Trumpet Weekly JULY 1, 2016



Brexit Exposes UK's Many Infirmities

Brad Macdonald | July 1

again." That, in essence, was the Leave campaign's mantra leading up to last week's referendum. We must "take back control of this great country's destiny," gushed former London mayor Boris Johnson. UK Independence Party leader Nigel Farage encouraged voters to "dare to dream that the dawn is breaking on an independent United Kingdom." For months, voters were persuaded to vote for "the bright sunlit uplands" of a future free of Brussels.

That's the dream. Here's reality, as expressed by Jeremy Warner, assistant editor of the *Telegraph*: "There is no word for our current state of affairs other than chaos—constitutional chaos,

BRAD MACDONALD

chaos in the Tory Party, chaos in the Labour Party, chaos in Europe and, though we have certainly seen worse, something close to chaos in financial markets." In less than a week, Britain has lost its prime minister; the Labour Party has lost its way; the pound has lost significant value; and the public has lost faith, confidence and, for many, hope. "Frankly

if the four horsemen of the apocalypse went trotting past, I wouldn't bat an eyelid or have time to write about it," tweeted the *Spectator*'s assistant editor Isabel Hardman.

The Leave campaign sold an upbeat, hope-filled message—one that obviously resonated with many Brits. But so far, Britain hasn't had an inkling of a bright, sunlit upland. The Leave campaign's message has a fatal flaw, one that grows more obvious with every sunset. The message *assumes* Britain has the CAPACITY to survive a messy, possibly vindictive, divorce and restore itself as a strong, stable and sovereign world power. Messrs. Johnson and Farage, and their supporters, believe Britain has the *health* to survive a Brexit.

But what if they're wrong? What if Britain is too sick to survive the challenges ahead?

Be honest. Can you look at events since Brexit and not wonder, even a little: Can Britain do this? It's still early and an event of this complexity was always going to come with challenges, but the signs thus far are deeply worrying. Consider what Brexit has revealed about the state of Britain's leadership; about its politics; about the strength of the union between Scotland, Ireland, Wales

and England; about the quality of its social cohesion (the state of relations between socioeconomic levels, between the young and old, and between the various cultures and ethnicities); about the nation's economy and finances; and about Britain's institutions, the monarchy, media, higher education and the Church of England.

It's too early to know whether Britain will survive Brexit or if it marks the beginning of the end. Either way, Brexit has revealed that the UK is terminally sick. Look at the world: It is falling apart, and the UK in the future is certain to face bigger tests than Brexit. Look how badly Britain responded to Brexit. How will it fair when another more significant crisis inevitably strikes?

This is not to say leaving the EU is a mistake. I believe it was inevitable. Britain and the EU are unequally yoked, on multiple levels, which meant Brexit was unavoidable. But in or out, it doesn't matter; Britain today lacks the capacity to reach the "the bright, sunlit uplands" it has been promised. Leavers wax eloquent about how great the UK is, but the truth is: Britain simply isn't the nation it once was. It lacks the social cohesion, the quality of leadership, the collective will, and the national sense of identity and purpose required to Make Britain Great Again. Britain's membership in the EU, its descent into lawless secularism, and decades of multiculturalism have eaten away at its political, social, economic, agricultural, industrial and cultural capacity to be great again. Perhaps Britain will experience a fleeting post-Brexit boon, but it has lost the ingredients required to re-create itself in the long term as a stable, thriving, sovereign world power.

This isn't Project Fear—it's Project Reality. Consider ...

... the Leave Campaign, which is now responsible for navigating the UK through the dangerous shoals of Brexit. Before June 23, the Leave camp was united behind the task of persuading as many British as possible to vote leave. Since the referendum, however, the Leave campaign has fractured dramatically and is now dividing between hard-core Leavers, led by Nigel Farage, and moderate Leavers, led by Boris Johnson and Michael Gove. The only thing the two camps currently agree on is that Britain must leave the EU. When it comes to what separation looks like—the degree of separation that must now occur and how the separation needs to be negotiated—the two camps are miles apart. It is remarkable how quickly the Leave campaign turned a stunning victory into a civil war.

Is this a political movement ready to lead Britain to "bright, sunlit uplands"?

... the Labour Party. The Labour Party is the second-largest political party in Britain; it represents 20 to 30 percent of the British public and is the primary ballast to the Conservative Party. Since Friday, 20 members of Labour's Shadow Cabinet have resigned (there are only 31 members total). A further 29 non-cabinet Labour M.P.s have resigned. And on Tuesday, 172 Labour M.P.s—more than 75 percent of the Labour M.P.s in Parliament—voted in favor of Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn resigning.

Think about this: Over the next few months, Britain will negotiate its way out of the EU, as well as maintain its participation in ongoing (and fresh) discussions and developments on geopolitical and domestic issues. Negotiations with the EU will be rancorous and tough, with Brussels seeking concessions and, quite possibly, a measure of vengeance. UK leaders will have to be united, alert and focused. Yet, as it stands today, Britain's second-largest political party, and supposedly a key voice in British leadership, is

beset by chaos and dysfunction and will be irrelevant.

Does that sound like a party ready to lead Britain to "bright, sunlit uplands"?

... the Conservative Party. In May 2015, Prime Minister David Cameron was reappointed when the Conservative Party shellacked its competitors in one of the most surprising general election victories ever. Thirteen months later, Mr. Cameron is hunting for a job, and the Conservative Party—and the country—is hunting for a new leader. The referendum took its toll on the Conservative Party, which for months experienced acrimonious bickering between Leavers and Remainers. There will now be a lot of negotiation and some closet deals, and Tory lawmakers will likely settle on a new leader who will attempt to chart a course for Britain's departure from the EU. But how strong will the unity be and how long will it last? Half of the Conservative Party does not want to leave the EU; the other half does. The Prophet Amos put it best: "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" The Conservative Party will now fight over who should lead the party (and Britain). There will also be conflicts over the hundreds, probably thousands, of details involved with departing the EU.

Does this sound like a party ready to lead Britain to "bright, sunlit uplands"?

... Scotland. The Scots voted overwhelmingly (62 percent) in favor of Britain staying in the EU. The decision to Brexit infuriated many pro-EU and stirred many, including Scottish First Minister Nicola Sturgeon, to search for ways to call another referendum on Scotland's independence from Britain. On Tuesday, Alyn Smith, the Scottish National Party (SNP) representative in the European Parliament, delivered an impassioned plea in which he implored the EU to come to Scotland's defense. The following day, Sturgeon visited Brussels, where she met with EU officials and reiterated Scotland's desire to remain in the EU. Today, the majority of Scots would prefer to be joined to the EU than to England.

Does it sound like this relationship is about to enter "bright, sunlit uplands"?

... Ireland. Brexit has reopened the Irish question—does Northern Ireland belong to Britain or the Republic of Ireland?—which has festered, erupting now and again, for centuries. Fifty-six percent of Northern Ireland voters wanted Britain to remain in the EU. Since Thursday, both Sinn Féin and the Social Democrat and Labour Party (SDLP) have said that they will not allow English voters to drag them from the EU. Like the snp in Scotland, Sinn Féin and the SDLP in Northern Ireland are presently exploring options to remain in the EU. (The same is happening in Gibraltar, where 95 percent voted to remain in the EU.)

Does this sound like a "United Kingdom" about to enter "bright, sunlit uplands"?

... London. Brexit has exposed the political and cultural chasm between London and the rest of the country. Londoners, in general, are wealthier, better educated, and more liberal than the rest of Britain and, in many ways, live in their own little world, detached from the rest of the nation. This is why the vote for Brexit shocked most Londoners, the large majority of whom voted to remain in the EU. A friend who works in London recalled the solemn atmosphere in the office last Friday, and how some colleagues, grown men in their 40s, simply broke down in tears.

Many Londoners are furious with the British public and view them as ignorant boobs and bigots. Meanwhile, the outsider's view of Londoners is that they're toffs, that is, rich, arrogant and motivated more by self-interest than national interest. This same spirit of animosity exists between other socio-demographic groups. Britain's millennials are hopping mad with the baby boomers for stealing their future. There are reports of young people verbally abusing older people for destroying their future. There have also been incidents of racism, both verbal and physical, against foreigners.

Does this sound like a society about to enter "bright, sunlit uplands"?

... Britain's institutions, the monarchy, the media, Oxford, Cambridge, and higher education, in general, and the Church of England. Each of these has, so far, failed to provide clear-minded, rational leadership. The monarchy, historically a force for hope and stability, has been virtually mute. The media is divided, often sensationalist, and generally bereft of constructive criticism and solutions. The message from the Church of England, which for the most part sided with the Remain camp, is vague, rambling and completely unsatisfying.

Does it sound like any of these historically significant institutions is positioned to lead Britain to "bright, sunlit uplands"?

The *Trumpet* isn't the only one questioning Britain's future and whether the UK has the health to survive the coming months and years. "Britain Is Sailing Into a Storm With No One at the Wheel," warned the *Economist* Sunday: "Britain could be thrust into talks under a lame-duck leader with no clear notion of what Brexit should look like or mandate to negotiate. All against a background of intensifying economic turmoil and increasingly ugly divides on Britain's streets. The country is sailing into a storm. And no one is at the wheel."

Hope and optimism are important in times of crisis and uncertainty, but we can't allow hope and optimism to blind us to reality. Britain (and the world at large) is in trouble. We must be ready and willing to ask why? This question was answered many years ago by a man named Hosea, an ancient prophet to the people of Israel and Judah. The biblical book of Hosea is filled with prophecies about the end time, and it is filled, more specifically, with prophecies about end-time events in Britain. (Britain today is the descendant of Ephraim, a name used repeatedly throughout Hosea's writings.)

Let's consider just two of Hosea's descriptions of Ephraim, or Britain, in the end time. In Hosea 5:11-12, the prophet says that "Ephraim is oppressed and broken in judgment, because he willingly walked after the commandment. Therefore will I be unto Ephraim as a moth" Here, God compares end-time Britain

with a moth-eaten garment. Have you ever gone to your drawer and dug out a shirt that you assumed was ready to be worn, but the moment you went to put it on, you realized that it had been devoured by a moth and was full of holes? That is Britain's current state, and Brexit is revealing that the UK is ridden with holes!

"Ephraim, he hath mixed himself among the people ..." (Hosea 7:8). This is a prophecy that end-time Britain would intertwine itself with foreign people, foreign customs, foreign religions and foreign entities—like the European Union. Verse 9 shows that this leads to devastation: "Strangers have devoured his strength, and he knoweth it not" Britain today, as Amos prophesied, has no "strength," which means "might, power, substance, wealth and force." Britain is sick—very, very sick—and a major part of the cause is its embrace of foreigners and foreign institutions, like the European Union. This isn't a politically correct message, but it is a truth backed by reality. (It isn't biblical justification of racism and bigotry either!)

There is a lot of talk among Leavers right now that the time has come for the resurrection of the British lion. Hosea says that Ephraim's personality and behavior in the end time is closer to that of a silly dove! Hosea 7:11 says that "Ephraim also is like a silly dove without heart" There's no strength, no clarity of vision and leadership, no force or vigor—just weakness, from top to bottom.

Other prophecies also describe the state of Ephraim in the end time. Isaiah 1:5-7 say that "the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment. Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers."

That's a hard truth to accept—and deliver—BUT WHAT AN APT DESCRIPTION.

We would all love to believe that Britain is entering "bright, sunlit uplands," but the truth of the matter is that Britain is plummeting into the dark abyss of total political, economic and social breakdown.

"There are no adequate words to describe the rolling political, economic and constitutional crises that have developed in the days since Britain voted, by a narrow majority, to leave the European Union," wrote Henry Porter in *Vanity Fair*. "The country has been swept by a kind of political Ebola"

That is a grim view, but it is, sadly, reality.

Follow Brad Macdonald

MIDDLE EAST



EU ARMY ON THE WAY! | JUNE 30

HERBERT ARMSTRONG WAS RIGHT ABOUT EUROPE, BRITAIN, GERMANY AND RUSSIA | JUNE 29

HEADLINE: 'THE RISE OF A GERMAN SUPERSTATE' | JUNE 28

HOW WILL BREXIT CHANGE THE WORLD? | JUNE 27

Why the Israel-Turkey Détente Is Doomed Brent Nagtegaal | June 30



In March 2013, Air Force One prepared to depart Ben Gurion International Airport en route to Turkey. On the tarmac, United States President Barack Obama reportedly handed a phone to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. On the line was then Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. During that now-famous phone call, Netanyahu apologized to Erdoğan for the deaths of nine Turkish citizens who were killed in May 2010 as they tried to break through Israel's naval blockade of Gaza. During the conversation, the two leaders agreed that it was time to normalize relations between their nations.

This week, three years later, that goal was realized.

The deal reached on Sunday has potentially far-reaching security and economic implications for the region. Initially, however, the terms of the deal were far less dramatic and have many wondering why the deal took three years from that initial phone call to come to fruition.

The main sticking point over the past few years was Erdoğan's demand that Israel lift the naval blockade of the Gaza Strip. Netanyahu consistently refused, since lifting the blockade meant Israel would have no way of stopping arms from reaching Hamas terrorists in Gaza via the Mediterranean Sea.

According to the agreement, which was signed on Tuesday, Erdoğan finally yielded his demand and essentially recognized that any aid coming from Turkey to Gaza will have to first go through Israel's Ashdod Port, where it will be inspected and then transferred to the Palestinians.

However, all the other parts of the agreement—a \$20 million Israeli compensation package to families of the victims of the 2010 raid; Turkey's commitment to drop all lawsuits against Israel Defense Force soldiers who participated in the raid; an OK for Turkey to build infrastructure, such as a hospital, power station and desalination plant in Gaza; and an understanding that Turkey will stop Hamas from planning attacks against Israel on Turkish soil—could have been easily worked out three years ago.

So why proceed with the deal now?

Clearly, the fact that Erdoğan signed this agreement before his key demand was met indicates how much he needs this deal. If life were good for Erdoğan, he would have much rather maintained the status quo without flinching as he had done the past few years.

Given that Turkey is largely a transit nation at the center of the world, maintaining workable relationships with its neighbors is essential for national prosperity. Turkey can only survive as a power if it has other nations to work with.

The last few years, however, Erdoğan has been increasingly isolated from other world powers.

While some Israeli papers are praising Netanyahu for the deal, there are still many reasons for concern.

Notably, by signing the deal, Israel has accepted the presence of Hamas in Turkey, as long as it does not initiate terrorist attacks from there. It is no secret that following Hamas's breakup with Iran over the Syrian civil war, Turkey stepped in to provide Hamas with financial aid, even allowing Hamas's exiled leadership to take up residence in Turkey.

That Israel did not demand Turkey to completely sever its ties with Hamas as part of this deal essentially legitimizes the political wing of Hamas.

It thus appears Israel has broken with its long-standing policy that there can be no delineation between the military and political wings of Hamas or Hezbollah.

Looking down the road from this agreement, Israel may regret its decision to accept delineation between Hamas's military wing and political wing. As conditions in the Gaza Strip improve because of Turkey's aid, Hamas will likely increase in popularity among the people. This will further increase its ability speak for the Palestinian people. Now that Israel has accepted the political wing of Hamas separate from its military, international pressure to enter into peace negotiations with Hamas will increase.

Clearly, the fact that Erdoğan only agreed to normalize relations with Israel when his back was against the wall does not indicate any repentance for his deep-seated anti-Semitic views. It simply shows that he is willing to work with Israel until he finds himself in a more favorable position—then this détente will be doomed. For now, Erdoğan will be happy to reap the economic rewards he so desperately needs to strengthen his rule. But let's be clear: Erdoğan is still no friend of Israel Furthermore, when Erdoğan does decide to return to his anti-Israel policy, he will be in a stronger position to inflict strategic harm on Israel, as Bible prophecy indicates.

T

Funding Hezbollah Reveals Iran's Interests Callum Wood | July 4

ORE EVIDENCE HAS COME TO LIGHT OF UNFROZEN IRANIAN funds going to terrorist organizations. In a candid address on June 24, Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah made a number of admissions pertaining to the funding of his organization.

The comments came after a fresh batch of United States

sanctions were implemented against the terrorist group. The U.S. Congress signed off on the sanctions in December 2015. The Lebanese Central Bank told smaller financial institutions around the country to comply with the ruling. Since then, many banks froze the assets of Hezbollah members and supporters.

But Nasrallah has belittled the move, saying that his funding doesn't come through Lebanon's banks.

"We say openly that our funds come directly from Iran. As long as Iran has money, so will Hezbollah have money," he said, according to *Arutz Sheva*. "We are open about the fact that Hezbollah's budget, its income, its expenses, everything it eats and drinks, its weapons and rockets, are from the Islamic Republic of Iran."

The fact that Iran was instrumental in the founding and financing of Hezbollah is not new. From its inception in 1985, Hezbollah has looked to Iran for help. Iranian leadership orchestrated the Beirut bombings, claiming more than 200 U.S. servicemen's lives. It has established Hezbollah's political influence within Lebanon and funded a military that easily overshadows Lebanon's government forces. Nasrallah's comments support and strengthen the overwhelming proof of Iran's terrorist sponsorship.

Yet despite clear history and comments from terrorist leaders like Nasrallah, Washington holds steadfast to the belief that the aid and support of terrorism is not a key goal for Tehran. Instead, the Obama administration insists the recently cash-injected Iran is going to focus on developing its ailing economy.

The U.S. State Department's *Country Reports on Terrorism* 2015 names Iran as the world's leading sponsor of terrorism: "Iran

remained the foremost state sponsor of terrorism in 2015, providing a range of support, including financial, training, and equipment, to groups around the world—particularly Hezbollah."

The report speaks of Iran's unabated support, and how it has assisted in the stockpiling of more than 100,000 missiles in southern Lebanon. It also makes specific mention of Iran boasting that it had "armed Hezbollah with advanced long-range Iranian-manufactured missiles, in violation of UN Security Council Resolutions." The report also acknowledged that through 2015—as the nuclear deal was finalized—Hezbollah "accelerated its military role in the support of the Syrian regime."

The report calls Hezbollah "Iran's primary beneficiary and terrorist partner" and indicates that hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent in support of the organization.

The U.S. government talks of trust, while at the same time it presents overwhelming proof that Iran *should never* be trusted—let alone financed. But instead of heeding its own report, the State Department sends officials to foreign governments and banks to teach them how to legally give Iran its money.

To understand Hezbollah's role and Iran's interest in being the dominant power in the Middle East, be sure to read our 2008 article "Iran Conquered Lebanon ... Now What?"

TW IN BRIEF

Raids in Istanbul: Istanbul police conducted a series of raids in the city on Thursday targeting Islamic State group suspects, following the gunfire and suicide bomb attack at Ataturk Airport, which killed 42 people and wounded over 230 others. There was no word on whether the raids were directly linked to the attack. Authorities blamed the Islamic State for Tuesday's coordinated attack by three assailants on one of the world's busiest airports. There was no immediate claim of responsibility by the militant group. Authorities said the attackers arrived at the airport in a taxi and blew themselves up after opening fire. Terrorist attacks have increased in scale and frequency in Turkey, damaging its tourism industry, which the economy heavily relies on.

New wave of terror in Lebanon: Eight suicide bombers attacked a Christian village in Lebanon near the Syrian border on Monday. The terrorist attacks were carried out in two waves—one at predawn and the other in the evening. Five people were killed and about 30 were injured. Authorities in Lebanon said the attacks represent a new phase of "confrontation between

the Lebanese state and evil terrorism." Authorities also believe the attacks represent a spillover of the Syrian civil war. They suspect the Islamic State is responsible for the attack. The Lebanese Army has detained more than 100 Syrians for entering the country illegally.

About those 10 American sailors: According to a Navy investigation released on Thursday, the 10 American sailors detained in the Persian Gulf by Iran in January were captured as a result of weak leadership, poor judgment, a lack of "war-fighting toughness" and a litany of errors. Six officers and three enlisted sailors have been disciplined or face disciplinary action. The report said the sailors were delayed, unprepared, poorly supervised and ill suited for the mission. At least one sailor had been up all night with boat repairs. The investigation concluded that while the boat crews erred in entering Iranian waters, the Iranians violated international law by impeding the boat's "innocent passage," and violated U.S. sovereign immunity by boarding and seizing the boats.

EUROPE

TrumpetHour

EUROPE AND AMERICA REACT TO BREXIT, ISLAMIC STATE ATTACKS TURKEY, CHINA CUTS OFF TAIWAN, AND MUCH MORE | JULY 1

BRITAIN—A HOUSE DIVIDED, THE TURKEY-ISRAEL DEAL, SCOTUS ON IMMIGRATION, AND MORE | JUNE 29

A Core Europe Must Integrate After Brexit



WE WILL ... TAKE FURTHER STEPS TOWARD A POLITICAL union in Europe, and we invite the other European states to join us in this endeavor," the foreign ministers of France and Germany wrote in a paper published on Monday. This has been at the heart of Europe's response to Brexit—a smaller group of nations needs to integrate more closely, while others lag behind. "We must ... acknowledge that there are different degrees of ambition towards further integration among the member states," the two ministers concluded. German-Foreign-Policy.com described Germany's plans in an article titled "Flexible Union With a European FBI," published June 27:

Berlin is applying intense pressure in the aftermath of the Brexit, to reorganize the EU. Under the slogan, "flexible Union," initial steps are being taken to establish a "core Europe." This would mean an EU, led by a small, tight-knit core of countries, with the rest of the EU member countries being subordinated to second-class status. ... German media commentators are speaking in terms of the EU's "new directorate" under Berlin's leadership. ...

Parallel to preparations for the transformation of the

European Union, leading German Social Democrats are calling for supplementary steps for the political-economic streamlining the EU or its core. For example, in their position paper titled "Re-Found Europe," Germany's minister of the economy, Sigmar Gabriel, and the president of the European Parliament, Martin Schulz, are calling for an expansion of the EU's single market, under the topic an "economic Schengen." ... In addition, Gabriel and Schulz are calling on the EU to "more than ever" "act as a unified governing force"

They point out that talk about a "flexible union" began earlier this year, and was already being put forward as a solution to Europe's crises.

The *Daily Express* covered the Franco-German paper in an article titled "European SUPERSTATE to Be Unveiled: EU Nations 'to Be Morphed Into One' Post-Brexit." However, their story does not match the text of the paper, which has been published online. What is proposed is significant, but more modest. Willing EU nations will work together on security, immigration economic growth.

After Brexit, Germany Is America's Best Friend



In the days after Brexit, several publications had articles pointing out that America's special relationship is now with Germany. "Washington Likely to Hasten Pivot Toward Germany as Top European Ally," wrote *Financial Times* on June 26:

As one special relationship falters, another may beckon. The British vote to leave the EU could hasten a changing of the guard among Washington's European allies, with Germany replacing the UK as its most important partner. ...

The reality is also that even before the British referendum on June 23, the U.S. had increasingly been looking to Germany

"Henry Kissinger's famous question about 'Who do I call in Europe?' has now been settled. The answer is that we call the German chancellor's office. That means we have to invest in the relationship with Germany," said Nicholas Burns, a former senior State Department official in the George W. Bush administration, who is now advising Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign. ...

There is also a broad acknowledgment that the importance of Germany is bound to rise—at the UK's expense. "We will now work to strengthen our relationship with

Germany, given the UK's influence in the EU has been greatly diminished ..." said Brendan Boyle, a Democratic Congressman from Pennsylvania. ...

With its postwar reticence on using its military, Germany also has a different stance on security to the U.S. "Germany is going to have to change. Where they have been hesitant to take a lead in security issues, before they could look to the UK and France," said Mike Turner, U.S. Congressman from Ohio. "It puts additional pressure on Germany and its membership in NATO."

Bloomberg drew the same conclusion in an article titled "U.S. Turns to Germany as Crucial Ally Within EU as UK Departs" published June 27:

While the strategic consequences of Britain's impending exit from the European Union are still being sorted on both sides of the Atlantic, one impact is clear: Germany is suddenly a lot more important to the U.S. ... "The United States and Germany are going to have to become closer strategic partners, closer than we have" been, said Nicholas Burns

Politico pointed out that much of this shift to Germany has already happened, in an article titled "Brexit Pushes U.S. Closer to Germany," published on June 29:

When it became clear that Britain had voted to leave the European Union, President Barack Obama called David Cameron to offer his sympathy. Then he dialed Angela Merkel, the leader he actually leans on in times of crisis.

It's no secret why. For years now, Germany, not the UK, has been Obama's main line into European politics. ... "On the big issues, we've seen the transition for years now where the first call has not been to London, where it used to be, but to Berlin," said Damon Wilson, a former senior director for European affairs at the National Security Council under George W. Bush and who is currently executive vice president of the Atlantic Council. "That transition has already happened and the great recession really accelerated that with the

magnification of German economic and political power." ...

So rather than diluting American influence in Europe, it's more likely that Brexit will expand U.S. reliance on Germany. ...

Several commentators pointed out that this cooperation would have to have a security dimension. On June 27, the *Atlantic Council* published a paper by Amb. R. Nicholas Burns and Gen. James L. Jones titled "Restoring the Power and Purpose of the NATO Alliance." The paper warned that "NATO actions are not sufficiently ambitious to meet the extraordinary challenges before us." One of the key things it said is that NATO needs "a stronger Germany with a military to match its political and economic weight."

"Germany must take the lead in this recovery of Europe's military strength," the paper warned. "As Europe's largest economy, Germany must take dramatic steps to raise its defense spending."

After Brexit, Europe to Push for Military Unity

EUROPEAN SECURITY AGENDA" WAS ONE OF THE THREE SUBheads in the Franco-German call for unity published on Monday. "We see our security [as] indivisible," wrote German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier and French counterpart Jean-Marc Ayrault. "Germany and France are committed again to the common concept of Europe as a security union on the basis of solidarity and mutual assistance between member states—a security union that seeks a common security and defense policy," they wrote, calling for Europe to work more closely together. They also called for European Union militaries to work together overseas, as well as for the union to better share intelligence. German-Foreign-Policy.com summarized some the key points in their paper in an article titled "The European War Union":

Steinmeier and Ayrault are therefore pushing for a "European Security Compact," which calls for maintaining "employable high-readiness forces" and establishing "standing maritime forces." The European Council should meet once a year as "European Security Council." Before this paper was made public, Germany's foreign minister and chancellor had made comments also promoting a German global policy and massive rearmament, possibly also with EU support. ...

The EU should become "more coherent and more assertive on the world stage." It is not only an actor "in its direct neighborhood" but also on "a global scale." ...

To implement the EU policies of global power, Steinmeier and his French counterpart drew up elements for a "European Security Compact." ... Steinmeier and Ayrault write in detail that to "plan and conduct civil and military operations more effectively," the EU should institute a "permanent civil-military chain of command." In addition, it must "be able to rely on employable high-readiness forces." In order to "live up to the growing security challenges," Europeans need "to step up their defense efforts." ...

Next, Steinmeier and Ayrault explain that a "European semester" should support the coordination of the individual member countries' future military planning. "Synergism" is the objective. Throughout the EU, an arms buildup must be as coordinated and efficient as possible. … Particularly important is "establishing standing maritime forces" or acquiring "EU-owned capabilities in other key areas." … With Britain, which had always adamantly opposed an integrated EU military policy, leaving the EU, Berlin sees an opportunity for reviving its efforts at restructuring the EU's military and mobilizing as many member countries as possible for the EU's future wars.

EU Foreign Policy Chief Federica Mogherini is making a similar case. In her long awaited Global Strategy document to be sent to European leaders next week, she calls for a "credible European defense." Mogherini delayed sending out the paper until after the Brexit vote. The *Express* published leaked excerpts of it in an article titled "EU Army on Way? EU Cannot Rely on NATO and Needs New Defense Policy Says Brussels Chief":

... Mogherini's Global Strategy document states that "as Europeans we must take greater responsibility for our security."

The white paper adds: "While NATO exists to defend its members—most of which are European—from external attack, Europeans must be better equipped, trained and organized to contribute decisively to such collective efforts, as well as to act autonomously if and when necessary. ..."

While it stresses that "NATO remains the primary framework for most member states," it goes on to urge EU members to "channel a sufficient level of expenditure to defense."

Meanwhile, German politicians are saying the their nation needs to improve its military after Brexit as Zeit Online reported in an article titled "A Force Less for Europe" on June 28 (*Trumpet* translation):

Brexit has consequences for the security policy. According to the Bundeswehr commissioner, Germany will fill the gap that is left by the UK military. "In any case, Germany has now even more responsibility," Hans-Peter Bartels told

the newspapers of *Funke Mediengruppe*. After Britain left, there is one less potential troop supplier for EU missions. "In Europe, security policy will arrive more on Germany and France in the future," said Bartels. "It is likely that more will be demanded from Germany in EU missions than previous," he told the *Funke* newspapers.

Brexit Exposes Germany's Power and Leadership Void

Britain's vote to leave Europe has increased Germany's dominant position in Europe. "Britain's Departure From the EU has Made Germany Far More Powerful Than It Should Be," wrote Foreign Policy:

[T]he Brexit vote has thrust Germany into the driver's seat of the European Union as never before. Britain's exit not only eliminates one third of the Berlin-Paris-London triumvirate, the gear shaft of the 28-member union, it also costs the union a member that often functioned as a counterweight to EU-wedded Germany. Given that France is entirely consumed with its own affairs—recession and economic reform, labor unrest, terrorism—Germany is emerging from the Brexit vote with more clout and responsibility than ever before.

However, it also noted that German Chancellor Angela Merkel does not know what to do with this power:

Tragically, it doesn't appear that Merkel has the slightest inkling of what to do with her country's new, even more powerful, status. She and Germany as a whole are so thoroughly intertwined with the problems plaguing the union that it's nearly impossible to imagine Berlin summoning the vision and grit to overhaul the union in order to halt its decline. Merkel and other members of Europe's leadership, like EU President Jean-Claude Juncker, are the old guard: the exhausted, played-out elite against whom the masses are rebelling. Their like can't be the EU's saviors, too. ...

But there's another underlying reason for Merkel's cagey, measured approach. Namely: She has no master plan

to keep the EU from unraveling. ...

The EU needs a remodeling and a fresh source of inspiration, something like the rallying cry for peace and prosperity that inspired enlargement and the integration process over the postwar decades.

Spiegel, Germany's top newsmagazine, made the same point in an article titled "Brexit on Ice: More Emotion Please, Angie":

Angela Merkel is known for her dispassionate objectivity. But when it comes to Brexit, a bit more emotion is needed. Change is necessary in the European Union, but the German chancellor seems uninterested in leading the charge. ...

Brexit is an historical watershed in the history of Europe—Merkel has said so herself. The British and, along with them, Europeans across the Continent are searching for answers. ...

Imagine, for a moment, that Merkel had given the kind of speech that goes viral, a moving speech that would be shared on Facebook and commented on with exclamation marks by young people across Europe. "Merkel gets it!!!" people might have said, written or felt, and they might have felt strengthened in their European identity.

That would have been something. And that is what Europe needs following Brexit: goose bumps.

"All Europe is actually ready—just waiting for the confidence-inspiring leader"

Plain Truth, November-December 1954

ASIA

Moscow's 'China Dreams' Are Less of a Fantasy Than Analysts Think



RUSSIAN PRESIDENT VLADIMIR PUTIN MADE HIS FIFTH VISIT TO Beijing this week, and it left many analysts wondering to what extent Russia's "pivot to the East" has actually taken place. Back in 2014, when China and Russia were making huge deals, analysts couldn't deny a Russia-China alliance had arrived. But Russia's

struggling economy under European sanctions led some Western pundits to claim that their partnership is deceptively shallow and largely hype.

In an article published Tuesday on War on the Rocks, Alexander Gabuev, the Russian chair in the Asia-Pacific program at the

Carnegie Moscow Center, challenged that view. Gabuev said the Western media's reaction to Putin's latest visit "has been predictably skeptical":

For understandable reasons, a sharp drop in bilateral trade in 2015 and the distinct lack of progress on high-profile investment and energy deals are cited as evidence that Russia's "China dreams" were totally unrealistic from the outset. However, the situation is much more complex than this analytically complacent narrative suggests. Poking holes in Russian and Chinese propaganda may be worthwhile, but not if it lulls outside observers into missing the fact that Moscow is slowly but surely drifting into Beijing's firm embrace.

The Kremlin's "pivot to China" is happening under challenging external conditions, a fact that should be taken into account when measuring its progress. Russian-Chinese trade fell by nearly 30 percent in 2015 largely due to the collapse in oil prices. But the actual volume of Russian

oil exports to China increased by the same amount, according to Chinese customs data. For the first time in history, Moscow has become the largest or second-largest crude supplier to Beijing, which puts them basically on par with Saudi Arabia. Now that Russia and China are expanding the pipelines that connect their energy networks, this trend is likely to continue.

While the Russian economy is definitely not in the position it hoped it would be a few years ago, being hit with sanctions from Europe and the U.S. has actually forced deeper cooperation with China, rather than causing a "crushing blow" as the West would have liked.

It is clear that both nations are working toward deepening their ties, no matter the few hiccups along the way. While analysts have only been talking about this trend in the last few years, the *Trumpet* has predicted it for decades. Our booklet *Russia and China in Prophecy* explains the big picture of this trend—request your free copy.

North Korea Mobilizes Children to Pick Wild Greens for Troops

THE NORTH KOREAN GOVERNMENT HAS ORDERED ARMIES OF children to forage for wild greens to be given to the nation's soldiers. The *Korea Herald* reported on June 27:

North Korea has mobilized residents and school children to pick wild greens for soldiers to make up for the country's food shortage, the U.S.-based Radio Free Asia (RFA) reported Monday.

A North Korean source told the RFA that the impoverished country has brought in middle and high school students this year to gather wild edible greens of various kinds in the mountains and fields. The picked greens are being prepared as side dishes for troops.

Anyone who fails to meet the allotted amount for the greens [is] being forced to make cash contributions to the authorities, according to the source in the country's North Hamgyong Province.

By prioritizing the health and comfort of the soldiers, the North Korean regime can better ensure its own survival and power. The fact that it comes at the expense of the impoverished civilians is of no concern to the world's most incompetent and abusive regime.

T

Russia Humiliates America, Again

Richard Palmer | June 30

T'S HARD TO FIND "GOOD GUYS" IN SYRIA. MANY OF THE GROUPS that America may want to support against Syrian dictator Bashar Assad have links to al Qaeda or other Sunni terrorist groups. And many groups fighting the Islamic State have links to Assad or to Iranian-backed terrorist groups.

But one group that comes closest to being "the good guys" is the New Syrian Army (NSA). The group focuses almost exclusively on fighting the Islamic State. It is funded by the Pentagon and has received training from British and American special forces.

The *Telegraph* wrote that "experts say the NSA stands out as a rare success story."

Then Russia bombed the NSA, repeatedly, despite the presence of United States fighter jets.

This was not an area Russia had bombed before. It's not a hotbed of terrorist activity. Russia went out of its way to bomb one of America's closest allies in the region.

American forces immediately used their hotline to the Russian command post—set up by both sides so that any misunderstandings could be resolved quickly. The Russians ignored American demands to stop bombing.

Stratfor, an organization not prone to hyperbole, wrote, "No matter how one examines it, this is a brazen move on Russia's part."

But it gets worse. Now it looks like in conducting the bombing, the Russians used illegal incendiary "cluster bombs."

There are several troubling issues with this incident. The first is that American aircraft in the region could not hold air superiority over the target for very long.

The fact that Russia just showed this administration who is boss in the Middle East is extremely disturbing and not being talked about in the media.

What was America's response to this "brazen" move? CBS News reported, "Aides to Defense Secretary [Ash] Carter described him as irate at the Russian action, although publicly he confined himself to calling them unprofessional."

"Unprofessional" and "problematic" were the strongest words American officials used in public about Russia's actions.

Despite Secretary of State John Kerry's warnings about America's "very limited" patience, nearly two weeks later, there have been no consequences for Russia. The total extent of America's

response was a mild rebuke and a videoconference, where U.S. officials "expressed strong concerns." Maybe next time the U.S. will escalate things to a strongly worded letter.

With this bombing, Russia sends a clear message to groups in Syria and to nations around the world: *There's no point siding with the U.S. It can't protect you. You'd be much better off coming to an agreement with Russia.*

This is just the latest step in a Russian strategy that has been going on for at least a decade: Chip away at America's reputation; show the world that America doesn't follow through on its promises.

If you were to sum up one of Russia's main foreign-policy

strategies in just a few words, it would be: *Attack America's prestige*. In a way, it is astonishing that Russia is winning in this. California alone has a bigger economy than the whole of Russia. Russia should not be able to dent U.S. prestige.

But it can and is. And in diminishing America's prestige and reputation, it is in reality decreasing America's power. In Leviticus 26:19, God warns America that if it disobeys Him, "I will break the pride of your power." America has power, but it lacks the will to use it. This weakness is emboldening America's enemies around the world. For more information on the Bible's warning for America, read our free book *The United States and Britain in Prophecy*.

Follow Richard Palmer

Beijing Ends Diplomatic Contact With Taiwan

JUST WEEKS AFTER TAIWAN'S NEW PRESIDENT, TSAI ING-WEN, came into power, China announced that it has suspended diplomatic contact with the island nation. The announcement was a response to Tsai's refusal to endorse the so-called One-China policy.

The New York Times reported on June 26:

In a sign of growing friction between China and Taiwan, mainland diplomats said Saturday that they had suspended contact with their Taiwanese counterparts because the island's new leader would not endorse the idea of a single Chinese nation.

Beijing said it had cut off communication because

President Tsai Ing-wen of Taiwan failed to endorse the idea that Taiwan and the mainland are part of one China, a concept known as the 1992 Consensus.

The relationship between Taiwan and China has been tense for as long as the two have existed as separate nations, beginning with the Communist Revolution of 1949. In 1992, the two sides agreed to view themselves as parts of a single country, though each holds a different interpretation of what that means. Tsai's immediate predecessor, Ma Ying-jeou, was submissive to China and brought the two sides nearer. Tsai's hard-line and pro-independence stance could push Beijing to take drastic action to realize its dreams of a reunited China.

TW IN BRIEF

Russia lifts tourism ban on Turkey: President Vladimir Putin said on Wednesday that Russia is lifting a ban on tourism to Turkey after his first talks with Turkish counterpart Recep Tayyip Erdoğan since the downing of a Russian warplane plunged relations into crisis last November. Putin said it was time to "begin the process of normalizing trade relations" with Turkey. Russia has been looking to have sanctions against it lifted by Europe, but has met with little success. But while the Kremlin is looking to normalize ties with Turkey, a majority of the Russian population says it is against the cancellation of economic sanctions imposed

on the country since the downing of the Russian jet.

Indian warships in Russia: Three Indian warships left the Russian port of Vladivostock Friday at the conclusion of a four-day visit. The visit was designed to boost Russo-Indian military cooperation, specifically in the military realm. A press release by the Indian government said the trip was aimed at further enhancing the already robust maritime cooperation between the two nations' navies. The press release said the visit was "a demonstration of India's commitment to long-standing India-Russia strategic partnership."

ANGLO-AMERICA



Archaeology Filled With Hope Gerald Flurry, The Key of David | July 3

Critics dismiss much of the Bible as tall tales, but archaeology tells a different story. Proof of the biblical narrative sometimes lies just a few feet below the topsoil.



Federal Judge: 'U.S. Judges Should Stop Studying the Constitution'

T'S BECOME INCREASINGLY COMMON TO HEAR PUNDITS FROM THE left of the political spectrum speak of the United States Constitution as an impractical, antiquated document unworthy of the 21st century. Richard Posner, a federal judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, posted a condemnation of the U.S. Constitution on Slate's website last Friday:

And on another note about academia and practical law, I see absolutely no value to a judge of spending decades, years, months, weeks, day, hours, minutes or seconds studying the Constitution, the history of its enactment, its amendments, and its implementation (across the centuries—well, just a little more than two centuries, and of course less for many of the amendments). Eighteenth-century guys, however smart, could not foresee the culture, technology, etc., of the 21st century. Which means that the original Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the post–Civil

War amendments (including the 14th), do not speak to today.

America's Constitution has given more freedom to more people than any other government charter in history. It is a noble document that has inspired and enabled so many to attain accomplishments that any other system anywhere else in the world would have denied them. You would think Americans would love the Constitution, but that is not the case in this country anymore.

Some in the media say that President Barack Obama's only real problem has been that he hasn't used enough executive actions to circumvent Congress and enact radical change. Many liberals now preach that for America to solve its many problems, it needs to abandon the Constitution. Most of the educational institutions would like to get rid of it. Many even argue that it is not even the supreme law of the land. Even one of the *Supreme Court justices* said the Constitution is outdated and should not be used.

WPA Research Poll: Majority of Democrats Want Third Term for Obama

In another example of how little the United States Constitution means to the American people, especially those on the radical left, a new research poll indicates that a large portion of the Democratic Party would prefer an illegal third presidential term for Barack Obama to a Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton presidency. In an article for the Hill published Thursday, Jonathan Easley writes:

A strong majority of Democrats would cancel the 2016 election between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump if it meant President Obama could serve another term, a new poll found.

Data provided to the Hill by the conservative polling outlet WPA Research found that 67 percent of Democrats would take a third term for Obama over a potential Clinton administration.

Only 28 percent said they're ready to move on from the Obama White House, while 6 percent are undecided. ...

"The results should give pause to the Hillary Clinton campaign as Democratic respondents clearly prefer the status quo to a Clinton presidency," a memo from WPA said. ...

The WPA survey of 384 registered Democrats was conducted between June 22 and June 27 and has a 5-point margin of error.

Granted, the sample size of this poll is too small to make a *conclusive* claim about a true *majority* of Democrats preferring a third presidential term for Barack Obama. This study does give a good indication, however, that there are at least many Democrats who would support trashing the U.S. Constitution if it meant getting their preferred political leader into office.

While it would take an almost unfathomable political crisis in America for anything like the abolishment of term limits to actually happen, it is undeniable that a spirit of lawlessness has taken deep root in the United States of America.

Liberal Narrative About Free Condoms Debunked

OUR YOUNG PEOPLE ARE BEING LIED TO—SOLD A BILL OF GOODS that is wounding them physically, emotionally and spiritually. These lies are even killing a few. You probably realize that a majority of unmarried college students—80 percent or more in America—are having sex. Almost two thirds of high schoolers have had sex by their senior year; over one in five has had four or more partners by that point.

What you may not realize is how much this sexualized culture is hurting these students. One quarter of sexually active teens contract a sexually transmitted disease. Teenage girls are over three times more likely to feel depressed most or all of the time if they are sexually active, and almost three times more likely to have attempted suicide, according to one study. Teenage boys are *eight times* more likely to try to kill themselves if they are sexually active.

Instead of advocating abstinence until marriage, however, government officials in the United States and Britain are pushing schools to distribute free contraception. A new study has debunked the myth that free contraception has no correlation to increased teenage sexual activity. In an article for the *New York*

Post published June 21, Naomi Schaefer Riley wrote:

Another liberal narrative got deflated last week when the National Bureau of Economic Research showed that the distribution of free condoms at high schools seemed to be correlated with a significant increase in teen pregnancy and a rise in sexually transmitted diseases. ...

At Vox.com, Sarah Kliff explained that some "social conservatives" might believe that "free condoms encouraged teenagers to engage in riskier behavior than they would have otherwise—with the condoms available, they could possibly decide to have sex in situations where they otherwise wouldn't."

But then she dismissed such silliness immediately, citing the results of one 1998 study of the sexual behavior of students at a high school in Los Angeles. The NBER study, though, was based on a national data set that included thousands of schools. Hard to ignore or explain away. ...

A 1996 paper coauthored by Nobel laureate George Akerlof and current Fed chair Janet Yellen suggests that contraception makes sex cheaper and leads to more sex—and thus to more nonmarital childbearing. The two attributed the rise in out-of-wedlock births in the 1970s to laws that permitted unmarried couples access to contraception and liberalized abortion laws.

They wrote: "Although many observers expected liberalized abortion and contraception to lead to fewer out-of-wedlock births, the opposite happened—because of the erosion in the custom of shotgun marriages." As a result of

the widespread availability of abortion and contraception, "sexual activity without commitment was increasingly expected in premarital relationships."

The widespread availability of contraception in high schools has had largely the same effect.

The risks associated with early sex experience are many, and the younger it begins, the higher the risks. It boosts the probability of unmarried pregnancy and abortion, births and single parenthood, and poverty among mothers and children.

The danger of infection by STDs is higher not only because of increased exposure, but also because of the biological susceptibility of less-mature sex organs. At the same time, early sex experience is proven to lower happiness and decrease the odds of later marital stability.

What makes this tragedy more than merely sad—what makes it truly outrageous and angering—is the fact that these students are, at least in part, acting in ignorance, having been *deliberately fed false information* that obscures how destructive their behavior really is.

Unscrupulous educators—people more committed to politically correct principles of "sexual freedom" than to protecting our youth—are *suppressing* solid, scientific evidence, damning facts that might endanger their own perverse social agendas.

If you would like to understand why God made male and female, marriage, sex and family—if you want to understand how to prepare for marriage and family during your youth, and how to make these things work in your adulthood—then request a free copy of Herbert W. Armstrong's book *The Missing Dimension in Sex*.

TW IN BRIEF

B an lifted on transgender people joining U.S. Army: Transgender individuals will now be allowed to serve openly in the United States armed forces, Defense Secretary Ash Carter announced on Thursday. The changes will be phased in over a year. Carter's announcement comes despite concerns from senior military leaders that the department needs more time to work through the changes. The decision ends one of the last bans on service in the armed forces. Gays and lesbians were recently given permission to serve in combat. Bans on women joining the military were also recently lifted. By October 1, transgender troops should be able to receive medical care, including surgery, and begin formally changing their gender identification in the

Pentagon's personnel system.

Three Amigos summit: United States President Barack Obama arrived in Ottawa, Canada, Wednesday to partake in the annual Three Amigos summit. President Obama met with Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto. The focus of the summit was on the North American Free Trade Agreement. The three leaders hope to push back against anti-free-trade sentiments and enhance cooperation between their nations. Clean energy, Brexit and security were other subjects discussed during the summit. President Obama addressed the Canadian Parliament Wednesday evening.



Is There Life After Death? Stephen Flurry, Trumpet Daily | July 1

The simple answer to a question that has perplexed humanity throughout history

Follow Stephen Flurry

