

Trumpet Weekly

JULY 8, 2016



Dallas Police Chief David Brown attends a prayer vigil July 8, the day after snipers killed five police officers during a Black Lives Matter protest in Dallas, Texas.

War on Police in Dallas

Stephen Flurry | July 8

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



AROUND THIS TIME LAST YEAR, *TRUMPET* EDITOR IN CHIEF Gerald Flurry published his article "Police Under Attack." Last night in Dallas, Texas, five police officers were gunned down during a Black Lives Matter protest.

To a growing number of these protesters, while black lives might matter, the lives of law enforcement officials do not. But expect the major media to bend over backwards creating a story line that says these killers were in NO WAY connected to

Black Lives Matter.

Just look at what has been building over the years: In Ferguson and St. Louis, Missouri, protesters chanted, "Kill the police" and "[We're ready for war](#)." In Minnesota, they chanted, "Pigs in a blanket, fry 'em like bacon." In Chicago, it was, "When I say 'oink, oink,' you say 'bang, bang.'"

Should the Dallas attack really come as a surprise to anyone? As the *New York Times* (and others) reported, that attack occurred "during a demonstration protesting shootings by officers in Minnesota and Louisiana this week." What happened Thursday night was payback.



STEPHEN FLURRY

GETTY IMAGES

A Dallas police spokesman said at a press conference: “We believe that these suspects were positioning themselves in a way to triangulate on these officers from two different perches and garages in the downtown area and planned to injure and kill as many law enforcement officers as they could.”

According to the *Times*, “The police believe four suspects coordinated the attack with rifles, Police Chief David O. Brown said, and positioned themselves in triangulated locations near the end of the route the protesters planned to take.”

One of the gunmen, Micah Johnson, was killed in a standoff with police in a parking garage shortly after the shooting. Before dying, Johnson told police he was upset over a recent string of police shootings against blacks and “wanted to kill white people—especially white police officers.” Police are investigating three other suspects.

They are promising more violence and more bloodshed. And distinguished leaders in the black community are inciting such violence! What we’re witnessing, as former New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani said in December, is the result of “propaganda, starting with the president, that everybody should hate the police.” Giuliani said black leaders, especially, have incited “strong anti-police hatred in certain communities.”

Following the riots in Baltimore last year, U.S. President Barack Obama remarked: “Well, there’s some police who aren’t doing the right thing.” A year earlier, he also lashed out at law enforcement officials: “There’s also no excuse for police to use excessive force against peaceful protests.”

During the “peaceful protests” in Dallas, the police *did not* use “excessive force.” In Baltimore, remember, the police were instructed to give plenty of “space” for the rioters, and the rioters ended up destroying half the city!

Notice this from the *Times* (emphasis added throughout):

Although the shooting occurred during a rally to protest police-involved shootings, it was unclear what relationship the gunmen had to the demonstration.

It was *unknown what the motives* were, “except they fired on the police,” said Clay Jenkins, the Dallas County judge and the county’s chief executive.

The day after the attacks, the motives were quite clear: They wanted to kill white people—especially white police officers. It’s

all about payback for Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown and Freddie Gray—all cases where the white police officers have been acquitted and/or exonerated.

Again from the *Times*:


Chief Brown said it was too early in the investigation to say whether there was *any connection between the shooters and the demonstration*. He suggested that the suspects had some knowledge of the march route.

“How would you know to post up there?” he said. “So we’re leaving every motive on the table of how this happened and why this happened.” He added, “We have yet to determine whether or not there was some complicity with the planning of this, but we will be pursuing that.”

Be sure to read my father’s May-June 2016 *Trumpet* article “The Real Agenda Behind Black Lives Matter.” He explains how this movement is essentially a reincarnation of the Black Panther organization from the 1960s and 1970s—a movement glorified during this year’s Super Bowl half-time show.

Black Lives Matter started in 2012 after George Zimmerman shot and killed African-American teenager Trayvon Martin. One of its three founding members, Alicia Garza, candidly cites Assata Shakur as a key influence. Shakur is an African-American activist who murdered a New Jersey state trooper and then fled to Cuba for political asylum. At a February 18 event at Mizzou University, Garza was paraphrased as saying, “The goal of the Constitution was to make an agreement between factions known as states, which were built on the backs of black slaves.” She described constitutionalism as racism, saying: “The people vowing to protect the Constitution are vowing to protect white supremacy and genocide.”

President Obama has met with this woman. Earlier this year, the president said this about Black Lives Matter: “As a general rule, I think that what, for example, Black Lives Matter is doing now to bring attention to the problem of a criminal justice system that sometimes is not treating people fairly based on race, or reacting to shootings of individuals by police officers, has been really *effective* in bringing attention to problems” (April 23).

This is the kind of rhetoric that incites race riots and war. The carnage in Dallas on July 7 was only a tiny snapshot of what the Bible prophesies for the latter days.  Follow [Stephen Flurry](#)

MIDDLE EAST

TrumpetDaily

RADIO SHOW

FIVE DALLAS POLICE OFFICERS GUNNED DOWN DURING ‘BLACK LIVES MATTER’ PROTEST | JULY 8

THE CALIFORNIA NIGHTMARE, THE WEST’S MORAL OBLIVION, AND CHINA SETS THE STAGE FOR THE NEXT WORLD WAR | JULY 7

HILLARY CLINTON AND THE RULE OF LAW | JULY 6

BREXIT AND THE BOOK OF HOSEA | JULY 5

GERMANY’S VISION FOR EUROPE | JULY 4

The Palestinians' Incentive for Killing Jews

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



“**W**HOEVER SAID CRIME DOESN'T PAY HASN'T TALKED TO THE family of a Palestinian terrorist,” wrote Eli Lake for [Bloomberg View](#). “For the Palestine Liberation Organization and the related Palestinian Authority, the killers of Jewish Israelis are considered ‘martyrs.’ And as such, their families are paid for the service these murderers have done for the Palestinian cause.”

One such family is that of Mohammed Tarayra, a Palestinian terrorist who stabbed and killed a 13-year-old Israeli girl while she was sleeping. Tarayra was only one on many terrorists who have committed over 250 similar attacks on Jews in the past nine months. Some of these terrorists were unaffiliated individuals. But nearly all of them were incentivized by the Palestinian government. Families of slain terrorists receive more money than a regular Palestinian earns.

The president of the Middle East Media Research Institute, Yigal Carmon, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the Palestinian Authority pays \$137.8 million annually for terrorists and their families.

Lake explained:

The origin of these payments goes back a long way. Before the Palestinian Authority was established in the 1990s through the Oslo peace process, the Palestine Liberation Organization paid the families of “martyrs” and prisoners detained by Israel. That practice became standardized during the Second Intifada of 2000 to 2005. The Israelis even found documents in the late Yasser Arafat’s compound that showed payments to families of suicide bombers.

For years the Israelis and the Americans didn’t do much on this issue. The Israel Defense Forces work closely with Palestinian security services to keep the peace in the West Bank. Meanwhile, the Bush and Obama administrations have pressed both sides to restart negotiations over a final status.

This is starting to change. On Friday, Israel’s prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, announced that he would begin withholding part of the tax revenue that Israel sends to the Palestinian Authority—equal to the amount paid to “martyrs.” ...

[T]he payments to terrorists’ families are exceedingly popular these days. Ziad Asali, the president and founder of the American Task Force on Palestine, told me that in recent years the media and politicians have elevated these payments to something “sacred in Palestinian politics.” Asali said the Palestinian Authority president, Mahmoud Abbas, and others are too weak to stop it. “This is where we find ourselves now. The vast majority understand there has to be an end to violence; it’s not serving the Palestinians in any way,” Asali said. “But I think nobody really has the stature and clout to confront these issues publicly.”

In “[Why Jerusalem Is Bleeding](#),” *Trumpet* executive editor Stephen Flurry wrote: “The violent trend we see today is leading to the fulfillment of a critical and surprisingly specific prophecy in Zechariah 14:1-2.” That prophecy is about the imminent, violent division of the city of Jerusalem.

Report: The Islamic State Is Expanding

ACCORDING TO A STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY REPORT, THE Islamic State is expanding to seven emerging areas of Europe, the Middle East, North Africa and Asia. “In addition to establishing its base in Syria and Iraq, and naming official provinces in numerous countries,” the report said, the Islamic State “has demonstrated a heightened capability to carry out and operate in the [seven] countries”: Turkey, Tunisia, Lebanon, France, Belgium, Bangladesh and the Philippines.

Bill Gertz of the [Washington Times](#) wrote:

The Syrian conflict, according to the report, has produced an unprecedented number of jihadis, far more than earlier Islamic conflicts in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Somalia and Chechnya. From 2011 to 2016, between 27,000 and 31,000 foreign jihadis from 86 nations joined the Islamic State group in Syria and Iraq.

The foreign fighter flows came from six major states: Tunisia (6,000), Saudi Arabia (2,500), Russia (2,400), Turkey (2,100), Jordan (2,000) and France (1,700). An estimated

280 foreign fighters joined the Islamic State from North America. ...

“Analysts agree that ISIL displays the intent to conduct cyberattacks against the energy grid, nuclear facilities, or other critical infrastructure systems, but there is currently little evidence to show that ISIL possesses this capability,” the report says. ...

Despite its successes, the Islamic State, which controlled about one third of Iraq and Syria and 9 million people at the end of 2014, lost about 22 percent of that territory by early this year, the report noted. ...

Key operating areas outside of Syria and Iraq include Libya, where up to 3,000 Islamic State fighters have controlled a 120-mile stretch of territory around the coastal city of Sirte. “Libya has become a regional hub for recruitment of foreign fighters, with ISIL’s Libya elements training regional operatives,” the report said.

In Egypt’s Sinai Peninsula, the Islamic State-affiliated group Ansar Beit al-Maqdis has some 1,000 fighters.

Another 300 Islamic State fighters are operating in Yemen, and Islamic State terrorists mainly have targeted Shiites in the eastern part of Saudi Arabia. In Africa, Boko Haram has pledged loyalty to the Islamic State. In Russia's Caucasus

region, the Islamic State has the Kavkaz province, which has absorbed a number of Islamist groups. The Afghanistan affiliate is the Khorasan Province, and the Algerian affiliate is a breakaway element of al Qaeda in the Islamic Magreb.

IEA Warns of Reliance on Middle Eastern Oil

THE INTERNATIONAL ENERGY AGENCY (IEA) WARNED THAT THE world risks becoming ever more dependent on oil from the Middle East. *Financial Times* paraphrased IEA executive director Fatih Birol as warning that “policymakers risk becoming complacent as rhetoric surrounding a rise in North American energy supplies has overshadowed the world’s growing reliance on Middle Eastern crude.”

This is a very precarious situation because the Middle East is

highly volatile. Also, countries like Iran have threatened to use oil as a weapon of economic war.

“Oil has become the Achilles heel of the world’s greatest, most advanced nations,” wrote *Trumpet* columnist Brad Macdonald. “Even though the United States doesn’t receive oil directly from Iran, in the event of Tehran [squeezing supply](#), those nations that do import Iranian oil would have to hunt elsewhere for it. In the end, it affects everyone.”

Middle East Headed for Greater Instability

WHETHER OR NOT THE ISLAMIC STATE IS DEFEATED, THE Middle East is headed for greater chaos, Yassin Fawaz wrote for [Forbes.com](#).

The chaos in Baghdad is evident to all. The government of Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi is weak and barely fended off protesters who breached the supposedly secure Green Zone. Abadi’s predecessor, Nouri al-Maliki, waits in the wings, hoping to regain power, even though his sectarian rule enabled the Islamic State’s takeover of much of the country.

The recent “liberation” of Fallujah, a Sunni city seized two years ago by [the Islamic State], revealed the desperation of Abadi to demonstrate success. The United States, instead, urged a focus on Mosul, but Abadi chose the symbolically more important Fallujah, the epicenter of sectarian resistance after the U.S. invasion. Failure to recapture Fallujah would have been ruinous, likely dooming Abadi’s government. But victory might prove almost as bad.

Victory in Fallujah will distract Iraqis from the incompetence of their government for only so long. Factions that had put aside their differences to support the operation against Fallujah had already begun to squabble again when a deadly attack, claimed by ISIS, hit Baghdad on Sunday morning, killing more than 200 people. Over the past few days, the government in Iraq has been weakened by the domestic and international fallout from this attack, with the United Nations human rights chief urging the government to better protect civilians. More importantly,

Iraq’s interior minister resigned on Tuesday after it was revealed that security personnel had been using fake bomb detectors. Mohammed al-Ghabban, the former minister of interior, is a member of the Iranian-backed Badr Organization. This could represent a setback for Iranian influence in Iraq’s politics, though this is unlikely, given how entrenched Iranian influence is. ...

Iraq is no longer an independent state. ...

For most of its security needs in Fallujah, Iraqi forces have relied heavily on the People’s Mobilization—a coalition of Iranian-backed militias. Fawaz continued:

Iraqi policymaking will remain subordinate to Iran’s interests. [Iraqis] fear the militias will dominate Iraq the way the Revolutionary Guard does Iran and the militant group Hezbollah does Lebanon. The result will be more discrimination against and persecution of Sunnis, fueling long-term hostility and instability. This obviously would be in Iran’s interest. The weaker the Baghdad government, the more it must lean on its next-door neighbor.

Which bodes ill for the stability of the region even if the Islamic State is ultimately defeated. Iraq will be far from the stable, democratic, pro-Western state once imagined by dreamers in Washington.

Instead, the People’s Mobilization will be the equivalent of a Fifth Column under Tehran’s control, available for disrupting Iraq and its neighbors whenever convenient for Iran.

TW IN BRIEF

U.S. ACCUSES ISRAEL OF SYSTEMATICALLY TAKING PALESTINIAN territory: The United States State Department accused Israel on Tuesday of “systematically seizing” Palestinian land in

East Jerusalem and the West Bank. The accusation came after Israel green-lighted the construction of 800 housing units in response to two recent Palestinian terror attacks against Jews.

State Department spokesman John Kirby said the U.S. opposes Israel's decision to build the units. He described it as only "the latest step in what seems to be the systematic process of land seizures" and "settlement expansions." Kirby said such moves by the

Israeli government are "fundamentally undermining the prospects for a two-state solution." Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said it was not the new construction that is preventing peace, but Palestinian incitement against Israel.

EUROPE



Britain Leaves the EU

Gerald Flurry, *The Key of David* | July 10

Britain's decision to leave the European Union is sending shock waves around the globe. No one knew for certain Britain would leave the EU. Or did they?



Trumpet Hour

DALLAS SNIPER ATTACK ON POLICE, GERMANY'S BANK CRISIS, EUROPE-RUSSIA STANDOFF | JULY 8

CHINA'S SILK ROAD, POST-BREXIT ECONOMY, IRAN IN SOUTH AMERICA, ELIE WIESEL AND MORE | JULY 6

Europe Braces for a Banking Crisis: Germany

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



EUROPE'S DORMANT FINANCIAL CRISIS MAY BE ON THE VERGE OF exploding again, thanks to banks in Italy and Germany.

On June 30, a report by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) singled out Deutsche Bank as "the most important net contributor to systemic risks in the global banking system." The United States Federal Reserve also singled out Deutsche Bank, along with Santander as the only two banks to fail an annual stress test. Deutsche Bank's shares have now hit their lowest level in 30 years. Jacob L. Shapiro and Lili Bayer reported on the potential consequences of such a crash in their article for *Geopolitical Futures* titled "[Signs of Trouble for Deutsche Bank](#)":

With all the news surrounding volatility in the markets due to [Brexit](#), there is a temptation to dismiss this as more of the same. **But in reality, these two developments, particularly the IMF report, are of far greater importance.** If Deutsche Bank really is on the verge of a crisis—and we believe it is—the implications will be felt worldwide and the global financial system will shudder. ...

Deutsche Bank is not merely Germany's biggest bank. The political role it plays in Germany is unique when compared with other countries. ... Deutsche Bank is technically

a private bank, but it is tied to the government informally and to most major German corporations formally. Its fate will be shared by all of Germany.

Deutsche Bank is technically a year older than Germany itself, having been founded in 1870 It is one of the Big Three German banks—the others being Commerzbank (also founded in 1870) and Dresdner Bank (founded in 1872 and bought by Commerzbank in 2009)—that played the role of both capital provider and master puppeteer in the development of the German industrial machine over the last century and a half.

After its founding, Germany was extremely poor. Deutsche Bank provided short-term loans and in return received equity shares in the companies it bankrolled. By the mid-1980s, according to a German government study, the Big Three were estimated to control the voting authority of over three-quarters of the shares of most major German companies. A 1995 report by the U.S. Congress's Federal Research Division estimated that the Big Three by themselves ... held 30 percent of the seats on the advisory boards of all German companies. Disaggregating Deutsche Bank from the German government's political goals or the

structure of German corporations is impossible. They are all inextricably linked.

Like many banks, Deutsche Bank took a major hit in the 2008 financial crisis. Geopolitical Futures continued:

Besides the problems with its bottom line, it still faces a battery of investigations, legal troubles, scandals and potential fines to be paid in the coming years. ...

Deutsche Bank is showing signs of that weakness more than any other German institution right now. Last year, Deutsche Bank posted a net loss of roughly €6.7 billion, or US\$7.4 billion. Deutsche Bank's chief financial officer told

CNBC that he did not expect Deutsche Bank to find its way back into the black until 2018 at the earliest. Deutsche Bank's first quarter report for 2016 said revenue was down 22 percent year-over-year

In just the last year, Deutsche Bank has laid off tens of thousands of workers and has seen rating downgrades from both Fitch and Moody's on its long-term debt and its deposit ratings. Deutsche Bank is also sitting on \$41.9 trillion (not a typo) worth of derivatives

An explosion at Deutsche bank would undermine the entire German economy—and hence the economy of Europe and the world.

Europe Braces for a Banking Crisis: Italy

THE ECONOMIC UNCERTAINTY FROM BREXIT MAY FINALLY FORCE Italy's nascent banking crisis out into the open. Giovanni Legorano outlined the problems that Italy could soon face in his article [“Bad Debt Piled in Italian Banks Looms as Next Crisis”](#):

In Italy, 17 percent of bank loans are sour. That is nearly 10 times the level in the U.S., where, even at the worst of the 2008–09 financial crisis, it was only 5 percent. Among publicly traded banks in the eurozone, Italian lenders account for nearly half of total bad loans.

Years of lax lending standards left Italian banks ill-prepared when an economic slump sent bankruptcies soaring a few years ago.

In a separate article, published on June 30, the *Wall Street Journal* revealed that on in the wake of Brexit, on June 26 the European Commission “authorized Italy to use government guarantees to provide liquidity support to its banks.” The commission spokeswoman said the support was approved “under extraordinary crisis rules for state aid to banks.”

Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi and German Chancellor Angela Merkel have publicly clashed over how to deal with these banks. On June 3, [Financial Times](#) reported:

Matteo Renzi, the Italian prime minister, is determined to intervene with public funds if necessary despite warnings from Brussels and Berlin over the need to respect rules that make creditors rather than taxpayers fund bank rescues, according to several officials and bankers familiar with their plans.

The threat has raised alarm among Europe's regulators, who fear such a brazen intervention would devastate the credibility of the union's newly implemented banking rule book during its first real test.

Meanwhile, Italy is planning to hold a referendum in October, this time over reforms to Italy's electoral system. Prime Minister Renzi has said he will step down if he does not get the approval he wants. Citi warned that the vote was “probably the single biggest risk on the European political landscape this year outside the UK.” Confindustria, an Italian business lobby, said there would be “political chaos” if Renzi lost.

Will Martin wrote on the risks posed by the referendum in an article for Business Insider, published on July 6 titled [“Forget Brexit—Italy Is Poised to Tear Europe Apart”](#):

Italy is on the cusp of tearing Europe apart, but the economic and political crisis brewing in the nation is largely going unnoticed. [I]f you look at the country's economic data, bank issues, and the impending constitutional referendum coming up, Italy is like a bomb waiting to explode. ...

A political mess can quickly turn into a cornucopia of financial and economic disarray. ...

The Italian financial system is teetering on a precipice without much hope of a solution. Brexit may be the biggest problem facing Europe right now, but Italy isn't far behind.

Meanwhile, [Bloomberg](#) noted on July 7:

European banks have fallen to levels not seen since the worst days of the region's debt crisis as turmoil surrounding Italy's lenders intensified. Worries about market contagion dragged the Stoxx Europe 600 Banks Index just 1.4 percent away from its 2011 low. Most of Europe's banks lost at least 40 percent of their value in the last year—Banco Popular Espanol SA, Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena SpA, Deutsche Bank AG and Credit Suisse Group AG reached fresh record lows this week.

Brexit Could See Power Shift From Brussels to Berlin

IN THE WAKE OF BREXIT, MANY EUROPEAN UNION NATIONS ARE growing tired of the EU's bureaucrats in Brussels. Germany has assembled a coalition of leaders that would like to shift power elsewhere—probably to Berlin. The *Sunday Times* reported on the story in an article titled “Berlin Tells Gloating Juncker: Go”:

Jean-Claude Juncker, the president of the European Commission, is under pressure to resign Angela Merkel, the German chancellor, is understood to believe that Juncker has become “part of the problem.”

“Juncker has time and again acted against the common interest and his reaction to the British referendum has been very damaging,” a German minister told the *Sunday Times*.

“This is not a time for institutional bickering, but the pressure for him to resign will only become greater and Chancellor Merkel will eventually have to deal with this next year.” ...

The minister's comments followed editorials in two leading German newspapers last week urging Juncker to resign

There is unhappiness with the Luxembourg's performance elsewhere in the EU, too. The Polish foreign minister, Witold Waszczykowski, joined calls for Juncker to step down, while his Czech counterpart, Lubomir Zaoralek, said he was “not the right man for the job.” Toomas Ilves, the Estonian president, called his behavior “abominable.”

Spiegel reported on the same trend in an article titled “Brexit Aftershocks: An Inside Look at the EU's Raging Power Struggle.” It wrote:

It is a power struggle between two opposing camps, both of which see Brexit as an opportunity to finally change Europe to conform to the vision they have long had for the

bloc. The protagonists of an institutionalized Europe are Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker and Parliament President Martin Schulz. On the other side stands the majority of Europe's heads of state and government, led by Angela Merkel, who has created an alliance on this issue with those governments in Eastern Europe.

Spiegel sees this as a clash between a Brussels that wants more Europe and EU nations that want less. However, it noted:

Jaroslaw Kaczynski, head of Poland's national-conservative Law and Justice party, which currently holds power in the country, doesn't want “less Europe” in all areas. When it comes to foreign and security policy, he would even like to see the EU play a more robust role. **Kaczynski is in favor of the establishment of a European army and would like to see a strong European president with far-reaching authority.** It is a demand that many governments in Eastern and Central Europe agree with.

It's hard to imagine anything “more Europe” than a strong president and a European army. These nations are not opposed to “more Europe”—but rather “more Brussels.” After the 2008 financial crisis, *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry wrote:

However it happens, Germany is prophesied to come out on top in this financial crisis. Social unrest and riots will eventually force Europeans to succumb to a strong united government of Europe, LED ULTIMATELY NOT FROM BRUSSELS, BUT FROM BERLIN.

Much of that shift has already happened, as the euro crisis roles on. However, Brexit could see this intensify.

EU to Use ‘Peacemaking’ Money to Fund Foreign Armies

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION PUT FORWARD A PROPOSAL ON JULY 5 to use funds earmarked for “[peace building](#)” to buy weapons for foreign armies. Currently peace-building funds are used to provide things like maternity health care in Syria. The new rules would allow it to be spent on military training and weapons.

EU Observer noted that “this is the first time” the EU “will pump money directly into a foreign military structure.” It wrote:

Some €100 million [US\$110 million] that were initially slated for development aid will be diverted to finance military-led border control exploits and other initiatives like mine-clearing. ...

The EU has already contracted out some €1 billion from 2001 to 2009 when it came to things like law enforcement and border management.

TW IN BRIEF

EU part of NATO military pact: NATO's secretary general said the European Union and the defense alliance would sign a joint declaration at the upcoming Warsaw summit on enhancing cooperation. Jens Stoltenberg said Thursday that Britain's decision to leave the EU only strengthens the need for closer ties

between NATO and the bloc as it faced “a new security environment, with new threats: hybrid terrorism, instability.” Stoltenberg also said NATO remains open to dialogue with Russia and is working with Russia to hold talks shortly after the summit.

T Russia Sends Largest Warship to Syria

Callum Wood | July 7

RUSSIAN PRESIDENT VLADIMIR PUTIN IS SENDING **RUSSIA'S LARGEST warship** to intervene in the Syrian civil war.

The Admiral Kuznetsov aircraft carrier, a 55,000-ton vessel, will be deployed from October until January. On board will be 30 jet fighters and attack helicopters to aid the Russian troops already in Syria.

The move is widely being hailed as Putin's largest and final effort to drive the Islamic State out of Syria. While some see the move as an encouraging sign in the war against the Islamic State, the arrival of the Kuznetsov is fraught with ominous potential.

The Russian carrier will be joining two United States carriers currently undergoing missions in the Mediterranean: the Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Harry S. Truman. The heavy military traffic does not bode well for U.S.-Russia relations. It was only this

week that Russian frigate Yaroslav Mudy passed dangerously close by USS San Jacinto. It was less than a fortnight prior that another U.S. destroyer had a close encounter with a different Russian frigate. U.S. officials have blasted the incidents as "highly provocative."

The Russian bear could crush the Islamic State if it chose to. But that isn't Putin's plan. His current plan is to support Assad, meanwhile keeping his Mediterranean naval base secure. Beyond that, Russia no doubt intends to keep shaking loose the U.S. grip on the Middle East.

It puts the U.S. into a tough spot: confront the Russian bear, or ignore Russia's thinly veiled attacks and allow Assad to regain his country. If Putin is to continue his current policy in Syria, the arrival of his largest warship is less ominous for the Islamic State than it is for the U.S. and its war-torn allies.

Moscow Assembles Forces in Eastern Europe Ahead of Cold War-esque Standoff With NATO

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



AS NATO MEMBER STATES MET ON FRIDAY TO INK A PLAN TO deploy more forces to Eastern Europe, Russia continued its rapid buildup of military forces at vital bases in the region. Analysts fear the rising tensions could lead to a Cold War-style standoff between Moscow and NATO nations.

The *Independent* wrote on July 6:

The Russian military has been mobilizing troops, trucks and equipment to **various bases around Kaliningrad**, a crucial outpost between Poland and Lithuania, as well as sites further inland

Servicemen have been seen working to increase security at important bases and further military radar systems are being constructed, in addition to Russia's rumored preparation of new missiles and anti-aircraft systems at Kaliningrad.

Russia says it believes its borders are under threat as NATO forces draw closer, with the increase in military activity likely to be a key talking point when NATO member states

meet in Warsaw on July 8.

Washington Free Beacon's Morgan Chalfant **wrote** on July 7:

[NATO's] plan to deploy four "robust" multinational battalions to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland on a rotational basis will be solidified at a time when tensions between Russia and the United States are higher than any point since the Cold War. ...

While experts applauded the move, they expressed doubt that the new force numbers will be enough to deter and respond to Russian aggression in the region.

Moscow has said its buildup is merely a response to the increased presence of NATO forces in the region. Friction between Russia and the nations of NATO have been exacerbated since Moscow's annexation of Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula in March 2014.

Could the South China Sea Erupt Into War?

NATIONAL INTEREST ASKED ON JULY 3: "**IS THE SOUTH CHINA SEA the Stage for the Next World War?**" The piece, written by Zidny Ilman, makes the case that the potential conflict is "not just about the rocks," meaning the scattered islands and reefs in the region.

Recent skirmishes in the South China Sea between the Indonesian Navy and China's coast guard have reinvigorated public interest towards the region. Some applauded Indonesia's resolve in defending her rightful maritime territory. However, some are still left wondering over China's motives in provoking such regional conflict—including

with Vietnam, Malaysia and the Philippines. How can one explain why China risks a major war that could potentially drag the United States in for a bunch of uninhabited rocks?

Some say they are fighting for control over major oil and gas reserves in those seas. But this seems not to be the case. After all, great powers have rarely fought one another in a major war over economic resources in modern history, if at all. Or is it because of China's nine-dash line? For sure, one needs to differentiate the means, ways and ends of phenomena. The nine-dash line is a means that China uses to justify its policy ends. But it does not explain the endgame it wants to achieve—therefore, it cannot be used to explain its motives in the South China Sea. ...

To understand the cause of the current U.S.-China rivalry, one needs to see the history and strategic picture of the Asian region. Put simply, one needs to see beyond the South China Sea. Following the defeat of Imperial Japan in World War II, the United States has been the sole great power that can project its power throughout the region. Since that day, the region has come under American-led regional order. Having only a fraction of the United States' power, other states in the region accepted American primacy.

What is happening today is that China has gathered enough power and is becoming powerful enough to match (or even surpass) America's ability to project power throughout much of Asia. Power means leadership throughout history and with its newly gained power, China wants a bigger role in regional leadership. For sure, though it seems weird for most people, anyone who carefully study history will concede that this is a normal—though arguably regrettable—state behavior.

The piece goes on to say that the South China Sea could prove to be an arena where China demonstrates to the world that the United States is a war-weary power and an unreliable ally. It continued: "China must show U.S. allies that the United States will not come by their side when they need her. That means instigating a conflict with U.S. allies, making sure they will call for U.S. assistance and, at the same time, making sure that the United States will not fulfill her insurance policy. It is a dangerous game to play for sure. Beijing must do its best to make sure the United States will not come by her allies' side or else it will face a war with the United States—a grim possibility given both sides' possession of nuclear weapons."

America Sanctions North Korean Leader for First Time

THE UNITED STATES SANCTIONED NORTH KOREAN LEADER KIM Jong-un because of his record of human rights abuses. The nation as a whole has long been under various sanctions for its illegal pursuit of nuclear weapons, but now the leader is being singled out for the first time.

BBC reported on July 7:

A statement from the U.S. Treasury [said,] "Under Kim Jong-un, [North Korea continues to inflict intolerable cruelty](#) and hardship on millions of its own people, including extrajudicial killings, forced labor, and torture." ...

The sanctions were announced to coincide with a State Department report documenting abuses in North Korea. It estimates that between 80,000 and 120,000 prisoners are being held in North Korean prison camps where torture,

sexual assault and executions are routine.

State Department spokesman John Kirby admitted the sanctions were unlikely to deter Mr. Kim. "But that doesn't mean this still isn't the right thing to do, and it doesn't mean that it still isn't the right thing for us to continue to pursue," he added.

On Thursday, the regime of Kim Jong-un responded to the sanctions in traditional fashion, saying it was a "declaration of war" and "the worst hostile act."

Though this U.S. measure may be a step in the right direction, it is basically the equivalent of sending Mr. Kim a strongly worded letter. A regime such as his only speaks the language of force, and, if it is not countered with ample quantities of force, it will continue its diabolical abuse of the North Korean people.

Putin Signs 'Big Brother' Law

RUSSIAN PRESIDENT VLADIMIR PUTIN TOOK ANOTHER STEP IN the direction of authoritarianism on Thursday by signing controversial "antiterrorist" legislation nicknamed the "Big Brother" law. The law gives the government sweeping new powers to access any Internet user's messages without judicial oversight.

Venture Beat wrote on July 7:

Today, Russian President Vladimir Putin signed the controversial "antiterrorist" legislation adopted by the lower and upper houses of parliament in late June, despite the flurry of criticism from opposition-minded circles and the serious concerns expressed by Russian telecom and

Internet companies. [T]he new legislation which Edward Snowden has called "Russia's new Big-Brother law"—is not only severe against those involved in "international terrorism," its financing or non-denunciation. Law-enforcement agencies will also be granted access to any user's messages without any judicial oversight.

Several key provisions will directly affect the Internet and telecom industry. In particular, telecom operators and Internet resources will need to store the recordings of all phone calls and the content of all text messages for a period of six months. They will be required to cooperate with the Federal Security Service to make their users' communications fully accessible to this organization.

Such measures eerily echo the era of the dictatorial Soviet Union. Yet the people of Russia appear largely unconcerned by

Putin's ever tightening grip on power.

General Hifter: Putin's Man in Libya?

LIBYA'S CONTROVERSIAL GENERAL, KHALIFA HIFTER, VISITED Moscow in late June, fueling speculation that he was working to procure arms from Russia. While Moscow dismissed those speculations, Russia likely has a longer-term strategy in Libya, as Al-Monitor wrote on July 6:

Hifter's reception in Russia was unusually high profile for such a controversial and divisive figure. He was received by the foreign affairs and defense ministers, but most importantly by Nikolai Patrushev, the secretary of the Security Council, a key decision-making body close to the president. In other words, the message that Hifter received in Moscow likely came from Vladimir Putin himself.

Interpreting Russian interests in Libya purely in terms of the profit it could make from arms trade there would be simplistic. The diplomatic efforts that Moscow has been making on the Libyan front lately are far-reaching for a power that simply wants to sell its weapons. It may in fact be the case that the Kremlin is playing a long game in Libya, seeking a place in its post-conflict political reconstruction. ... Many in Moscow believe that Hifter's vast network

of supporters and military power could make him Putin's point man in Libya.

Al-Monitor concluded:

The Russian ambassador to Libya probably put it best when he said, "It is not Libya's opposing sides but the whole of Libya that seeks Russia's support. They understand that without us it would be very difficult to overcome the existing crisis. It is therefore quite natural that different parties want to meet with us and ask us for moral and material support."

Molotov's statement gives a hint about the Kremlin's intentions in the region: For it, Libya is not the end game but a tool to help it stay relevant in Middle Eastern affairs. Contributing to the resolution of the political crisis in Libya, one that is increasingly becoming a contributing factor to the spread of the Islamic State in this country, may benefit Russia's image of a champion in the global fight against terrorism and put it on par with the United States in this region.

TW IN BRIEF

Russia-China war games: Russia's National Guard and China's People's Armed Police Force continued performing joint anti-terrorist drills on Thursday in the Moscow region. The large-scale tactical exercises will span 11 days, and are the third joint exercises of their kind to take place between Russia and China. Sputnik News said their purpose is to "improve mutual understanding" between the two nations and to boost "security in the scenario of a regional terrorist threat."

Flare-up in Kashmir: Protesters threw stones and raised Pakistani flags as violence erupted in India-controlled Kashmir after Eid celebrations Wednesday. Paramilitary soldiers fired tear gas shells to disperse the protesters who were angry that some separatist leaders were placed under house arrest and not allowed to participate in celebrations. More than a dozen rebel groups have been fighting for Kashmir's independence from India or its merger with neighboring Pakistan since 1989. Kashmir is divided between India and Pakistan, with both claiming it in its entirety.

ANGLO-AMERICA

America's Culture Wars Are Getting Expensive

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



THE PUBLIC NOW ACCEPTS HOMOSEXUALITY AND SAME-SEX "MARRIAGE," but the fight to reshape society in even more radical ways pushes forward.

An effort is gaining ground to create a world where not just "sexual orientation" but *sex itself* is a choice. Where boys can be girls and girls can be boys, or something in between.

In addition to the moral cost of this offensive to reshape society, the financial cost is also piling up. In a July 6 *Denver Post* article titled "[The High Costs of the Culture Wars](#)," Catherine Rampell wrote:

The culture wars are getting very, very expensive. ...

In North Carolina, legislators last week voted to transfer \$500,000 from the state's emergency response and disaster relief fund to pay for litigation of the so-called bathroom bill. Good thing there are never any hurricanes in the Tar Heel State, and there's no chance of a Zika crisis in its mosquito-dense coastal tourism areas.

Legal fees are likewise mounting in states that have attempted to bar Planned Parenthood from receiving Medicaid funds (which often turns out to violate federal Medicaid law), to implement constitutionally dicey restrictions on abortion access, or both.

Alabama, for example, recently had to pay \$51,000 in legal fees to settle a lawsuit over the state's brief attempt to cancel Planned Parenthood Southeast's Medicaid contract.

In recent years, cash-strapped Kansas has spent more than \$1 million defending its suite of anti-abortion laws,

including one that's now on hold after the Supreme Court struck down a similar Texas law. Texas, for its part, spent \$1 million defending that doomed law.

In the wake of the recent Supreme Court ruling, at least seven other states are facing renewed legal challenges.

And of course in some cases, such legal expenses are peanuts compared with the broader economic costs of these culture-war laws.

In an increasing number of cases, local, state and federal governments are trying to force people to make moral decisions against the dictates of their own conscience. Because of this, American taxpayers have to foot the bill for enormous legal fees. Considering that the nation is already drowning in debt, American society's war against morality is bringing the nation one giant step closer to economic collapse!



Today's Supreme Court Would Frighten Alexander Hamilton

Kieren Underwood | July 4

ALEXANDER HAMILTON, A FOUNDING FATHER OF THE UNITED States, would likely have been disturbed by the *Associated Press* headline from June 28: "Supreme Court Leans Left in Term Unsettled by Scalia's Death." *Didn't we make it clear*, he might ask, *that the judiciary was to remain "truly distinct from both the legislative and executive branches"?*

While Hamilton wouldn't know who Justice Antonin Scalia was, or what the policies of the left are, he would believe that a Supreme Court "leaning" toward a legislative body is a sure step on the path to despotism.

A number of polarizing issues have been pushed through the Senate and presidency and on to the courts in a matter of days. Two cases were decided in the Supreme Court on June 23: *Fisher v. University of Texas* examined the extent to which affirmative action could be used in universities; and *United States v. Texas* examined the protection illegal immigrants have from deportation. On June 27, *Women's Health v. Hellerstedt* looked at restrictions on abortion procedures in the state of Texas.

For months now, conservatives have blocked a new Supreme Court appointment; they see this nomination as more important than ever before. As the *Washington Free Beacon* wrote:

It's an unanticipated consequence of the outsized role the judiciary plays in our national life: The Supreme Court has become so influential that the legislative branch now has every reason to reduce its strength, and thereby its power, by not allowing new members to don the black robes.

Robert Bork, the eminent constitutional scholar whose 1987 nomination to the Supreme Court was rejected by the Senate, wrote extensively about the dangers of the court creating its own morality—whether it be conservative or liberal. He described the terrible scene of "massive marches," "one by anti-abortionists and one by pro-abortionists," coming down Constitution Avenue

to the Supreme Court building to protest *Roe v. Wade* from his third-floor office window.

The demonstrators on both sides believe the issue to be moral, not legal. So far as they are concerned, however, the primary political branch of the government to which they must address their petitions is the Supreme Court. There is something very disturbing about those marches, for if the marches correctly perceive the reality, and I think it undeniable that they do, a major heresy has entered the American constitutional system.

A "major heresy" because, as Alexander Hamilton wrote and expected, "the judiciary, from the nature of its functions, will always be the least dangerous" branch of government to the rights of the people. Hamilton was the primary author of the *Federalist Papers*, the incomparable exposition of the U.S. Constitution. Political philosopher Thomas Sowell said it could be titled *Constitution for Dummies*. Hamilton described in the *Federalist Papers* how the "least dangerous branch" could become a tyranny to fear:

It equally proves that though individual oppression may now and then proceed from the courts of justice, the general liberty can never be endangered from that quarter: I mean so long as the judiciary remains truly distinct from both the legislature and executive; for I agree that "there is no liberty if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and the executive powers." And it proves, in the last place, that as liberty can have nothing to fear from the judiciary alone, but it would have everything to fear from its union with either of the other departments.

For those who would look to the courts to move forward legislation on affirmative action, immigration, abortion, gun control or any other polarizing issue, they are succumbing to a common temptation: trading the right of self-government for decisions from currently-benevolent judges. History has not been kind to those who went down that path!

America Is Being Undermined by China in the South China Sea

EVER SINCE XI JINPING TOOK OVER AS GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE Communist Party of China, his administration has been militarizing the South China Sea and working to push the United States out of East Asia. In two island chains, the Paracels and the Spratlys, China is building a series of man-made islands, 800 miles from China's shore. These islands are being installed with anti-aircraft batteries and fighter jets are stationed on them.

The Spratly Islands are claimed by the Philippines, Malaysia, Taiwan and Vietnam. China is ignoring these nations' territorial claims. China is being aggressive and provocative.

If China can prove to America's allies that Washington is an unreliable partner, they can undermine the current U.S.-led global security system.

In a July 3 article in the *National Interest*, Zidny Ilman writes:

China seems to believe that the U.S.-led regional order is based on the U.S.-led political security regional order. This political security order in turn is based on the U.S. regional alliance system, which is known as hub-and-spoke system, encompassing Japan, South Korea, Australia, the Philippines and Thailand. This alliance system grants the United States access to forward bases that ensures her ability to rapidly project her power throughout the region whenever crisis erupts.

Without such bases, the United States won't be able to effectively project forces and, therefore, will have only

marginal influence in a crisis. Thus, curtailing the United States' capability to respond to a regional crisis means much less U.S. influence upon regional order.

So, as the logic goes, breaking this alliance system will lead to a breakup of the U.S.-led regional order. Thus, the question now becomes: How can China break up the U.S. alliance system? ...

As long as U.S. allies believe that Washington will fulfill her words, the alliance system will hold up. However, if U.S. allies do not believe her words—thereby doubting the credibility of her words—the alliance system will unravel. ...

Put another way, China must show U.S. allies that the United States will not come by their side when they need her. That means instigating a conflict with U.S. allies, making sure they will call for U.S. assistance and, at the same time, making sure that the United States will not fulfill her insurance policy.

Vladimir Putin's Russia already proved to the world, by his invasion of Crimea, that U.S. promises to protect Ukraine are worthless. If China can prove to Japan, Taiwan and the Philippines that the U.S. isn't willing to defend them from foreign aggression, then the current U.S.-led global security system will unravel. Both Japan and Taiwan could find themselves being forced into a new Chinese-led regional security order sooner than they think.

TW IN BRIEF

FBI recommends no charges for Hillary Clinton: Federal Bureau of Investigation director James Comey announced Tuesday that the bureau would not recommend criminal charges against Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton for her handling of classified information while she was secretary of state. Comey rebuked Clinton for being extremely careless in using a personal e-mail address for sensitive communications. He said that a person still employed by the government could face administrative punishment for such conduct. This announcement lifted an enormous legal cloud from the Clinton campaign less than two hours before she boarded Air Force One for her first joint campaign appearance with President Barack Obama.

British pound drops to 31-year low: The British pound dropped sharply to a new 31-year low on Tuesday amid concerns that the country's decision to leave the European Union might cause a steep slide in United Kingdom commercial real-estate values and hurt the wider economy. Markets were jittery after three financial firms stopped trading in their respective UK commercial property funds following a rapid increase in investors trying to sell their holdings. The funds buy commercial property and offer shares to investors. Some of those investors now appear worried that companies might opt to leave London to move operations to mainland Europe to retain access to the EU market. That would vacate office space and weigh down real-estate values in Britain's capital.



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

