth annual joint cabinet meeting.

The frequency of these visits alone shows the strong political relations between Germany and China.

But most important was a new initiative for Germany to work alongside China in its economic colonization. "If we join forces and get active in markets such as Asia or Africa, we can all benefit from our combined strength," Merkel said.

This was a key theme of her visit. The second chapter of the joint statement produced after the meetings was "Cooperation in Third Countries and on Third Markets."

The two nations will begin with a small project in Afghanistan. China and Germany agreed to cooperate on a coal-mining project, university education and disaster relief in the country.

"That may seem like a small step, but for China, a country that normally follows strict noninterference policies, it's a new direction," wrote Dagmar Engel for *Deutsche Welle*.

Handelsblatt hailed this as "a new fundamental idea for the already dramatically changing cooperation with China."

Of course, it's also about money. "Concerning cooperation in third-country markets, Germany's idea is to include China, use its economic power—and make money," wrote Engel.

Reuters reported that "German government and industry

sources" told it that "Joint German-Chinese teams could knock competitors out of the running, while helping German firms tap into larger Chinese financial resources"

The two governments also promised to support cooperation between German industrial giant Siemens and the China Railway Rolling Stock Corp., as well as cooperation between China Railways Group and Deutsche Bahn. These companies, they said, would work together in China and Europe but also in "third countries."

"That means a market power of entirely new dimensions," wrote Engel.

As *Handelsblatt* explained, the benefits to Germany are twofold: It helps German companies avoid competition with China overseas. And it also helps integrate China into existing trading structures and ways of doing business internationally—international norms, which the European Union helped set up and benefits from.

The relationship is not completely harmonious. Germany and China are the world's premier export powerhouses. They have plenty of incentive to compete against each other. But both leaders seem determined to smooth over the conflicts and work together.

One of the *Trumpet's* key warnings in recent years has been the emergence of an economic system that does not revolve around the United States. The only way this can happen is if Europe and China cooperate. China's New Silk Road Initiative is aimed at drawing the economies of China and Europe closer together, as well as drawing the Middle East and Asia closer to China. *Trumpet* editor in chief [Gerald Flurry](#) wrote in 2010 that "the trend of collusion between these two great economic blocs is worth watching."

If Germany and China follow through on the promises of this summit, it will not only help both nations generate much-needed export business, but also increase their economic involvement across the world. It will help pave the way for the creation of this new economic system. For more on the cooperation between Germany and China, read "[The Great Mart](#)."

 Follow [Richard Palmer](#)

EU Citizens To Be Allowed in the German Army

GERMANY WILL ALLOW EUROPEAN UNION CITIZENS TO JOIN ITS army, *Die Welt* reported June 20, citing a comprehensive

security paper that will soon be passed to the cabinet. Until now non-Germans have only been allowed to join the German military

in exceptional circumstances. *Die Welt* wrote (*Trumpet* translation throughout):

One of these target groups is described on page 68 [of the security paper]: “It is not a minor point, that the opening of the Bundeswehr for EU citizens does not only provide a far-reaching integration and regeneration potential for human robustness of the Bundeswehr, but also a strong signal to the European perspective.” Simply stated, it means [German Defense Minister Ursula] von der Leyen can recruit EU foreigners for the armed forces.

Thus she touches the very foundations of the military profession. “The soldier has the duty to faithfully serve the Federal Republic of Germany and bravely defend the rights and freedom of the German people,” it says in paragraph 7 of the Military Law. The condition for this is German citizenship, according to paragraph 37. Only in some cases, as the law says, can the ministry grant exemptions and adjust professional and regular soldiers without a German passport - “if an official need exists.” So far, this provision has made no difference in the application. But because of the lack of personnel the exception could soon become the rule.

The idea itself is not new; many states have already opened their forces for foreigners. For 170 years, the French had their Foreign Legion, the Spaniards allowed immigrants from Latin America, and the British employed soldiers from their former colonies. In the United States, immigrants that commit to the armed forces get their applications for an U.S. citizenship accelerated. And the von der Leyen pre-predecessor Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg (CSU),

who caused the suspension of conscription, anticipated already that a volunteer army needed to develop a new recruitment potential.

A 2011 published paper from the Defense Ministry said: “Existing regulations need to be expanded in a way that residents with appropriate qualifications, skills and performance can be regularly used in the armed forces even without German citizenship.” The idea partially sparked strong reactions, including the risk of a mercenary army without an emotional attachment to Germany. Leading representatives of the former ruling parties CDU and FDP distanced themselves. The paper quickly disappeared in the drawer.

Even today the idea receives mixed responses. ...

How dramatic the staff issue of the armed forces is now shows a calculation of the Armed Forces Association. If one subtracts the 25,000 soldiers in their studies and training, and the around 10,000 soldiers who are taking vocational training service for their time in the army, from the current total of 166,818 professional and regular soldiers, only around 132,000 combat-ready women and men remain for the federal defense, foreign missions and other functions. That's a paltry figure for a country whose government claims in the new White Paper “to actively shape the global order.”

Germany's defense minister has already said she plans to create a multinational panzer division. Germany is absorbing the heart and core of the Dutch Army into its military. Allowing citizens from all over Europe to join will only add to the Army's pan-European nature.

Germany to Spend More on the Army

GERMAN CHANCELLOR ANGELA MERKEL PROMISED JUNE 22 TO spend more on the military, *Handelsblatt* explained in an article for its global edition: “[Merkel Signals Big Rise in Military Spending](#)”:

NATO summits tend to be uncomfortable events for Chancellor Angela Merkel because she's regularly reproached by U.S. President Barack Obama and others for spending too little on defense. She may be under a little less pressure at the next NATO summit in Warsaw in early July because she pledged a significant rise in defense spending on Wednesday evening at a meeting of her center-right Christian Democratic Union (CDU) party.

In the long term, she said, it is not a good idea to allow others to shoulder the burden of defense. ...

Berlin has been alarmed by the conflict in Ukraine and terrorism, and Germany also faces growing expectations from its allies.

Now Ms. Merkel is signaling that she is willing to up the ante. “In the coming budget deliberations, the defense budget will have to be increased to a greater extent than

previously planned,” Hans-Peter Bartels, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Armed Forces, told *Handelsblatt*. To add 7,000 more troops, as the government has announced, and to fully equip the armed forces with tanks and helicopters, “defense spending as a share of GDP must increase to 1.4 to 1.5 percent in the foreseeable future,” said Mr. Bartels, a member of the center-left Social Democratic Party (SPD).

Based on current figures, this would amount to about €9 billion (US\$10.2 billion) in additional annual spending. Still, the defense industry remains skeptical. “We will see whether these announcements will be followed by actions,” said Georg Wilhelm Adamowitch, head of the Federation of German Security and Defense Industries (BDSV). The industry has been waiting for more than a year for a contract to refurbish 100 outdated tanks.

The sea change is no accident. Berlin has been alarmed by the conflict in Ukraine and terrorism, and Germany also faces growing expectations from its allies. “Germany is increasingly being perceived as a key player in Europe,” reads the government's draft of a new white paper on security policy.

It remains to be seen which of these political statements can actually be implemented in the negotiations with the finance minister and in the parliamentary budget discussions. ...

The commander of U.S. land forces in Europe, Gen. Ben Hodges, warned that NATO would not be able to protect the Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia against a Russian attack. "Russia could conquer the Baltic states faster

than we would be there to defend them," General Hodges told *Die Zeit* in an interview published on Thursday. He said he agreed with military analysts who said Russian troops could be in the Baltic capitals in 36 to 60 hours. He also said a major military exercise by troops from 22 NATO and partner countries in Poland this month had revealed many shortcomings including the inability to move heavy equipment from Western to eastern Europe quickly enough.

TW IN BRIEF

Germany's Steinmeier favors eliminating Russia sanctions: Germany's foreign minister said the European Union should eliminate sanctions against Russia on Sunday. Frank-Walter Steinmeier said he is in favor of gradually lifting sanctions if Russia proves it is working toward peace with Ukraine. He reasoned

that if there is to be an effective peace process, sanctions imposed on Russia over the Ukraine crisis will have to be removed. German Chancellor Angela Merkel does not agree. She says sanctions can only be removed once an agreement to end conflict with Ukraine is in full swing.

ASIA

T China Buys Panama's Largest Port Callum Wood | June 22

FOR MORE THAN 100 YEARS, THE PANAMA CANAL HAS CONTROLLED the bulk of goods transferred between the Pacific and the Atlantic. For much of that history, this monumental feat of engineering was under the control of the United States. But this is no longer the case.

In May, Panama's largest port was purchased by a Chinese company called Landbridge Group.

Margarita Island Port, on the canal's Atlantic side, offers the company intimate access to one of the most important goods distribution centers in the world.

While promising to upgrade the ailing Panama facilities and offer more trade with America's distant east coast, there is substantial reason to hesitate at the purchase of such a critical trade hub.

Landbridge has deep ties to the Chinese government and has signed a \$900 million deal to control Panama's Margarita Island Port.

Landbridge is by no means the first Chinese company to move into the Panama Canal. On March 1, 1997, Chinese corporation Hutchinson Whampoa took control of the American-constructed ports of Balboa and Cristobal.

Late *Trumpet* columnist Ron Fraser wrote extensively on this modern geopolitical phenomenon in the February 1999 *Trumpet* issue: "As we gaze toward the procession of container vessels stringing out across the Gulf of Panama, it seems the light has not yet dawned on the United States and the rest of the world to reveal the catastrophic nature of this deal involving Panama and the Red Chinese. ... The temptation to yield to the Chinese buying off Panamanian loyalty by filling the cash vacuum left in the wake

of U.S. withdrawal may prove too great a temptation for Panama to resist. The Chinese could readily squeeze further concessions out of the Panamanian government by such a process."

It was less than a year later that the U.S. officially handed over control of the canal to the Panamanian government. Flash forward 17 years, and today China owns and controls the majority of the ports and loading bays on each end of the canal.

Long-time readers of the *Trumpet* magazine know that the U.S., Britain and the English-speaking Commonwealth nations have been the end-time recipients of the birthright promise of national greatness conferred by God upon the patriarch Abraham. (For more information, request *The United States and Britain in Prophecy*.)

"[T]he most High ruleth in the kingdom of men," as it states in Daniel 4:17. God promised Abraham approximately 4,000 years ago that his descendants would "possess the gate of his enemies" (Genesis 22:17; 24:60). In the last 200 years, that is precisely what we have seen. Britannia ruled the waves. The empire controlled Gibraltar, Malta, the Dardanelles, the English Channel, the vital Suez Canal, the Gulf of Aden, Capetown, Sri Lanka, the Strait of Malacca, Singapore and Hong Kong. America had the Panama Canal, a string of islands across the Pacific, a substantial presence in the Philippines.

Today it is almost all gone. Our enemies control our ports and sea-lanes. Keep abreast of Chinese interests in ports and sea gates around the globe. Landbridge's purchase is just one of many Chinese maneuvers to consolidate power over the world's most crucial trade routes, and it brings our civilization one step closer to global calamity.

Are Russians “Peacekeepers” in Moldova Turning into a Secessionist Army?

FEARS ARE GROWING AMONG MANY IN THE SMALL EUROPEAN nation of Moldova that the Russian peacekeepers stationed there are becoming something of a secessionist army. *New Europe* reported on the growing worries on June 22:

The Moldovan Foreign Ministry summoned for the Russian ambassador in Chisinau to demand from Russia to stop recruiting locally for the Russian Armed Forces.

The [key] to understanding the dispute is that recruiting mostly takes place in a territory not controlled by Moldova, that is, Transnistria. With the de facto secession of the region of Transnistria in 1992, a de facto independent state was established that has until recently [remained] economically viable thanks to Russian subsidies in cash and natural gas. Most Transnistrians carry a Moldovan and often a Russian passport. The territory borders Ukraine but not Russia.

In this context, the conscription of Moldovan citizens has added negative significance, because they are to be

deployed as “peacekeepers” by the Russian Army, theoretically, side-by-side Ukrainian observers. This is in line with a 1992 ceasefire agreement that has all but collapsed.

Russian “peacekeepers” in Transnistria in effect operate as checkpoint guards for the regime. But they also guard more than 20,000 tons of arms brought to Transnistria when Soviet troops withdrew from Eastern Europe 25 years ago. When recruited locally, they are becoming gradually a Transnistrian army with Russian uniforms.

Meanwhile, a poll published on June 17 showed that more than **80 percent of people living in Transnistria** said they would like for Transnistria to officially become part of Russia. After Russia’s annexation of Ukraine’s Crimean Peninsula in 2014, behavior of this kind from the Russians prompts much anxiety. Ukraine has denounced the security framework for Transnistria that it signed with Russia in 1992, so the legal mandate of the Russian soldiers there is unclear.

Army Chief of Staff: Four Most Threatening Nations Are Russia, China, North Korea and Iran

UNITED STATES ARMY CHIEF OF STAFF GEN. MARK MILLEY HAS ranked the four countries that pose the gravest threat to America’s security: Russia, China, North Korea and Iran.

Task and Purpose reported on the ranking on June 20.

Though there was no definitive ranking of these nations, **he stressed that Russia is number one**, according to Breaking Defense. It is the only country that is “literally an existential threat,” Milley said at an Association of the U.S. Army breakfast, adding that Russia can physically destroy us. In addition, the country has postured itself as an aggressive state over the last several years. ...

Milley suggested that while Russia is aggressive, China is “assertive.”

While its Navy has begun exploring disputed waters, the country has made no attempts to venture into other sovereign nations. In addition, China is not our enemy ... yet. ...

[E]veryone knows [North Korea] has a small military, petulant leader, and is a resource-depleted country. But North Korea does have nuclear capabilities. All four characteristics

make for an unstable nation with very little to lose. Plus, North Korea is backed by China in most instances. ...

Though Iran seems to be compliant with the terms of the 2015 nuclear deal, the nation still remains a question in the minds of the security community. The *Wall Street Journal* recently reported that old uranium particles found at a base in Iran suggest President Hassan Rouhani was lying when he said that there were no plans to acquire nuclear weapons.

Despite the facts, every indication shows that U.S. President Barack Obama is unwilling to confront the aggression and threats posed by these nations with anything beyond the gentlest rhetoric. The idea of being drawn into a conflict is nearly too unbearable for Washington to contemplate. And the leadership of these countries know that as long as Mr. Obama is in power, any real show of U.S. force is unlikely. This fuels increasingly provocative behavior. Approximately six months remain of President Obama’s second term. Will these nations use these months to ramp up their aggression?

AFRICA/LATIN AMERICA

South Africa on Fire

VIOLENCE HAS SPREAD ACROSS PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA, ON Tuesday, following disputes over mayoral election candidates. Some protesters burned buses and set tires on fire to barricade roads. Others attacked police vehicles and looted shops. The dispute arose as the ruling African National Congress (ANC) Party unilaterally selected a mayoral candidate.

Analysts say the chaos is emblematic of the corruption and

factionalism that’s plaguing the ANC. “South Africa is not a country unused to violence. In fact, we are mostly inured to it,” wrote the Institute for Security Studies’s Judith February. “Yet, as news of burning buses and looting trickled in, this somehow felt different. Our fragile post-1994 peace seems to be **faltering badly** on the eve of a highly contested election.”



Orlando Terrorist Attack

Gerald Flurry, *The Key of David* | June 26

The Orlando shooting is a prime example of the chaos gripping America today. What is the cause of such devastating bloodshed?



A Major Problem with U.S. Gun Control Proposals

Sam Livingston and Andrew Miiller | June 27

THE UNITED STATES SENATE VOTED LAST MONDAY ON TWO competing proposals to prevent suspected terrorists from buying guns. Although these two proposals differed substantially, each was based on the premise of using the federal government's terror watch list as a screening device to determine which American citizens have a right to gun ownership.

Senators couldn't muster enough bipartisan support to pass either proposal, but a new CNN/ORC survey shows that a majority of Americans back gun-ownership restrictions for those on a watch list.

While this may sound like a common sense solution to many, the American Civil Liberties Union has expressed concern that the Federal Bureau of Investigation could use such a watch list for racial or religious profiling. At the end of the day, the 1 million people currently in the government's Terrorist Screening Database are suspected terrorists because the FBI says they are suspected terrorists.

There are currently about 1,000 American citizens on the federal no-fly list and 5,000 American citizens in the Terrorist Screening Database. While most of these individuals probably do have some connection to terrorism, tying the constitutionally protected freedoms of American citizens to the whims of federal bureaucracy raises some serious civil liberties concerns.

Conservative journalist and frequent guest on Fox News, Stephen F. Hayes was recently put on a terror watch list after he took a vacation with his wife to the Republic of Turkey. In 2012, Mississippi resident Wade Hicks found himself on the federal no-fly list due to a "clerical error"—although, there are those who think that Wade's political views were the real reason he lost his right to get on an airplane. You see, Wade was a member of the Mississippi Preparedness Project, a nonviolent organization that advocates storing food for an economic emergency.

Currently, an American citizen can only have his constitutional right to gun ownership revoked by the federal government if he is convicted of a felony by a jury of his peers.

Granting a government agency from the executive branch the power to revoke this right on suspicions of what a person might do in the future isn't just a violation of the U.S. Constitution's Second Amendment regarding firearm ownership, it's also

a violation of the Fifth Amendment provision that American citizens cannot be "deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law."

Why does this matter? Even if you trust the Obama administration to make wise decisions regarding who is and isn't a suspected terrorist, just imagine what a future president with no respect for civil liberties could do if secret lists suddenly became the basis for depriving people of liberty!

The main reason the Second Amendment was ratified by the 13 original colonies was to protect people from government tyranny and preserve freedom. Yet America's founders also knew that no society could be free simply because the people touted guns. Freedom couldn't be preserved unless the American people held fast to the principles of morality!

Four years before the Second Amendment was ratified, Benjamin Franklin elaborated on this point. He wrote to Messrs. Abbes Chalut and Arnaud that "only a virtuous people are capable of freedom."

What happens when a people are no longer virtuous? When morality and the serious sense of responsibility that comes with owning a gun begin to disappear?

Franklin continued, "As nations become corrupt and vicious, they have more need of masters."

When the people are out of control, when the sense of personal responsibility and morality degenerate, freedom diminishes and tyrants rise. When a society becomes full of killers, it becomes necessary for the government to step in and "save" people from themselves.

Micromanaging gun ownership won't make America safe; it will only foster tyranny. What makes America safe are strong family values that cultivate a culture where people don't murder each other.

According to one Harvard Research study, the rate of mass shootings in America has tripled since 2011. Past generations didn't experience the kind of mass shootings that America suffers today. This isn't because America had more efficient gun control in the past. In fact, guns were easier to obtain in past generations.

The reason mass shootings have increased threefold since 2011 is because the moral fiber of America is breaking down!



Canada Votes to Make National Anthem Gender Neutral

Tyrel Schlote | June 19

CANADA'S HOUSE OF COMMONS PASSED A PRIVATE BILL ON JUNE 15 to change the wording in the national anthem. The bill proposed new lyrics to make the anthem gender neutral, with the line, "in all thy sons command," replaced with the more inclusive line, "in all of us command." The bill now must pass in the Senate, which generally passes all measures that are passed in the House of Commons.

Attempts to change this line of Canada's national anthem is nothing new. "O Canada" became the nation's official national anthem in 1980, but by 1990, a measure had already been introduced to have more gender-neutral wording. Since then, multiple attempts have been made, but all have fallen flat.

When the motion was presented this time around, however, it was met with little resistance.

This bill reflects of the changing mentality among Canadians, and their embrace of political correctness. Three years ago, one opinion poll found that 65 percent of Canadians didn't want the lyrics changed. Today, those numbers seem to be reversed, with 62 percent in favor of the change, according to a recent report.

Much of the argument for changing the lyrics is based on restoring the anthem to its original wording. The Canadian national anthem was originally written in 1880 as a French anthem. An English rendition was not composed until 1901. After several rewrites, it became popular among Canadians in 1908. In a 1908 version, the line "True patriot love thou dost in us command" appeared. However, just before World War I broke out, the lyrics were changed to "in all thy sons command." It is thought that the change was made in honor of the men going over to fight in France.

While the motives of Canadian lawmakers may be sincere, the

direction they are heading down is dangerous. Their prime argument is that times have changed; women too have the ability to fight in combat today, so we need to update our national symbols. Thus the lyrics must be changed. Mauril Bélanger, the M.P. who introduced the bill, said, "As Canadians, we continually test our assumptions, and indeed our symbols, for their suitability. Our anthem can reflect our roots and our growth."

But where does that testing stop? Where do Canadians draw the line between maintaining their historical national roots and promoting their "growth"? And whom do we trust to make those decisions for us? If we begin tinkering with pieces of our national identity to fit the current national sentiment, at what point do we decide that enough is enough?

This is the slippery slope that Canadians have begun to head down. In the Western world, there is an ever growing call to throw away the past to make room for the present. Last year, New Zealand held a national referendum to change its flag, part of which contains the Union Jack. The newly proposed flag had no symbols connecting it to its colonial past.

By a slim margin, the people opted to retain the old flag.

In a similar vein, in the United States there is a growing hatred toward the U.S. Constitution. Many Americans, including the president, view it as an antiquated document that restricts growth and "progress." *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry has written extensively on this topic. Many are in favor of an "evolving Constitution" in which sections of text are edited, or even deleted, to make the prevailing sentiments of the day more acceptable.

The mentality of discarding the old to make room for the new is becoming increasingly popular.



America Needs to Change the Way It Views Child Care

Kieren Underwood | June 23

THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELEASED A report this month titled "High-Quality Early Learning Settings Depend on a High-Quality Workforce." The authors decried the low earnings of child-care workers in contrast to the important role they play in society.

The report, along with the journalists who picked up the story, were clear in their analysis: Child-care workers are extremely important to a child's development, and the government should make sure they're paid enough to encourage high-quality workers.

But there is another way to look at the problem.

Marcy Whitebook, director of the Center for the Study of Child-Care Employment at the University of California-Berkeley, has been studying early childhood for four decades. On May 6, she wrote, "[T]he lived experiences of early educators and the families they serve underscore the case for a national solution

that fundamentally shifts the way we think about early childhood jobs and how we prioritize working with young children." Whitebook said it is ironic that child-care workers "often cannot afford child care for their own children."

A number of topics continue to underpin the child-care discussion.

First, the earliest years of a child's life are crucial to his or her later development. As one journalist noted, "[T]he belief that good early-childhood education can help prevent later gaps in test scores and graduation rates from emerging between poor and well-off children is widely shared."

Second, child-care work is not something to be viewed as rudimentary. "People tend to think of this as unskilled work," Whitebook said, "when in fact the work of facilitating the education and development of babies is every bit as complex as working with

kindergartners.” Not many parents are likely to tell you their job is easy.

Third, small teacher-to-student ratios are beneficial for overall academic achievement, language development and thought processes. The greatest benefits come from those ratios in the early years of schooling.

These benefits could be maximized if children were taught by a parent in their own home. The child could be educated from the youngest age, given the attention from someone whose primary goal is the child’s best interest, and offered the smallest teacher-to-student ratio possible: one to one. Yet the government-planned incentives are not about having the fewest possible children involved in child care, but having the greatest amount of adults.

In 2014, President Barack Obama set the goal of enrolling 6 million children in “high-quality preschool.” He then laid out the agenda in his 2015 State of the Union Address:

In today’s economy, when having both parents in the workforce is an economic necessity for many families, we need affordable, high-quality child care more than ever. It’s

not a nice-to-have—it’s a must-have. It’s time we stop treating child care as a side issue, or a women’s issue, and treat it like the national economic priority that it is for all of us.

Besides the misnomer of an economic “necessity” (rather than an economic “want”), President Obama is right. America, and all countries, needs high-quality child care. The real question is whether that care comes from the child’s parents or someone else. Single parents often have very little choice but to put their young children into a child-care institution. As of 2015, 58 percent of mothers with infants under age 1 were in the workforce. But for those families who have some leeway to choose, shouldn’t we incentivize parental child care rather than institutional care?

The question for Americans, especially during the crucial early years of their child’s development is whether strengthening the family or the workforce is more important. With the prevalence of single-motherhood, working toward improving the quality of institutional child care is a worthy goal. But we cannot forget the more important role highlighted by *Trumpet* executive editor Stephen Flurry in “[Wanted: Good Mothers.](#)”

Why Does the IRS Need Its Own Swat Team?

FOR A CENTURY, THE PUBLIC FACE OF FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT has been the Federal Bureau of Investigation. More recently, however, midnight SWAT-style raids are increasingly likely to come from other federal police forces working for a startling array of lesser-known federal agencies. The list of administrative agencies that now have their own military-style units includes: the National Park Service, the Postal Inspection Service, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

An article by Tom Coburn and Adam Andrzejewski in the [Wall Street Journal](#) this week makes this same point:

The number of non-Defense Department federal officers authorized to make arrests and carry firearms (200,000) now exceeds the number of U.S. Marines (182,000). In its escalating arms and ammo stockpiling, this federal arms race is unlike anything in history. Over the last 20 years, the number of these federal officers with arrest-and-firearm authority has nearly tripled to over 200,000 today, from 74,500 in 1996.

What exactly is the Obama administration up to?

On Friday, June 17, our organization, American

Transparency, is releasing its OpenTheBooks.com oversight report on the militarization of America. The report catalogs federal purchases of guns, ammunition and military-style equipment by seemingly bureaucratic federal agencies. During a nine-year period through 2014, we found 67 agencies unaffiliated with the Department of Defense spent \$1.48 billion on guns and ammo. Of that total, \$335.1 million was spent by agencies traditionally viewed as regulatory or administrative, such as the Smithsonian Institution and the U.S. Mint.

Some examples of spending from 2005 through 2014 raise the question: Who are they preparing to battle?

The Internal Revenue Service, which has 2,316 special agents, spent nearly \$11 million on guns, ammunition and military-style equipment. That’s nearly \$5,000 in gear for each agent.

This militarization of the administrative state has been decades in the making, but it has dramatically accelerated under the Obama administration. With over 2 million bureaucrats in the administrative state and some 120,000 federal law-enforcement officers, any U.S. president who wants to use executive action as a means to circumvent the checks and balances of our constitutional system certainly has the means to do so.

TW IN BRIEF

Wildfires in Los Angeles: Two wildfires in the San Gabriel Valley of Los Angeles County merged into a massive inferno on Wednesday after burning for three days. The Los Angeles County Fire Department dispatched around 1,000 firefighters, a massive fire engine fleet and helicopters in an attempt to contain

the fires. The merging of the two fires, however, has made it even more difficult for the firefighters to bring the situation under control. Two firefighters have been hospitalized due to smoke inhalation. The fires have burned 5,400 acres of vegetation and cut power in many neighborhoods.