

# Trumpet Weekly

JANUARY 20, 2017



Iranian President Hassan Rouhani gives a press conference in Tehran on January 17, 2017, to mark the first anniversary of the implementation of a historic nuclear deal.

## The Iran Nuclear Deal: One Year On

**Tyrel Schlote | January 19**

ONE YEAR AGO, THE WORLD WITNESSED THE IMPLEMENTATION OF what was supposed to be one of the greatest peace deals ever struck. The Iran nuclear deal, agreed to in July 2015, was formally implemented on Jan. 16, 2016.

The deal was meant to cut off Iran, the world's number one terrorist-sponsoring nation with aspirations for nuclear weapons, from obtaining the bomb. It required Iran to make numerous changes to its nuclear program, including cutting its uranium stockpiles by 98 percent, reducing the number of centrifuges it installs, and reducing its level of enrichment. In response, the United States, along with other world powers, lifted sanctions on Iran that had been in place because of its illegal nuclear program. All totaled, \$150 billion in assets were unfrozen. Vigorous inspections, the threat of snap-back sanctions, and time clauses delaying Iran's ability to access certain nuclear technology were

promised in the deal to ensure that Iran never got a nuclear weapon.

U.S. President Barack Obama called the deal "a milestone in preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon," while Secretary of State John Kerry said that "the entire world [was] safer because the threat of a nuclear weapon has been reduced."

Now, one year on, we must ask: Is the world a safer place? Has peace come to the Middle East? Has Iran given up on its nuclear ambitions? All indications from the past year thunder a resounding "No." Rather, the implementation of this deal has only emboldened Iran and given it access to new military hardware and billions of additional dollars to fund its operations.

Despite extending an olive branch to Iran through the deal, the U.S. has received nothing in return but harassment. Since the deal was implemented, Iranian naval vessels have made repeated

provocative maneuvers around U.S. ships operating in international waters in the Persian Gulf.

The most recent episode happened on January 9, when five Iranian vessels harassed three U.S. Navy ships in the Strait of Hormuz over the course of nine hours. The Iranian vessels made six separate approaches against the U.S. vessels, one of which was deemed unprofessional, resulting in warning shots being fired at the Iranian craft. This came after numerous radio calls, flares and whistle blasts were used to deter the Iranian craft.

Referring to these provocative moves, Pentagon spokesman Capt. Jeff Davis said that “a total of 35 in 2016 ... were assessed to be unsafe and unprofessional.” Only 35 of these incidents were deemed unprofessional; the January 9 incident saw the Iranian vessels make *six* passes at American ships, and only *one* was considered unprofessional. Added to that, Captain Davis said that “the vast majority of those were in the first half of 2016,” which would have only been a few months after the deal was implemented. Why would Iran act so aggressively—and so *quickly*—against the nation that was so instrumental in reintroducing it to the global community?

In 2016, American forces also came under threat when Iranian-backed Houthi rebels fired two missiles at a U.S. Navy destroyer operating off the coast of Yemen in the Red Sea on October 9 (the third such attack against U.S. naval forces in the area). Another incident saw a small Iranian vessel point its weapon at a U.S. military helicopter in the Strait of Hormuz on November 26. It was as if Iran was taking every opportunity to take a shot at the U.S. in 2016. If it spurns America so much, what do you suppose its attitude is toward the nuclear deal?

Iran has received little more than a tongue lashing for all of its provocative moves over the past year. America has willingly overlooked these acts, because it is desperate to keep the deal intact. Iran knows this and has taken every opportunity to make America look weak to the world.

Last year also saw Iran push against the restrictions placed on its ballistic missile program. During 2016, Iran conducted four ballistic missile tests, despite much opposition from the world community. While these tests did not violate the nuclear agreement, Western powers viewed it as a violation of a United Nations security resolution which “calls upon” Iran to refrain from any activity connected to ballistic missiles. However, nothing significant was done to deter Iran’s missile program.

In reality, Iran was able to forge ahead with these missile tests *because of* the nuclear deal. Following the deal’s agreement, the UN Security Council adopted a new resolution that outlined the conditions of lifting its sanctions on Iran. This resolution also carried with it the new wording regarding Iran’s ballistic missile programs. While a previous resolution stated that Iran “shall not undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons,” the new resolution softened the language, simply “calling upon” Iran to stop. As many point out, this weak wording makes it impossible to enforce the resolution, and thus it is not legally binding. It would be up to the Security Council to determine how to interpret the language of the resolution, and Russia, having veto power, stated it would not allow any sanctions to be imposed on Iran.

The *Washington Post* reported that the new wording also dictates that Iran stop testing missiles “designed to be capable of

delivering nuclear weapons” instead of just being “capable” of delivering such warheads. Iran argued that the missiles it tested were not “designed” to carry those warheads, giving it more legal coverage.

So instead of making the world a safer place, the nuclear deal actually gave Iran the green light to press ahead with developing ballistic missiles. Iran now has one year of research and development under its belt, and it’s unlikely that the UN will pass any new resolutions to deter Iran’s progress.

Iran also proved that its ambitions to destroy the State of Israel have not been abated by the nuclear deal. During a test in March 2016, Iran launched a missile carrying the Hebrew message, “Israel must be wiped out.” The test occurred the same day that U.S. Vice President Joe Biden visited Israel. Though Iran has frequently called for the destruction of Israel, “this was the first reported post-deal display of anti-Israeli messaging in an Iranian [missile] test,” *Newsweek* reported.

In 2016, Iran also disregarded limitations on the amount of heavy water it possessed. During the past 12 months, Iran twice exceeded those limits.

The Institute for Science and International Security raised serious concerns over a heavy water “loophole” that exists in the nuclear deal. Iran is only allowed to have 130 metric tons of heavy water; any additional heavy water that it produces has to be shipped to Oman where it is to be sold off. This loophole exists because Iran had no desire to stop producing heavy water once it reached the cap nor to dispose of any excess.

Following the implementation of the nuclear deal and the lifting of sanctions, Iran was quick to begin making arms deals. The first deal with Russia was made in February for \$8 billion, which included purchasing a more sophisticated anti-aircraft missile system and a batch of warplanes. Then, in November, U.S. officials voiced concern after another \$10 billion deal was inked between Iran and Russia for more military hardware, including tanks, planes and artillery systems. All these deals would see Iran take possession of the hardware over the course of the next few years.

Under current UN Security Council resolutions, Iran is banned from purchasing offensive weaponry without permission from the Security Council. But Iran has yet to request permission to purchase these arms.

This past year, Iran also received its shipment of S-300 surface-to-air missiles from Russia, thanks again to the nuclear deal. The missile system had been purchased in 2007, but Russia blocked delivery after the U.S. and Israel protested the sale. Once the nuclear deal was agreed upon in 2015, Russian President Vladimir Putin allowed the sale to proceed. After receiving the first shipment in May, Iran deployed the system around the Fordow underground uranium enrichment facility in August. Why would Iran deploy state-of-the-art anti-aircraft missile batteries around an underground nuclear facility if it’s just being used for civilian purposes?

While 2016 looked to be an aggressive year for Iran’s arms purchases, 2017 looks to be even more so. In May, Iran announced its 2016–2017 budget, which has \$19 billion allocated for the military. This is a 90 percent increase over the previous year. Once again, Iran has the nuclear deal to thank for the increase. With sanctions lifted, Iran now can seek more loans from international banks to fund its military expansion. The most belittling aspect

of Iran's budget increase is the fact that Iran earmarked all \$1.7 billion it received from the U.S. last January for the release of hostages to go toward its 2017 military budget.

It is true that the International Atomic Energy Agency, which monitors Iran's nuclear program, issued several reports last year saying the country is in compliance regarding its nuclear-related obligations. But one year on from the implementation of the nuclear deal, it's clear Iran has gained much from it. Thanks to the deal, Iran has spent the last year using every opportunity to stick it to America's military with no consequences, develop its ballistic missiles, and gain access to billions of dollars of additional funds as it continues to be the number one state sponsor of terrorism.

The nuclear deal has not made the world safer but more dangerous. Iran has already reaped all these benefits, and it's now one year closer to the expiration of the nuclear deal, assuming

the Iranians don't violate the deal before then.

If all this happened over the course of 2016, what does 2017 hold? This nuclear deal has plunged the world into a dangerous age. As *Trumpet* editor in chief [Gerald Flurry](#) wrote after the deal, "[Iran changed nothing](#) in its policies of aggression, subversion and sponsoring terrorism. It didn't even say it would reform in any of these areas! Without giving in on *anything*, Iran was given all it needed in order to greatly accelerate its race toward getting the nuclear bomb."

If you haven't done so yet, read our free booklet [The King of the South](#). Bible prophecy makes clear that Iran is steering the world to a devastating conflict that will touch the lives of every person on Earth. However, there is great hope in all of this: Following on the heels of the soon-coming destruction, Jesus Christ will return to put an end to all war and suffering. Mankind will finally be free of the threat of nuclear war forever!

## MIDDLE EAST

# TrumpetDaily

RADIO SHOW

INAUGURATION DAY, THE REAGAN BIBLE, AMERICA IN PROPHECY  
AND THE GREAT TRIBULATION | JANUARY 20

TRUMP'S PLEDGE TO REWARD BRITAIN, HIS CHALLENGE TO GERMANY  
AND HIS LOVE AFFAIR WITH PUTIN | JANUARY 19

THE DESPICABLE COMMUTATION OF PRIVATE MANNING AND THE MEDIA'S LOVE  
AFFAIR WITH BARACK OBAMA | JANUARY 18

DONALD TRUMP AND THE POST-TRUTH WORLD | JANUARY 17

TRANSITION WEEK: OBAMA RUSHES TO REGULATE AS TRUMP SLAMS THE EU  
AND REACHES OUT TO BRITAIN | JANUARY 16

## **T** Egypt Rejects Handover of Islands to Saudi Arabia, Foreshadowing 'Iran Pivot'

Jeremiah Jacques | January 19

ON JANUARY 16, AN EGYPTIAN COURT [REJECTED A PLAN](#) BY President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi to transfer control of two Red Sea islands to Saudi Arabia, a move which some analysts say could set the stage for Egypt to make an "Iran pivot."

Last April, during a visit by Saudi King Salman bin Abdulaziz al-Saud, President Sisi signed a maritime demarcation deal that shifted the Egypt-Saudi border in a way that positioned the uninhabited islands of Tiran and Sanafir in Saudi waters. This essentially transferred their control from Egypt to the Saudi kingdom.

The islands, less than five miles from both Egypt and Saudi Arabia, are strategically valuable because their position at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba grants them control of the sole sea route to Jordan's seaport of Aqaba and to Israel's seaport of Eilat.

The move was seen as a gift from Sisi to the Saudi regime, which has pumped tens of billions of dollars in financial aid into Egypt in recent years. The *New York Times* called the transfer

plan a "show of gratitude" for the Saudi kingdom's support. But the news prompted [widespread public outcry among Egyptians](#) who say the islands are an integral part of Egypt.

In June, an administrative court ruled that Sisi's border demarcation deal was illegitimate, and that both islands should remain under Egyptian control. The verdict issued on Monday upheld this June ruling with a final decision that cannot be appealed by any administrative court. Egyptians celebrated the court's decision.

Saudi Arabia, however, is angered by the ruling, which adds fresh strain to the already tense ties between Cairo and Riyadh. Back in October, evidence of the tensions was abundant when [Saudi Arabia halted its oil shipments to Egypt](#) for an "indefinite" duration. Reuters said the move suggested a "deepening rift" between the two nations.

Egypt's decision to reject the island transfer will further deepen this rift and could prompt the Egyptians to boost ties

with Saudi Arabia's main political rival. On Monday, ZeroHedge said the Egyptian court's decision could be "setting [the] stage" for Egypt to make an ["Iran pivot."](#)

After asking which nation Egypt may look to for oil if the court's decision adds overwhelming strain to Egypt-Saudi ties, ZeroHedge said:

We hinted at the answer in November, when we reported that [Egyptian] Oil Minister [Tarek] El-Molla said that he is in negotiations with Iran, Saudi Arabia's sworn political rival, to try to strike new oil deals, hinting that Egypt may be the latest to join a fledgling Mideast axis which includes

Iran, Syria, Russia and perhaps, Turkey. ... It has yet to be confirmed if, indeed, Egypt—whose Suez Canal has critical geopolitical importance—has pivoted away from a Saudi sphere of influence (and oil supplies), and into that of Iran.

As the report notes, such an Egyptian pivot is not confirmed. And the January 16 court decision may not end up being a deciding factor that causes such a pivot. Nevertheless, the *Trumpet* expects Egypt to break ties with Saudi Arabia and pivot into Iran's sphere of influence. To understand why, read *Trumpet* editor in chief [Gerald Flurry's](#) article ["Iran-Egypt Alliance Prophesied."](#)

 Follow [Jeremiah Jacques](#)

## **Russia Upending the Middle East** **Anthony Chibariwe | January 20**

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



IT IS BECOMING CLEARER THAT WHEN RUSSIAN PRESIDENT VLADIMIR Putin lamented the collapse of the Soviet Union as "the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the century," the geographic scope of his perceived losses extended beyond former Soviet satellite states to its client states far and wide.

Consider Russia's resurgent power play in the Middle East.

Within the first 16 months of the Syrian Arab Spring, which began in 2011, Russia (and China) opposed every major world power by vetoing three United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolutions that would have condemned the regime of President Bashar Assad.

After a veto in July 2012, Britain's UN Ambassador Mark Lyall Grant said Russia and China had "chosen to put their national interests ahead of the lives of millions of Syrians." Nearly half a million people have since been killed in the country, and Russia, in particular, is surging ahead with its national interests.

When United States President Barack Obama's administration backed away from its "red line" regarding Assad's use of chemical weapons in August 2013, Russia seized the opportunity by brokering a deal that would remove Assad's chemical weapons. From that point forward, Russia became the most influential player in Syria and the greater Middle East.

In September 2014, a U.S.-led coalition began bombarding Islamist rebels from Syrian airspace. One year later, Russia joined the Syrian battlefield with its own air strikes—its first military conflict outside the borders of the former Soviet Union since the end of the Cold War.

Russia established an airbase near the Syrian port city of Latakia and a naval facility in Tartus. Its target list included Islamist rebels and "moderate" rebel groups that the U.S.-led coalition was supporting.

Russia has repeatedly violated an air safety agreement with the U.S. in Syria, and the threat of a war between the U.S. and Russia has intimidated Washington from imposing a no-fly zone in Syria.

Russia formed a joint alliance with Syria, Iran, Iraq and

Hezbollah—the so-called "4+1"—and established an information exchange center in Baghdad. Russia's relationship with Iran, Assad's biggest ally in the Middle East, grew so strong that in August 2016, Russia launched air strikes from an Iranian airbase. That was the first time a major world power had done so in Iran since the Islamic Revolution of 1979.

Following the downing of its Sukhoi Su-24 attack aircraft for violating Turkish airspace in November 2015, Moscow bolstered its military presence in Syria and created an arms race of sorts with Turkey. Relations between Russia and Turkey have since warmed and the two countries began conducting joint air strikes against the Islamic State in northern Syria on January 18.

As for the negotiations for a political settlement in Syria, Russia has aggressively taken the lead. In December 2016, Russia and Turkey brokered a ceasefire deal for Aleppo and for the parts of Syria that are not controlled by Islamic extremists. Russia will also lead Syrian peace talks, which will begin in Kazakhstan on January 23.

Libya is another former Soviet client state that Russia has increasingly meddled in. Under the late Muammar Qadhafi, Libya maintained close ties with Russia. But when the Libyan Arab Spring and a NATO-led military intervention toppled Qadhafi in 2011, the nation descended into chaos and Moscow lost an ally. President Obama described his intervention in Libya without a plan for the aftermath as his "worst mistake." The nation now has essentially three separate governments: the UN-backed Government of National Accord (GNA), the General National Congress (GNC) and the House of Representatives.

Russia has provided direct support to none of these entities, however, it has allied with Cmdr. Khalifa Haftar of the Libyan National Army. Haftar's military organization recognizes the House of Representatives but opposes both the Western-backed GNA and the GNC. It has been the most successful organization in combating terrorist groups in Libya.

Twice in 2016, Haftar visited Russia to request support for his



military ventures in Libya. On January 11, Russia flew Haftar from his headquarters in Tobruk to its Admiral Kuznetsov aircraft carrier anchored in the Mediterranean. While on board, Haftar conducted a videoconference with Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu. According to the Russian Defense Ministry, the two “discussed pressing issues in the fight against international terrorist

groups in the Middle East.”

Beyond Libya, Syria, Turkey, Iran and Iraq, Russia also has, in recent years, increased its cooperation with, and/or its involvement in, Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Afghanistan as part of its remarkable Middle Eastern offensive.

 Follow [Anthony Chibarirwe](#)

## TW IN BRIEF

**Russian and Turkish jets work together:** The Russian military said Wednesday that it has teamed up with Turkey to conduct air strikes against an Islamic State stronghold in northern Syria. A military spokesman said nine Russian warplanes and eight Turkish jets have taken part in the strikes in the province of Aleppo. The statement was the first acknowledgement of the Russian strikes in support of the Turkish offensive. The news highlights an increasingly close alliance between Russia and Turkey, which last month jointly brokered a Syria truce.

**Russia to invite Trump administration to talks on Syria—Iran upset:** Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov said his country will invite representatives of the United States President Donald Trump’s new administration to attend upcoming Syria talks in Kazakhstan. Lavrov said at a news conference on Tuesday that Russia is encouraged by President Trump’s focus on combating terrorism. He said he hopes that Russia and the U.S. could start discussions on fighting terrorism in Syria when the talks begin on Monday. However, the same day Iran’s foreign minister said Tehran is against any U.S. involvement at the talks.

The peace drive is part of a three-way process led by Russia and including Turkey and Iran, now the most powerful players inside Syria. The Russian invitation comes just one month after the U.S., under the Obama administration, was denied a seat at the previous round of talks.

**Europe against U.S. Embassy in Jerusalem, Trump under-terred:** On Monday, European Union foreign ministers expressed opposition to any plan by President Donald Trump to move the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The foreign ministers warned that such a move could ratchet up tensions with the Arab world. The EU foreign policy chief cautioned against unilateral action, that she said could have “serious consequences in large sectors of public opinion [and] in large parts of the world.” She said the EU would maintain its delegation in Tel Aviv. Mr. Trump was asked by *Israel Hayom* on Tuesday if he intended to go through with his pledge to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem. He responded: “Of course I remember what I said about Jerusalem. You know that I am not a person who breaks promises.”

## EUROPE

# Trumpet Hour

TRUMP INAUGURATION, GERMAN NEO-NAZISM, RUSSIAN POWER, CHINESE GLOBALIZATION, AND MUCH MORE | JANUARY 20

THE TRUMP EFFECT ON THE MIDDLE EAST, JAPAN’S NIPPON KAIGI, DISEASE MONGERING, AND MORE | JANUARY 18

## Neo-Nazi Rhetoric Brings Great Applause in Germany

WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



“GERMAN HISTORY IS HANDLED AS ROTTEN AND MADE TO LOOK ridiculous,” lamented Björn Höcke, a rising star in Germany’s upstart Alternative for Germany (AfD) party at a rally on January 17, as he exhorted his listeners to take pride in their past. “Deutschland, Deutschland!” the crowd chanted.

Höcke’s rally has raised concerns across the world, both for its shift to the far right and its enthusiastic reception. Until now,

the *Trumpet* has been cautious in labeling the AfD as far-right. We point to the worrying trend it is part of, but the AfD has been careful not to cross the line over into outright neo-Nazism.

No more. The *New York Times* wrote an article on January 18 titled “[In Germany, a Far-Right Leader Stirs a Long-Suppressed Nationalism](#)”:

At a chandelier-lit beer hall on Tuesday evening, the lean blond man's voice boomed out over a crowd of hundreds—some middle-aged and working-class, but with a contingent of polished young professionals.

"The AfD is the last revolutionary, the last peaceful chance for our fatherland," declared the man, Björn Höcke, referring to the political party Alternative for Germany, and employing a reverential term for Germany, one of several nationalist buzzwords usually shunned in the country's politics.

"Jawohl!" a few shouted. "Yes!" ...

His speech at the rally in Dresden on Tuesday touched off a wave of national alarm by challenging Germany's national atonement for the Holocaust and for its Nazi crimes. His comments drew broad criticism for their venom and because Mr. Höcke, a rising star in the AfD, has found growing success with his messages of extreme nationalism.

Shouting to be heard over cheering supporters, many of whom stood, Mr. Höcke challenged the collective national guilt over the war that has restrained German politics for three generations. At times he used language that seemed to hint at lamenting Nazi Germany's defeat.

Germans were "the only people in the world to plant a monument of shame in the heart of its capital," he said, referring to a memorial to murdered Jews in Berlin. He added that Germans had the "mentality of a totally vanquished people." ...

[H]is speech and the crowd's energetic reception of his words offer a glimpse of the relatively new party's threat to German politics. He is on the fringe, but that fringe is growing in numbers and in willingness to defy the usual restraints, to the rising alarm of Germany's establishment leaders, who on Wednesday denounced his comments. ...

Mr. Höcke's comments even drew a rebuke from the chairwoman of Alternative for Germany, Frauke Petry, who said they were out of line and "straining" the party. Ms. Petry and Mr. Höcke have been locked in a power struggle for months over how far to the right to position the party, which was originally founded on an anti-euro platform.

The party is polling at nearly 15 percent, ahead of some mainstream parties, for this fall's national election. Its rapid rise demonstrates that German nationalist politics can find a foothold in unexpected places, for example among educated young people like those at Tuesday's rally.

Those 20-somethings, many in coat and tie, looked clean-cut and primly trendy. ...

Mainstream parties in Germany have long eschewed

charisma-driven politics—in the style of personality-centered movements—and have avoided shows of overt nationalism. But that leaves an opening: A populist party like Alternative for Germany can indulge those ideas just enough to excite its supporters without scaring off larger groups of voters.

The Alternative for Germany supporters who were gathered in Dresden, the capital of Saxony, seemed animated in a way that is unusual when it comes to modern politics in Germany. Most Germans rarely feel allowed to get excited about their political beliefs or, just as sensitive an issue, about their national identity.

The atmosphere lent the evening a feeling of thrilling transgression, as if the act of cheering half-forbidden ideas was as important, or perhaps more so, than the ideas themselves. ...

Mr. Höcke, for instance, disavowed a famous 1985 speech by Richard von Weizsacker, then the president of Germany, that called for the Allied victory to be seen as the liberation of the German people, not as their defeat.

Mr. Höcke called Mr. Weizsacker's address "a speech against his own people, and not for his own people."

Since 2015, when Germany received nearly a million asylum seekers, Alternative for Germany has sought to portray national identity as under threat from migration and multiculturalism. ...

Yascha Mounk, a lecturer at Harvard and a fellow at the Transatlantic Academy of the German Marshall Fund, said Germany had a style of government that could leave an especially wide opening for fringe parties. Because the German parties tend to govern in a grand, cross-ideological coalition, voters often see little change when parties shift in and out. ...

But young and old supporters of Alternative for Germany seemed to find something at Tuesday's rally that is not common among far-right politics: a sense of impending victory. Not in the sense that they would oust Ms. Merkel's government this fall—she is likely to retain power—but in the belief that their movement would quickly shape and perhaps one day overcome a system that they see as denying them their German pride. ...

Mr. Höcke concluded his speech on Tuesday with a rallying call. "Beloved friends, we must do little less than make history, so that there will be for us Germans, us Europeans, a future," he said, as the audience stood, cheered and chanted his name.

He added, "We can make history, and we are doing it."

---

## Donald Trump to Be Europe's Enemy?

UNITED STATES PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP HAS FAMOUSLY DISTURBED Europe with his lack of commitment to NATO. But in an interview with *Bild* and the *Times* published January 15, Mr. Trump spoke of his ideological opposition to the whole European

Union project. The EU, he said is "basically a vehicle for Germany." He praised Britain's decision to leave, adding, "I believe others will leave. I do think keeping it together is not going to be as easy as a lot of people think."

Meanwhile the *Financial Times* reported on January 13 that “Donald Trump’s transition team have called EU leaders to ask ‘what country is to leave next’ with a tone suggesting the Union ‘is falling apart’ this year, according to the outgoing U.S. ambassador to the bloc.”

During the same *Times* interview, Mr. Trump repeated his opinion that NATO is “obsolete.”

Naturally his comments provoked outrage in Europe. French President François Hollande similarly rejected them, saying that Europe “has no need for outside advice to tell it what to do.” German Chancellor Angela Merkel stated, “I think that we Europeans have our destiny in our own hands, and I would very strongly argue that we all stand together.” Similarly, French Foreign Minister Jean-Marc Ayrault said, “The best response, is European unity.”

German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier said that Mr. Trump’s comments had provoked “astonishment and anxiety.”

Where is this leading? Reuters concluded a commentary piece

on the subject titled “[Why Europe Became a Baby](#)” with a sentence that could have come right from the *Trumpet*:

This week, Germany’s former Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer wrote that “the EU should be preparing for some profound shocks. The incoming U.S. president, an exponent of the new nationalism, does not believe in European integration,” pointing out that Trump has suggested he may not uphold NATO treaties to protect any threatened member. Fischer’s antidote is a European military, developed by Germany and France: a project often mooted, never seriously pursued.

Brexit, a shock all around, will combine with a Trump presidency to force the EU to put away childish things, and ask hard questions of itself. Infancy may be ending: always a hard transition.

Donald Trump’s presidency is piling the pressure on Europe, forcing it to become a major power.

---

## Reagan Adviser Calls for Germany to Get Nukes

THE ELECTION OF UNITED STATES PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP has caused senior German officials to ask, “Do we need our own nuclear weapons?” Writing in the *National Interest*, former special assistant to Ronald Reagan and senior fellow at the Cato Institute Doug Bandow encouraged Germany to do just that:

Rather than expect the United States to burnish NATO’s nuclear deterrent, European nations should consider expanding their nuclear arsenals and creating a continent-wide nuclear force, perhaps as part of the long-derided Common Security and Defense Policy. ...

He pointed out the increased interest in Europe for a credible nuclear deterrent, and asked, “Since two European nations possess nuclear weapons and others could develop them, why should the United States remain the country expected to bring Götterdämmerung to life?”

“Do Americans really want to use nuclear weapons to defend Europe?” he asked. “Is it truly in America’s interest to do so?” He continued:

Instead of expecting the United States to risk a nuclear exchange to protect Europe, the Europeans should take over that risk.

A possible solution would be to create European nuclear deterrent through contributions from member nuclear states. Roderich Kiesewette, a Bundestag leader on foreign policy, suggested turning to Britain and France, with a build-up financed by a joint European military budget ....

However, it would be hard for Germany to avoid joining such the nuclear club. No doubt, history would make such a

decision controversial, and the German people have shown little desire to play such a role. But those concerns do not justify expecting the American people to act as defenders of last resort for Germany and Europe.

Berthold Kohler, a publisher of the conservative *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, followed with the suggestion that Germany might need to augment the small British and French arsenals to successfully confront Russia and maybe China. The Carnegie Endowment’s Ulrich Kuehn called such musings “an important early warning sign.”

However, a nuclear Germany isn’t a new idea. It came up during West Germany’s rearmament and induction into NATO. Chancellor Konrad Adenauer advocated possession and use of American tactical weapons and capability to make German warheads. The latter proposal deserves a full debate today. ...

One policy which deserves rethinking is extended deterrence in Europe. The Continent already has two European nuclear states as members of NATO. Instead of expecting the United States to risk a nuclear exchange to protect Europe, the Europeans should take over that risk. With their continent already hosting two nuclear states, it is time to ask whether that number should grow.

“How naive is America to entrust this immense firepower to nations that so recently—and throughout history—have proved to be enemies of the free world!” wrote *Trumpet* editor in chief Gerald Flurry in January 2014. Now it appears America’s foreign-policy establishment has no problem with Germany building nuclear weapons of its own. For more on this subject, read his article “[Europe’s Nuclear Secret](#).”

**Moldova turns to Russia:** Moldova's new president, Igor Dodon, announced that he planned to pull his nation out of a treaty he had signed with the European Union and join sides with Russia instead. At a press conference with Russian President Vladimir Putin in Moscow on January 17, Dodon said he planned to sign a memorandum on cooperation with Russia's Eurasian Economic Union. Putin had earlier imposed sanctions on Moldova and threatened to expel up to half a million Moldovans who worked in Russia. But he said he would lift the sanctions if

Moldova withdrew from its treaty with Europe.

**Germany announces election date:** Germany's ruling coalition decided that this year's elections will be held on September 24. The decision, announced on January 18, must still be approved by the country's president, Joachim Gauck. The announcement of the date "fires the starting gun for an election campaign that Chancellor Angela Merkel has said will be her toughest yet due to opposition to her liberal asylum policy," wrote the *Local*.

## ASIA

### Russia, Though Neither Populous Nor Wealthy, Now 'Runs the World'

#### WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



ON JANUARY 16, THE *NATIONAL POST* PUBLISHED A TELLING ANALYSIS titled "Why Russia—a Country With Less Money Than Canada and Fewer People Than Nigeria—Runs the World Now."

Despite Russia's comparatively modest gross domestic product and population, the *Post* says the nation is "utterly dominating foreign affairs."

How can this be? According to the *Post*:

Russia's military spending is only one 10th that of the United States', it has fewer military personnel than India, and the smoke-billowing flagship of the Russian Navy has to be followed everywhere by a tug in case it breaks down. And yet, this all seems to be plenty for a country that is very good at commanding global influence on the cheap. Crimea was seized without firing a shot. The Syria intervention required only about 50 aircraft and cost only \$500 million—exactly the same amount the U.S. spent on training Syrian rebels. With Russia, it may not be so much the size of the army, but the fact that they're demonstrably willing to use it.

The *Trumpet* has often pointed to *will* as the missing ingredient in America's military power. But in President Vladimir Putin's Russia, the will to use military might is present in superabundance. This is evident in the fact that, since Putin came to power in 1999, Russia has deployed its armed forces into at least five theaters of conflict. Chechnya, the Caucasus border regions, Georgia, Ukraine and Syria have all been scenes of Russian force.

The *National Post* said Russia's power also comes from its refusal to fully trust other global players, its UN veto power and its diplomatic prowess:

Russia, much like Israel, is never entirely sure who it can trust as an ally. The old members of the Warsaw Pact took off almost as soon as the Berlin Wall was down. Ditto with many of the former Soviet republics, three of whom are now NATO countries directly abutting Russia's border.

Russia also has a jihadist problem in the Caucasus and a vast, empty resource-rich region sharing a largely undefended border with an expansionist China. The implication is that Russia's aggressive approach to foreign affairs is partly a product of its neighborhood. ...

Russia inherited the Soviet Union's UN Security Council veto, which it earned through victory in the Second World War. What's more, Russia uses it. Since 2000, Russia has used its veto power on 13 Security Council resolutions—mostly in regards to the Middle East. France and the UK, by contrast, haven't touched their vetoes since 1989. A veto-happy Russia naturally makes it hard to discuss global crises without inviting them to the table. ...

The United States expelled 35 Russian diplomats in retaliation for Russian interference in the U.S. election. The next day, Putin magnanimously invited the children of U.S. diplomats to the Kremlin in order to see his Christmas tree. It was a shrewd move, and the product of a country that puts a lot of stock in diplomatic positioning. Since the Soviet era, diplomats around the world have acclaimed their Russian counterparts as well-trained, relentless and extremely professional. "The truth is, actually, Putin, in all of our meetings, is scrupulously polite, very frank," U.S. President Barack Obama told the *Atlantic* in 2013. Although the crème de la crème nature of the diplomatic corps may have diminished under Putin's tighter control, they're still scoring some major Russian foreign-policy wins: Brokering the Syrian chemical weapons disarmament deal, rapprochement with China, and creating the EU-style Eurasian Economic Union with Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan.

**"The Russian election is triggering a fear that will hasten the uniting of the European Union. The Russian election will cause**



**Germany and other European nations to want a stronger leader. Throughout history, Germany has often sought a strong leader. Bible prophecy says it will do so again—for the last time! ... Mr. Putin has just changed the course of world history. And Bible prophecy reveals exactly where it is leading. ... NEV-**

**ER IN THE HISTORY OF MAN HAS SO MUCH PROPHECY BEEN FULFILLED IN SUCH A SHORT SPAN OF TIME!"**

**—Gerald Flurry, "Russia Frightens Europe—And Fulfills Bible Prophecy!," *Trumpet*, January 2004**

## Chinese President Seizes Davos Stage, Heralding Beijing as Free Trade Leader

ON TUESDAY, XI JINGPING BECAME THE FIRST CHINESE LEADER to attend the Davos World Economic Forum, the venue at which European and American elites have long assembled to establish the framework for global affairs. Mr. Xi delivered a speech in the Swiss city proclaiming China as the new champion of globalization and free trade, since the United States is attenuating its role on the global stage.

"Some people blame globalization for chaos of our world, but our problems are not caused by globalization. They are caused by war and conflict," he said.

Writing for the *Telegraph*, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard explained the significance of [Mr. Xi's speech](#):

China's leader Xi Jinping swept into Davos as the champion of free trade and the unlikely guardian of the international order, throwing down the gauntlet to the incoming Trump administration with a theatrical flourish. ...

His star appearance is packed with geostrategic symbolism. It comes just days before Donald Trump is sworn in as U.S. president, and as America turns in on itself, openly wishing to cede direction of the international system for the first time in three quarters of a century.

Mr. Xi is seizing the chance to fill the vacuum, presenting himself in Davos as a voice of moderation, almost as a Confucian philosopher. The task is to tame the excesses of globalization and salve the festering sores of inequality rather than smash the system in a fit of pique.

While he was careful not to rebuke Mr. Trump openly, his warnings against those who pursue narrow national interest, or "bend the rules as they see fit," or "walk away from their commitments," was clearly directed at the incoming U.S. president—and understood as such by everybody sitting in the hall.

Mr. Xi—now elevated to Maoist heights as the "core leader" of China—has until now been pushing for new institutions such as Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and a "BRICS" (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) fund to rival the Western power structure. This time he is going further, bidding for the moral high ground and for leadership of Western-led globalization itself. ...

By a remarkable twist of history, China is all of a sudden the superpower defender of the Paris climate pact agreed

by 194 countries in December 2015.

While Donald Trump has appointed global warming skeptics or deniers to the departments of energy, interior and transport, as well as the Environmental Protection Agency, Xi Jinping is basking as the reborn as the savior of the world's green movement.

*China Daily* chimed in on the significance of Xi's speech, championing Beijing as the world's new hegemon: "[C]hina has become the de facto world leader seeking to maintain an open global economy and battle climate change. In effect, President Xi has become the general secretary of globalization."

But not everyone is convinced of China's pure motives or its ability to take America's place as global hegemon. George Magnus from Oxford University's China Center said, "Xi Jinping's attempt to present China as a beacon of stability is a façade. ... China has been one of the biggest beneficiaries of globalization, but it is not a supporter of what we mean by free trade or a system governed by rules. It relies on subsidies, state aid and hidden barriers. The Chinese version of globalization is entirely different, and it is anti-liberal to its roots. If people at Davos really understood what China wants the rules of the game to be, they would be rather less in awe."

Evans-Pritchard agreed with this assessment: "Mr. Xi's pious invocation of global harmony sits oddly with the militarization of reefs and atolls in the disputed waters of the South China Sea, or with his refusal to accept a ruling in favor of the Philippines by the International Court in The Hague," he wrote.

The day after the landmark Davos address, Mr. Xi urged the world to abandon nuclear weapons. He made the remarks during an address to the United Nations in Geneva, saying, "Nuclear weapons should be completely prohibited and destroyed over time to make the world free of nuclear weapons." China has had a viable nuclear weapons program since 1964.

He also said, "We should reject dominance by just one or several countries," adding that "major powers should respect each other's core interests." Later in the speech, he said China would consider a disarmament deal with Russia if Washington were to ease its sanctions against Moscow.

The Agence France-Presse said the two Swiss speeches taken together showcase Xi's desire "to capture the mantle of global leadership at a time when Washington is clouded by uncertainty with an unpredictable political novice about to take charge."

## TW IN BRIEF

**Taiwan angers China with plans to attend Trump inauguration:** Taiwan is upsetting China once again by determining to send diplomats to Donald Trump's inauguration. China said on Wednesday it opposed the Taiwan delegation's attendance, which

could "disturb or undermine China-United States relations." While past U.S. presidents have maintained a one-China policy, where Taiwan is supposedly part of China, Mr. Trump has suggested he will not continue that trend. On January 20, a group of Taiwanese

security officials and lawmakers plan to attend the president-elect's inauguration. China has told the U.S. not to allow them to attend.

**China reiterates its position on the one-China policy:** China has said that its one-China policy is nonnegotiable. A spokesperson for the Chinese Foreign Ministry said today that the one-China policy is a “prerequisite” for the development of bilateral ties with other countries. She told reporters in Beijing that China opposes any arrangement by other countries to allow the leader of the self-governing Taiwan to stop over their territory. Taiwan's president increased tensions with mainland China when she visited Central America earlier this month. She also made two

transit stops in the United States.

**Sino-Russian response to U.S. presence in South Korea:** Chinese state media reported on January 13 that Beijing and Moscow have agreed to take further countermeasures in response to plans for an advanced American missile defense system in South Korea. The proposed Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense system is intended to guard against North Korean missiles. The Xinhua News Agency said the agreement was reached during security talks between the two countries in Moscow. The report gave no details, but a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman said today that China has a legitimate right to defend its security interests

## ANGLO-AMERICA



### The Prophesied Prince of Russia—Part 2 Gerald Flurry, The Key of David | January 22

Russian President Vladimir Putin is a spy by trade. United States President Donald Trump says that he will get along well with this man. Can Vladimir Putin be trusted? Could he be a dependable ally of America?



## President Trump Awakens Germany

### WE TALKED ABOUT THIS



**T**HE NEW PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES HAS ALREADY threatened to shake up the established world order by praising Brexit, criticizing the European Union, and reaching out to Russia.

Judy Dempsey wrote in an article published by [Carnegie Europe](#):

Even before he was elected U.S. president in November 2016, Donald Trump reached out to Nigel Farage, the former leader of the euroskeptic UK Independence Party (UKIP) who campaigned successfully for Britain to leave the EU. Since Trump's own victory, he has met Farage, has even suggested he become Britain's ambassador to Washington, and has lavished praise on Britain's decision to quit the EU.

Trump now plans to meet British Prime Minister Theresa May—though she might have to be second in line if Trump sticks to his intention to first hold talks with Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Trump has not only spent many words praising Brexit and using conciliatory language with Putin. He has also lambasted the EU, asking which country will be the next to leave a bloc that the United States helped create after 1945

as part of a new Western liberal order. That order is now under threat. If only European leaders realized the implications for their security, for their trade, and for their values.

Above all, Trump has not hesitated to criticize Germany, its industry, or its leader, Chancellor Angela Merkel—or to air his view that Germany is using the EU as its own vehicle.

It is definitely true that the European Union is a vehicle for German economic ambition. Yet the prospects of a potential Russo-American alliance is awakening old fears in Germany and threatening to transform the EU into a vehicle for German military ambitions as well.

Dempsey continued:

On a deeper level, it is not the criticism of Germany that should rankle Germans. It is the way in which the next president of the United States might rekindle old fears of German encirclement, as David Marsh, the managing director of the Official Monetary and Financial Institutions Forum, argued. These fears can be challenged only if Germany and like-minded EU allies do whatever it takes to go for more integration or a two-speed Europe. ...

In contrast to the outgoing administration of U.S. President Barack Obama, who wanted a strong EU, praised Merkel's tenacity in dealing with Russia and keeping the EU together, and warned a Britain outside the EU could not expect a quick bilateral trade deal with Washington, Trump is turning everything upside down.

In the time of ancient Judah, when King Zedekiah formed an alliance with the pharaoh of Egypt to protect his nation from the Babylonian Empire, God commissioned the Prophet Jeremiah to

tell King Zedekiah that because he trusted Egypt more than he trusted God, his allies would betray him (Jeremiah 4:30).

The people of America and Britain have not learned from this history. Under President Obama, America trusted Germany to protect it from Russia. Under President Trump, it seems likely that America and Britain will reach out to Russia to protect them from Germany. Just like the ancient Israelites, however, America and Britain will be betrayed by their hired "lovers," because they refuse to repent and turn to God for deliverance.

---

## The National Debt Is Leading to Economic Collapse

**I**N THE LEAD-UP TO THE GREAT RECESSION OF 2008, THE AMOUNT of personal debt held by private citizens skyrocketed. Between 2001 and 2009, outstanding mortgage debt climbed from \$6.8 trillion to \$14.7 trillion. Mediocre economic growth mixed with a rising debt created a perfect storm that eventually led to the 2008 collapse.

Today, conditions are even worse. According to an article by Justin Haskins, published in [the Hill](#):

Since January 2009, more than \$4 trillion has been pumped into the money supply, the most ever added in an eight-year period, and after a brief dip, the outstanding mortgage debt has returned to the \$14 trillion mark, which means the inflated housing market of the 2000s never fully corrected. Also, student loan debt is now at an all-time high, with outstanding debt totaling \$1.4 trillion, more than credit card debt or debt from auto loans.

Government debt also increased under Obama as he has attempted to stimulate the economy with government spending. The \$8 trillion added to the national debt under

the Obama administration is the most debt ever accumulated under a single president (and it doesn't include figures for 2017).

Further, just as in the latter-half of Bush's presidency, GDP growth has been very low, averaging less than 2 percent since 2009.

The current economic picture looks eerily similar to the one in 2008: Economic growth is sluggish, personal debt is extremely high, the government is running massive annual deficits, and riskier investments are being encouraged by the current market conditions, although this time it's being caused by excess cash in the monetary supply.

Growing numbers of Americans have allowed themselves to get into this same predicament as a result of spending money they don't have. At almost all levels of society, debt burden is a problem. Eventually, our creditors will not only refuse to extend credit but will also demand to be paid.

That will take a toll on the economy and our standard of living.

---

## Archbishops Call for Anglicans to Repent for Their Role in Protestant Reformation

**T**WO LEADING ANGLICAN ARCHBISHOPS HAVE DECIDED TO COMMEMORATE the 500th anniversary of the Protestant Reformation in a most unusual way, demanding that the Church of England repent of its role in perpetuating division between Anglicans and Roman Catholics.

In a [joint statement](#) issued on Tuesday, Archbishop Justin Welby of Canterbury and Archbishop John Sentamu of York wrote:

This year, churches around the world will be marking the great significance of the 500th anniversary of the beginning of the Reformation in Europe, dated from Martin Luther's 95 Theses protesting against the practice of indulgences, on Oct. 31, 1517 at Wittenberg. The Church of England will be participating in various ways, including

sharing in events with Protestant church partners from Continental Europe. ...

Many will also remember the lasting damage done five centuries ago to the unity of the church, in defiance of the clear command of Jesus Christ to unity in love. Those turbulent years saw Christian people pitted against each other, such that many suffered persecution and even death at the hands of others claiming to know the same Lord. A legacy of mistrust and competition would then accompany the astonishing global spread of Christianity in the centuries that followed. All this leaves us much to ponder. ...

Remembering the Reformation should also lead us to repent of our part in perpetuating divisions. Such repentance needs to be linked to action aimed at reaching out to

other churches and strengthening relationships with them. This anniversary year will provide many opportunities to do just that, beginning with this Week of Prayer for Christian Unity.

Given that Queen Elizabeth II is the official head of the Church of England, popular Anglican blogger, writing under the pseudonym [Archbishop Cramer](#), wrote:

The United Kingdom and the Church of England are separate and distinct: The United Kingdom is separate from the Continent of Europe; the Church of England distinct from the Church of Rome. In her very offices of church and state, the Queen embodies political and historic division, and she perpetuates ecclesial and theological schism. ...

Are Dr. Welby and Dr. Sentamu asking the Queen to repent of her sacred oath? They appear to be, for their statement is concerned not merely with the unholy burnings, hangings, drawings and quarterings of the past, but with those who perpetuate division into the present, which the Queen is sworn to do. And she is sworn to do this because

the Reformation in England was an act of the state of which she is now head; a parliamentary transaction sustained by the consent of the people over whom she reigns. How can the Queen repent of her part in perpetuating division without handing over her church to the bishop of Rome (who, constitutionally, *hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England* [Art. xxxvii])?

Starting all the way back in the early 1930s, Herbert W. Armstrong taught that Bible scriptures in Isaiah 47 and Revelation 13 predict a coming unity between Catholics, Protestants and Orthodoxians.

Notice this excerpt from the October 1961 *Plain Truth*: “The pope will step in as the supreme *unifying* authority—the only one that can finally unite the differing nations of Europe. The iron jurisdiction over both schools and religion will be turned over to the Roman Catholic Church. Europe will go Roman Catholic! *Protestantism will be absorbed into the ‘mother’ church—and totally abolished.*”

Today, 500 years after the Protestant Reformation, we see the Church of England reaching out to Rome!

## TW IN BRIEF

**P**resident Obama pardons Manning: United States President Barack Obama commuted the 35-year sentence of the former U.S. soldier Bradley Manning on Tuesday. Manning is imprisoned for leaking a trove of diplomatic cables and national security documents to Julian Assange’s Wikileaks back in 2010. Manning will be released from prison in May, more than three decades earlier than his sentence called for. While in prison, Manning decided he was a woman and is now commonly recognized under the name Chelsea. His pardon has brought attention back to Julian Assange who has been holed up for more than four years at the Ecuadorian Embassy in London.

**P**resident Barack Obama decides to free a terrorist: In his last days in office, the departing United States president commuted the prison sentence of Armed Forces of National Liberation member Oscar Lopez Rivera. The Puerto Rican terrorist organization is responsible for over 70 bombings that killed five and wounded

dozens more in New York City, Washington and Chicago between 1974 and 1983. Rivera was in the middle of a 55-year federal prison sentence. He is set to be released on May 17. New President Donald Trump can do nothing to reverse Mr. Obama’s decision.

**C**yberattacks increase: Cybersecurity experts at the World Economic Forum said on Wednesday that large-scale attacks threaten both the United States and Russia. Such attacks are already happening but most are not made public, according to the CEO of Cylance Consulting. One industry leader said his company’s software detects some 300,000 cyberattacks daily. He said he expects “more and more attacks on critical infrastructure.” International agencies such as Interpol and Eurojust, the European Union’s justice arm, are struggling to keep up with the fast pace of cybercrime. On Wednesday, they urged more cooperation and information sharing between businesses and governments to fight these cyberattacks.



### Is This the Year Things Spiral Out of Control?

Stephen Flurry,  
Trumpet Daily | January 22

2016 was bad, but 2017 might be worse.

Follow [Stephen Flurry](#)

