TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY
WATCH
Vol. 19 No. 4
Fourth Quarter 2016

Patriotism or "Crude Nationalism?"
A Debate That Will Rage for Years

What's RIGHT With America?

by John Mitchell

Ask that question of 1,000 different Americans and you would probably get 1,000 different answers. Ask many professional sports figures, politicians at the highest level of America's government, radical thug groups such as *Black Lives Matter*, illegal aliens who both curse and burn the flag, members of the media, or any of a host of others whose sentiment is prevalently anti-American and a majority of the answers would be there is nothing right with America.

Step into the classroom of most any secular College or University and you'll hear liberal, atheistic professors spewing forth venomous propaganda about America and her Godly heritage in an attempt to rewrite the history of our nation. Turn on the evening news and listen to all the stories about murder, about war, about our economic woes, the true unemployment rate, and one could but wonder if there really is anything right with America.

Well, it is time to remember that there is more right with America than wrong. The problem is we have forgotten the right people, the right purpose, and the right principles upon which this great nation of the United States of America was founded.

America Was Founded By the Right People

In the summer of 1787, representatives met in Philadelphia to write the Constitution of the United States. After they had struggled for several weeks making little or no progress, 81 year old Benjamin Franklin rose and addressed the discouraged men who were about to adjourn and go home. Here are the words Benjamin Franklin spoke to that assembly:

"In the beginning of the contest with Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayers in this room for DIVINE protection. Our prayers, Sirs, were heard and were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a super-intending Providence in our favor. Have we now forgotten this POWERFUL FRIEND? Or do we imagine we no longer need His divine assistance? I have lived, Sirs, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: that GOD governs in the affairs of man. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

One of the first official acts of our very first President was to designate a national day of Thanksgiving. President George Washington proclaimed:

"Whereas it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and to humbly implore His protection and favor**…** I do hereby recommend and assign Thursday, the 26th day of November, to be devoted by the People of these States to the service of that great and glorious BEING who is the beneficent AUTHOR of all the good that was, that is, or that will be**…** that we may then all unite in rendering unto HIM our sincere and humble thanks for His kind care and protection."

Many years later, our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln said, "It is the duty of nations, as well as of men, to owe their dependence on the overruling power of God, and to recognize the sublime truth announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all his-

Continued next page

tory, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord."

The pages of our History books are filled with numerous quotes such as these from our founding fathers — men who were not ashamed of their faith in Almighty God. We read in Proverbs 29:2 "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; but when the wicked bear rule, the people mourn." Had America been founded by Godless men, this nation would never have risen to greatness.

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, the people He chose for his inheritance." - Psalm 33:12

As the scripture in Psalm 33:12 says, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, the people He chose for His inheritance." Yes, America was founded by the right people.

For the Right Purpose

When we Americans look back upon our humble beginnings, we usually point to that little band of sea-weary travelers that landed in 1620 on Plymouth Rock. We have come to refer to them as Pilgrims. Those pilgrims did not come here for economic or political reasons, they came here for RELIGIOUS reasons.

Believing the liberal Church of England had strayed far from the scriptures, the 100+ Pilgrims boarded the Mayflower and made a perilous journey across the Atlantic to lay the groundwork for a new nation where they could worship God according to the scriptures. When they arrived at Plymouth Rock they drew up what is now called The Mayflower Compact. In that document the Pilgrims stated:

"In the name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten have undertaken for the Glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia."

It has been about 396 years since those Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. Only half of the 102 passengers aboard the Mayflower even survived the first winter. We all owe a debt of gratitude to those brave men and women who came here to found this great nation for the right purpose, that Biblical Christianity might advance.

As this nation grew she became home to more churches, more Christian Private Schools, more Bible Colleges, and more Christian Orphanages than any other nation in history. This nation has also trained more preachers, sent out more missionaries, and printed more Bibles and Christian literature than any other nation on earth. Our most prestigious University, Harvard, was formed in 1636. The University's original motto, *Christo et Ecclesiae* ("Christ and Church"), later changed to *Veritas* ("Truth").

A 1643 publication said the school's purpose was "to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity, dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches when our present ministers shall lie in the dust." Perhaps they knew the meaning of Proverbs 29:18, which states "Where there is no vision, the people perish; but he that keeps the law, happy is he."

On the Right Principles

Listen to the words of one of our great American Forefathers, Noah Webster: "The moral principles and precepts contained in the scriptures ought to form the basis of all civil constitutions and laws. All the miseries and evils which men suffer from vice, crime, ambition, injustice, oppression, slavery and war proceeds from their despising or neglecting the precepts contained in the Bible."

Let's suppose you turned on the evening news tonight and heard Lester Holt or Scott Pelley or Chris Matthews report the following lead story "Today, in a shocking development, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Roberts, announced that "I conceive we cannot better express ourselves than by humbly supplicating the Supreme Ruler of the world… that the confusions that are and have been among the nations may be overruled by the promoting and speedily bringing in the holy and happy period when the kingdoms of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ may be everywhere established, and the people willingly bow to the scepter of Him who is the Prince of

Continued on page 29

Europe's Planned Migrant Revolution

by Yves Mamou

with permission from Gatestone Institute

▪ Between 2005 to 2014, Germany welcomed more than 6,000,000 people.

▪ Two essential questions about integration must be put on the table: 1) What do we ask of newcomers? And 2) What do we do to those who do not accept our conditions? In Europe, these two questions of integration were never asked of anyone.

▪ In the new migrant order, the host population is invited to make room for the newcomer and bear the burden not of what is an "integration," but the acceptance of a coerced coexistence.

▪ "No privileges are granted to the Europeans or to their heritage. All cultures have the same citizenship. There is no recognition of a substantial European culture that it might be useful to preserve." — Michèle Tribalat, sociologist and demographer.

▪ "We need people that we welcome to love France." — French Archbishop Pontier, Le Monde, October 2016.

▪ When "good feelings" did not work, however, the authorities have often criminalized and prosecuted anti-immigration critics. The Dutch politician Geert Wilders is currently on trial for trying to defend his country from Moroccan immigrants whose skyrocketing crime wave has been transforming the Netherlands.

Everyone now knows — even German Chancellor Angela Merkel — that she committed a political mistake in opening the doors of her country to more than a million migrants from the Middle East, Africa and Asia. It was, politically, a triple mistake:

▪ Merkel may have thought that humanitarian motives (the war in Syria and Iraq, the refugee problem) could help Germany openly pursue a migration policy that was initially launched and conducted in the shadows.

▪ Merkel mainly helped to accelerate the defense mechanisms against the transformation of German society and culture into a "multicultural" space -- the "multi" being a segregated, Islamic way of life. The anti-immigration party Alternative for Germany (AfD) is now a big player on the German political scene.

▪ Merkel raised anxiety all over Europe about the migrant problem. She might even have encouraged the United Kingdom to Brexit and pushed central European countries such as Hungary to the point of seceding from the European Union.

For many years, Germany was the country in Europe most open to immigration. According to Eurostat, the official data body of the European Union, between 2005 to 2014, Germany welcomed more than 6 million people.

Not all six million people came from the Middle East. The vast majority of them, however, were not from Europe. Clandestine immigration is not, of course, included in these figures.

Other countries also participated in a migrant race. In the

Continued next page

same time frame, 2005-2014, three million people immigrated to France, or around 300,000 people a year. In Spain, the process was more chaotic: more than 700,000 migrants in 2005; 840,000 in 2006; almost a million in 2007 and then a slow decrease to 300,000 a year up to 2014.

The "refugee crisis," in fact, helped to make apparent what was latent: that behind humanitarian reasons, a huge official immigration policy in Europe was proceeding apace. For economic reasons, Europe had openly decided years ago to encourage a new population to enter, supposedly to compensate for the dramatic projected shrinking of Europe's native population.

According to population projections made by Eurostat in 2013, without migrants, Europe's population would decline from 507.3 million in 2015 to 399.2 million by 2080. In roughly 65 years, a hundred million people (20%) would disappear. Country by country, the figures seemed even more terrifying. By 2080, in Germany, 80 million people today would become 50 million. In Spain, 46.4 million people would become 30 million. In Italy, 60 million would decline to 39 million.

Some countries would be more stable: by 2080, France, with 66 million in 2015 would grow to 68.7 million, and England, with 67 million in 2015, would shrink only to approximately 65 million.

Is migration in itself a "bad" thing? Of course not. Migration from low-income countries to higher-income countries is almost a law of nature. As long as the number of births and deaths remains larger than the number of migrants, the result is considered beneficial. But when migration becomes the major contributor to population growth, the situation changes and what should be a simple evolution becomes a revolution.

It is a triple revolution:

1 — Because the number of migrants is huge. The 2015 United Nations World Population Prospects report states: "Between 2015 and 2050, total births in the group of high-income countries are projected to exceed deaths

Paris, FRANCE - OCTOBER 31, 2016 : Urban migrant camp in northeastern Paris near the Stalingrad subway station.

by 20 million, while the net gain in migrants is projected to be 91 million. Thus, in the medium variant, net migration is projected to account for 82 per cent of population growth in the high-income countries."

2 — Because of the culture of the migrants. Most of them belong to a Muslim and Arabic (or Turkish) culture, which was in an old and historical conflict with the (still?) dominant Christian culture of Europe. And mainly, because this Muslim migration process happens at a historic moment of a radicalization of the world's Muslim population.

3 — Because each European state is in a position of weakness. In the process of building the European Union, national states stopped considering themselves as the indispensable integrator tool of different regional cultures inside a national frame. On the contrary, to prevent the return of large-scale chauvinistic wars such as World War I and World War II, all European nation-states engaged in the EU process and decided to program their own disappearance by transferring more and more power to a bureaucratic, unelected and untransparent executive Commission in Brussels. Not surprisingly, alongside Islamist troubles in all European countries, weak European states have now to cope with the strong resurgence of secessionist and regionalist movements, such as Corsica in France, Catalonia in Spain, and Scotland and Wales in United Kingdom.

Why did France, Germany and many other countries of the European Union opt for massive immigration, without saying it and without letting voters debate it? Perhaps because they thought a new population of taxpayers could help save their healthcare and retirement systems. To avoid the bankruptcy of social security and the social troubles of "dissatisfied retirees," the EU took the risk of transforming more or less homogenous nation-states into multicultural societies.

Politicians and economists seem blind to multicultural conflicts.

Politicians and economists seem blind to multicultural conflicts. They seem not even to suspect the importance of identity questions and religious topics. These questions belong to nations and since WW II, "the nation" is considered "bad." In addition, politicians and economists appear to think any cultural and religious problem is a secondary question. Despite the growing threat of Islamist terrorism (internal and imported from the Middle East), for example, they seem to persist in thinking that any violent domestic conflict can be dissolved in a "full-employment" society. Most of them seem to believe in U.S. President Barack Obama's imaginary jobs-for-jihadists solution to terrorism.

To avoid cultural conflicts (Muslim migrants vs non-Muslim natives) Germany could, of course, have imported people from the countries of Europe where there were no jobs: France, Spain, Italy. But this "white" workforce is considered "expensive" by big companies (construction, care-givers and all services...) who need cheap imported workers no matter the area (Middle East, Turkey, Northern Africa) they are coming from. Internal migration inside the EU would not have solved either the main problem of a projected shrinking European population as a whole. Added to that, in a world where competition is transferred partially from nations to global regions, the might of European countries might be thought to lie in their population numbers.

Can Europe borrow a Muslim population from Turkey, Northern Africa, sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East, and become a European world power, based on a population that is multicultural and multi-religious?

In theory, one can do that. But to succeed and avoid being crossed, day after day, by racial and religious tensions, two essential questions about integration must be put on the table: 1) What do we ask of newcomers? And 2)

Continued next page

What do we do to those who do not accept our conditions?

In other words, integration is an asymmetrical process where the newcomer is expected to produce the effort to adapt.

Of course, if the flow of migrants is big, the host society will change, but that is evolution; the sense of cultural and historical continuity will not be demanded into a decline.

Integration is an asymmetrical process where the newcomer is expected to produce the effort to adapt.

In Europe, these two questions of integration were never asked of anyone. According to Michèle Tribalat, sociologist and demographer:

"EU countries agreed at the Council of 19 November 2004, on eleven common basic principles to which to commit. When it is a question of integration they disclaim any asymmetry between the host society and newcomers. No privileges are granted to the Europeans or to their heritage. All cultures have the same citizenship. There is no recognition of a substantial European culture that it might be useful to preserve. The social bond is designed as a horizontal one, between the people in the game. Its vertical dimension in reference to history and to the past seems to be superfluous. They speak about values, but these values appear to be negotiable."

In France, in Germany, and in Sweden, it became rapidly clear that the growing flow of a radicalized Muslim population began to change the rules of the integration game. The migrants did not have to "adapt" and are free to reproduce their religious and cultural habits. By contrast, the local "natives" were ordered not to resist "environmental" changes produced by immigration. When they tried to resist anyway, a political and media machine began to criminalize their "racist" behavior and supposed intolerance.

In the new migrant order, the host population is expected to make room for the newcomer and bear the burden of not what is "integration," but the acceptance of a coerced coexistence.

France's Archbishop Pontier declared to Le Monde in October 2016:

"We need people that we welcome to love France. If we always offer a negative view, they cannot love the country. However, if we see them as people who bring us something new, we get to grow together".

When "good feelings" did not work, however, the authorities have often criminalized and prosecuted anti-immigration critics. The Dutch politician Geert Wilders is currently on trial for trying to defend his country from Moroccan immigrants whose skyrocketing crime wave has been transforming the Netherlands.

He may go to jail for as long as a year and could be fined a maximum of €7,400 ($7,000 USD). [Update: On December 9, 2016 Wilders was found guilty of inciting discrimination, but cleared of inciting hatred.]

In France, the Paris prosecutor opened a preliminary investigation for an "apologia of terrorism" against the anti-immigration writer Eric Zemmour. In an interview with the magazine *Causeur*, published October 6, Zemmour said that "Muslims must choose" between France and Islam. He added that he had "respect for jihadists willing to die for what they believe." The Paris prosecutor chose to take this sentence out of context to prosecute him.

Will this double movement—the injunction to love Islam plus criminalizing anti-Islam critics—be enough to kill off any opposition to the EU's migration policy, and serve to Islamize the continent?

We shall find out. ❑

Yves Mamou, based in France, worked for two decades as a journalist for Le Monde.

O.S.U. Knife Attacker, Poster Boy for Assimilation

by Mark Armstrong

There is tremendous sympathy for the family of the Somali student who rammed his car into a crowd of college kids, jumped out and went on a butcher knife rampage that grievously injured nearly a dozen people. A policeman happened to be nearby, responded to the commotion and shot the Somali student dead.

Soon after eleven students were rushed to area hospitals, ISIS claimed responsibility for the attack and said the Somalian perpetrator was their "soldier." Everybody who knew the boy was astonished and in disbelief. In the case of his family, it really is disbelief. They refuse to acknowledge that their close relative had actually committed this brutal act of terror. They want to see a video of their boy in action before admitting that he could have done such a thing. If integration into western society is the comprehensive answer to potential terrorists, it would seem that the young Somali had gone above and beyond what is expected of immigrants.

The family's lawyer put out a statement on their behalf. "Abdul graduated from the Ohio community college last summer with cum laud. He was a polite and hard working person who was spending most of the time either working at Home Depot or studying. The family told me he was a good man with a brighter future and they want to know to a large extent to see some kind of proof [sic]." He went on to say that they want to see proof on video before they'll accept his guilt.

But it's the statement of the president-elect saying the lad "should never have been in our country" that has them truly rattled. Why, they're afraid to go anywhere for fear of being attacked! The family's lawyer says they are traumatized, shocked, and they want answers. "They want to make sure that nobody else has to go through the pain, the suffering and the trauma they are going through."

Maybe it seems too obvious a question, but what about the "pain, suffering and trauma" of the bludgeoned and stabbed students who were minding their own business when the "good man" decided to mow them down and try to stab them to death? How about their families? Should anyone be concerned about their grief and trauma? As far as we know, no news organization has sought out the victims or their families for comment thus far. Will it be a hate crime if they do?

What about the families of tens of thousands of college students all across the United States who have plenty of "nice boys" in the mix with their sons and daughters? Do they have any cause for concern? What about the 300 cities and towns that are now home to some 132,000 Somali refugees? Do those citizens have any cause for concern about their safety when they go about their daily business? That's a question that is no doubt highly inappropriate to ask. After all, there have only been mass murder attempts by a couple of Somalis. Oh, and there have been several arrests of Somalis who joined ISIS.

According to Tucker Carlson, *Fox News* host, the "nice boy" was taking a class on "micro-aggressions" and is working on a project to illustrate just who in our society was targeted, demeaned or discriminated against. In the end we have to wonder. Was this "nice boy" pushed over the edge by ISIS' calls to use vehicles and knives to carry out jihad in the west? Or was it his college professor's class on "triggers" and "micro-aggressions" that put him over the edge? Maybe it was some combination of the two.

Continued next page

By all accounts, he was the cream of the crop of Somali refugees. He was polite, a hard worker and a good student who got along with everybody. Until he did this. Never mind the pain and trauma of parents and grandparents whose children are hospitalized, and may never be the same. The Somali community is suffering FEAR that someone will look at them with suspicion. That, according to the family's lawyer, much of academia and many in the press, would be a real crime.

While certain organizations are dedicated to searching out examples of "hate crimes" against minorities, they'll point out words or symbols that showed up on a wall or the side of a shed. But who's to say how the slur originated? There have been very visible examples of "activists" who would write themselves a death threat just so they could go public with "proof" of their cause.

There was the example of the Black Lives Matter protester who was trying to get the top administrators to resign or be fired for failing to create a safe campus environment. She "tweeted" death threats against all black students at Kean University in New Jersey, and targeted them directly to the Campus Police. It caused a major stir, as you would imagine. State and local police descended on the case as did the Department of Homeland Security. The hoax threats were tracked back to the activist using them as ammunition, and now she's got serious legal trouble. The "tweets" were able to be tracked down. Spray paint scrawled on a wall can be more difficult, and is sometimes bogus.

Police respond to attack at Ohio State University.

The claim that many people in the heartland of America are white supremacists, xenophobes and bigots because they hope that some semblance of their traditions and their children's future can be saved from the overwhelming transformation of recent years is equally bogus. How many violent demonstrations have we seen protesting against the millions of immigrants that have been imported and hidden out of sight all across the United States? How many have been maimed and murdered by citizens angered by the fact that national resources have been used to support immigrants on a scale where they don't even need to find gainful employment to live comfortably? What's that? None? In the aftermath of the Ohio State University attacks by an apparently well-adjusted, completely assimilated refugee, we have only to ask, "What more do the refugees, illegal immigrants and their advocates in the media want from the citizens of the United States?"

They want a confession to all the imagined slights, malicious thoughts and unconscious bias that characterize white American citizens, and they're not about to stop demanding it. It's beginning to look as though they may just be disappointed, again. ❑

GERMANY SUBMITS TO SHARIA LAW

"A Parallel Justice System Has Established Itself in Germany"

by Soeren Kern

with permission from Gatestone Institute

A German court has ruled that seven Islamists who formed a vigilante partol to enforce Sharia law on the streets of Wuppertal did not break German law and were simply exercising their right to free speech.

The ruling, which effectively legitimizes Sharia law in Germany, is one of a growing number of instances in which German courts are — wittingly or unwittingly — promoting the establishment of a parallel Islamic legal system in the country.

The self-appointed "Sharia Police" sparked public outrage in September 2014, when they distributed yellow leaflets which established a "Sharia-controlled zone" in the Elberfeld district of Wuppertal. The men urged both Muslim and non-Muslim passersby to attend mosques and to refrain from alcohol, cigarettes, drugs, gambling, music, pornography and prostitution.

The vigilantes are followers of Salafism, a virulently anti-Western ideology that openly seeks to replace democracy in Germany (and elsewhere) with an Islamic government based on Sharia law.

Salafist ideology posits that Sharia law is superior to secular, common law because it emanates from Allah, the only legitimate lawgiver, and thus is legally binding eternally for all of humanity. According to the Salafist worldview, democracy is an effort to elevate the will of humans above the will of Allah, and is therefore a form of idolatry that must be rejected. In other words, Sharia law and democracy are incompatible.

Wuppertal Mayor Peter Jung

A German court has ruled that a group of Islamists who formed a vigilante patrol to enforce Sharia law on the streets of Wuppertal did not break German law and were simply exercising their right to free speech. They were charged under a law that prohibits the wearing of uniforms at public rallies -- a law originally designed to ban neo-Nazi groups from parading in public.

Continued next page

said he hoped the police would take a hard line against the Islamists: "The intention of these people is to provoke and intimidate and force their ideology upon others. We will not allow this."

Wuppertal Police Chief Birgitta Radermacher said the "pseudo police" represented a threat to the rule of law and that only police appointed and employed by the state have the legitimate right to act as police in Germany. She added:

"The monopoly of power lies exclusively with the State. Behavior that intimidates, threatens or provokes will not be tolerated. These 'Sharia Police' are not legitimate. Call 110 [police] when you meet these people."

Wuppertal's public prosecutor, Wolf-Tilman Baumert, argued that the men, who wore orange vests emblazoned with the words "SHARIAH POLICE," had violated a law that bans wearing uniforms at public rallies. The law, which especially prohibits uniforms that express political views, was originally designed to prevent neo-Nazi groups from parading in public. According to Baumert, the vests were illegal because they had a "deliberate, intimidating and militant" effect.

On November 21, 2016, however, the Wuppertal District Court ruled that the vests technically were not uniforms, and in any event did not pose a threat. The court said that witnesses and passersby could not possibly have felt intimidated by the men, and that prosecuting them would infringe on their freedom of expression. The "politically correct" decision, which may be appealed, effectively authorizes the Sharia Police to continue enforcing Islamic law in Wuppertal.

German courts are increasingly deferring to Islamic law because either the plaintiffs or the defendants are Muslim.

German Courts and Sharia Law

German courts are increasingly deferring to Islamic law because either the plaintiffs or the defendants are Muslim. Critics say the cases — especially those in which German law has taken a back seat to Sharia law — reflect a dangerous encroachment of Islamic law into the German legal system.

In May 2016, for example, an appeals court in Bamberg recognized the marriage of a 15-year-old Syrian girl to her 21-year-old cousin. The court ruled that the marriage was valid because it was contracted in Syria, where such marriages are allowed according to Sharia law, which does not set any age limit to marriage. The ruling effectively legalized Sharia child marriages in Germany.

The case came about after the couple arrived at a refugee shelter in Aschaffenburg in August 2015. The Youth Welfare Office (Jugendamt) refused to recognize their marriage and separated the girl from her husband. The couple filed a lawsuit and a family court ruled in favor of the Youth Welfare Office, which claimed to be the girl's legal guardian.

The court in Bamberg overturned that ruling. It determined that, according to Sharia law, the marriage is valid because it has already been consummated, and therefore the Youth Welfare Office has no legal authority to separate the couple.

The ruling — which was described as a "crash course in Syrian Islamic marriage law" — ignited a firestorm of criticism. Some accused the court in Bamberg of applying Sharia law over German law to legalize a practice that is banned in Germany.

Critics of the ruling pointed to Article 6 of the Introductory Act to the German Civil Code (*Einführungsgesetz zum Bürgerlichen Gesetzbuche*, EGBGB), which states:

"A legal standard of another State shall not be applied where its application results in an outcome which is manifestly incompatible with the essential principles of German law. In particular, it is not applicable if the application is incompatible with fundamental rights."

This stipulation is routinely ignored, however, apparently in the interests of political cor-

rectness and multiculturalism. Indeed, Sharia law has been encroaching into the German justice system virtually unchecked for nearly two decades. Some examples include:

In August 2000, a court in Kassel ordered a widow to split her late Moroccan husband's pension with another woman to whom the man was simultaneously married. Although polygamy is illegal in Germany, the judge ruled that the two wives must share the pension, in accordance with Moroccan law.

In March 2004, a court in Koblenz granted the second wife of an Iraqi living in Germany the right to remain permanently in the country. The court ruled that after five years in a polygamous marriage in Germany, it would be unfair to expect her to return to Iraq.

In March 2007, a judge in Frankfurt cited the Koran in a divorce case involving a German-Moroccan woman who had been repeatedly beaten by her Moroccan husband. Although police ordered the man to stay away from his estranged wife, he continued to abuse her and at one point threatened to kill her. Judge Christa Datz-Winter refused to grant the divorce. She quoted Sura 4, Verse 34 of the Koran, which justifies "both the husband's right to use corporal punishment against a disobedient wife and the establishment of the husband's superiority over the wife." The judge was eventually removed from the case.

In December 2008, a court in Düsseldorf ordered a Turkish man to pay a €30,000 ($32,000) dower to his former daughter-in-law, in accordance with Sharia law.

In October 2010, a court in Cologne ruled that an Iranian man must pay his ex-wife a dower of €162,000 euros ($171,000), the current equivalent value of 600 gold coins, in accordance with the original Sharia marriage contract.

In December 2010, a court in Munich ruled that a German widow was entitled to only one-quarter of the estate left by her late husband, who was born in Iran. The court awarded the other three-quarters of the inheritance to the man's relatives in Tehran in accordance with Sharia law.

The existence of parallel legal structures in Germany is an "expression of globalization." - Islam expert, Mathias Rohe

In November 2011, a court in Siegburg allowed an Iranian couple to be divorced twice, first by a German judge according to German law, and then by an Iranian cleric according to Sharia law. The director of the Siegburg District Court, Birgit Niepmann, said the Sharia ceremony "was a service of the court."

In July 2012, a court in Hamm ordered an Iranian man to pay his estranged wife a dower as part of a divorce settlement. The case involved a couple who married according to Sharia law in Iran, migrated to Germany and later separated. As part of the original marriage agreement, the husband promised to pay his wife a dower of 800 gold coins payable upon demand. The court ordered the husband to pay the woman €213,000 ($225,000), the current equivalent value of the coins.

In June 2013, a court in Hamm ruled that anyone who contracts marriage according to Islamic law in a Muslim country and later seeks a divorce in Germany must abide by the original terms established by Sharia law. The landmark ruling effectively legalized the Sharia practice of "triple-talaq," obtaining a divorce by reciting the phrase "I divorce you" three times.

In July 2016, a court in Hamm ordered a Lebanese man to pay his estranged wife a dower as part of a divorce settlement. The case involved a couple who married according to Sharia law in Lebanon, migrated to Germany and later separated. As part of the original marriage agreement, the husband promised to pay his wife a dower of $15,000. The German court ordered him to pay her the equivalent amount in euros.

In an interview with *Spiegel Online*, Islam expert Mathias Rohe said that the existence of parallel legal structures in Germany is an "expression of globalization." He added: "We apply

Continued next page

Islamic law just as we do French law."

Sharia Courts in Germany

A growing number of Muslims in Germany are consciously bypassing German courts altogether and instead are adjudicating their disputes in informal Sharia courts, which are proliferating across the country. According to one estimate, some 500 Sharia judges are now regulating civil disputes between Muslims in Germany — a development that points to the establishment of a parallel Islamic justice system in the country.

A major reason for the growth in Sharia courts is that Germany does not recognize polygamy or marriages involving minors.

The German Interior Ministry, responding to a Freedom of Information Act request, recently revealed that 1,475 married children are known to be living in Germany as of July 31, 2016 — including 361 children who are under the age of 14. The true number of child marriages in Germany is believed to be much higher than the official statistics suggest, because many are being concealed.

Polygamy, although illegal under German law, is commonplace among Muslims in all major German cities. In Berlin, for example, it is estimated that fully one-third of the Muslim men living in the Neukölln district of the city have two or more wives.

According to an exposé broadcast by RTL, one of Germany's leading media companies, Muslim men residing in Germany routinely take advantage of the social welfare system by bringing two, three or four women from across the Muslim world to Germany, and then marrying them in the presence of a Muslim cleric. Once in Germany, the women request social welfare benefits, including the cost of a separate home for themselves and for their children, on the claim of being a "single parent with children."

Polygamy, although illegal under German law, is commonplace among Muslims in all major German cities.

Although the welfare fraud committed by Muslim immigrants is an "open secret" costing German taxpayers millions of euros each year, government agencies are reluctant to take action due to political correctness, according to RTL.

Chancellor Angela Merkel once declared that Muslims must obey the constitution and not Sharia law if they want to live in Germany. More recently, Justice Minister Heiko Maas said:

"No one who comes here has the right to put his cultural values or religious beliefs above our law. Everyone must abide by the law, no matter whether they have grown up here or have only just arrived."

In practice, however, German leaders have tolerated a parallel Islamic justice system, one which allows Muslims to take the law into their own hands, often with tragic consequences.

On November 20, 2016, for example, a 38-year-old German-Kurdish man in Lower Saxony tied one end of a rope to the back of his car and the other end around the neck of his ex-wife. He then dragged the woman through the streets of Hameln. The woman, who survived, remains in critical condition.

The newsmagazine, *Focus*, reported that the man was a "strictly religious Muslim who married and divorced the woman according to Sharia law." It added: "Under German law, however, the two were not married." *Bild* reported that the man was married "once under German law and four times under Sharia law."

The crime, which has drawn renewed attention to the problem of Sharia justice in Germany, has alarmed some members of the political and media establishment.

Wolfgang Bosbach, of the ruling Christian Democratic Union (CDU), said: "Even if some people refuse to admit it, a parallel justice system has established itself in Germany. This act shows a clear rejection of our values and legal order."

On November 23, *Bild*, the largest-circulation newspaper in Germany, warned that the country was "capitulating to Islamic law." In a special "Sharia Report"

Continued next page

it stated:

"The 2013 coalition agreement between the CDU and the Social Democrats promised: 'We want to strengthen the state's legal monopoly. We will not tolerate illegal parallel justice.' But nothing has happened."

In a commentary, Franz Solms-Laubach, *Bild's* parliamentary correspondent, wrote:

"Even if we still refuse to believe it: Parts of Germany are ruled by Islamic law! Polygamy, child marriages, Sharia judges — for far too long the German rule of law has not been enforced. Many politicians dreamed of multiculturalism....

"This is not a question of folklore or foreign customs and traditions. It is a question of law and order.

"If the rule of law fails to establish its authority and demand respect for itself, then it can immediately declare its bankruptcy."

Soeren Kern is a Senior Fellow at the New York-based Gatestone Institute. He is also Senior Fellow for European Politics at the Madrid-based Grupo de Estudios Estratégicos / Strategic Studies Group. Follow him on Facebook and on Twitter. ❑

Right With America

Continued from page 18

Peace."

What do you think the reaction would be to such an announcement? While we Christians would applaud such an announcement it would likely set off a religious war and persecution of Christians unlike anything we have ever seen before. After all, one must be politically correct, and not do or say or write anything that might even in the smallest way offend other religions, especially that of ungodly Islam, its perverted prophet, and its Muslim followers.

Would you believe that announcement was actually made in a Fast Day Proclamation issued by Gov. Samuel Adams, Massachusetts, March 20, 1797? The Bible was the original American reading primer for school children. What a novel concept!

Christians, we must never forget that America was founded upon Biblical principles. It appears they also understood the wisdom of Ecclesiastes 12:13, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."

America was founded by the right people, for the right purpose and on the right principles. Why, then, are there so many things wrong with America today? The answer is obvious!

There was a time in our nation's past when we stood by and allowed the wrong people who lived by the wrong principles to use this Nation for their own wrong purposes. And now, this once great nation is reaping what it has sown.

But there is yet hope for America. It is found in 2 Chronicles 7:14 "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Therefore, we need to pray for our nation, ask God to grant America a time of national repentance, and trust the Sovereign God who reigns in the affairs of men to return America and her people to her right purpose and her right principles! God bless the United States of America. ❑

THE SHOCKING TRUTH
LIVE WEBCAST BY INTERCONTINENTAL CHURCH OF GOD MINISTERS
WATCH WEEKLY Friday at 9 pm (EST) on www.lulicg.org
STAY CONNECTED
lineuponline2810@gmail.com facebook.com/lineuponline2810 youtube.com/lineuponline2810 plus.google.com/+LineUponLine

Peace & Prosperity

Continued from page 2

prevailed throughout the lifetimes of the living.

Recently, however, it has felt like the country is faltering. Controversial moral issues, enormous national debt, racial tensions, and the threat of terrorism have caused many to wonder how long this divided house can stand. Preserving the greatness of the United States, how to do it, and even what constitutes greatness, has been a major source of contention. All would benefit from a look at what led to this country's unique place in the world, as well as the basic principles that bring peace and prosperity.

God is the source of all our blessings. Those who believe in Him, His son Jesus Christ, and the Bible have an enormous head start. There is no denying the physical laws that govern our movement and communication; the spiritual and moral laws He put in place are every bit as immutable. The Bible contains these precepts as well as numerous examples of the rewards for obeying and the punishment for ignoring them. If we desire His blessings, joy and peace, we must regard His admonitions both personally and collectively.

The Ten Commandments are the basic behavioral requirements God has given to man. Prohibition of murder and theft are nearly universal today. Many have been imprisoned for perjury or "bearing false witness." After being given the Commandments the people were told, "So be careful to do what the LORD your God has commanded you; do not turn aside to the right or to the left. Walk in obedience to all that the LORD your God has commanded you, so that you may live and prosper and prolong your days in the land that you will possess" as seen in Deuteronomy 5:32-33.

"Whosever commits sin also transgresses the law: for sin is the transgression of the law."
- 1 John 3:4

While establishing the nation of Israel, God gave them a detailed set of laws to live by. These laws included rules for civil as well as religious conduct. Many of its principles, such as protection of property, reparation in cases of wrong-doing or negligence, the right of the accused to face their accuser, are commonplace in civilized nations today. The people were told "if you faithfully obey the voice of the LORD your God, being careful to do all his commandments that I command you today, the LORD your God will set you high above all the nations of the earth" in Deuteronomy 28:1 and were further informed of the benefits of obedience and the consequences of disobedience.

This is not a unique sentiment expressed only in the books referred to as the "law." The thousands of years of history contained in the Old Testament detail personal or national behavior in relation to God's will and the inherent result, be it good or bad. The New Testament, the life of Christ and the beginnings of the church, reiterate the same ideals. Christ was without sin. What is sin? 1 John 3:4 reads "whosever commits sin also transgresses the law: for sin is the transgression of the law."

A Christian by definition would be an adherent to His teaching, emulating His example as much as possible and consequently obeying the law. In the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew chapters five, six, and seven) Christ illustrated the spiritual intent of the laws about murder and adultery, extending their authority even into human thoughts.

Over and over Christ and His disciples preached that people need to repent — meaning to be truly, deeply sorry — ask God's forgiveness, and prove their sincerity by continuing their lives in accordance to His will. Even at the very end, in Revelation 12:17, the "just" are described as those "which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

This law, these Command-

ments, are God's intent for all humanity. He does not change. His plan for mankind has not changed. The effects are evident in history and around the world today. The founders of these United States acknowledged this, they held it to be "self evident," obvious and universal, needing no explanation. In declaring independence from Great Britain, and listing the causes, they cited transgressions against the "Laws of Nature" and "Nature's God." One of their main concerns before doing so was whether the people were moral enough for self government. Benjamin Franklin wrote, "Only a virtuous people are capable of freedom. As nations become corrupt and vicious, they have more need of masters."

George Washington said in his farewell address, "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens…"

Is that advice being followed today? According to a Gallup poll 77% of Americans still identify as Christians. Of those, around 25% say religion is not important in their daily lives and 37% seldom or never attend religious services.

A separate survey focusing on church attendance reports that 37% of the population attends religious services weekly or near-weekly. This number is thought to be artificially high as it relies on self-reporting and other studies suggest the actual figure may be as low as 22%. After peaking in the 1950s, the trend has been downward. More people view religion as irrelevant to modern life, unable to address today's problems.

Collectively, we want the blessings of God, the peace, prosperity, and well being only He can provide. Yet many refuse to even acknowledge His existence.

God does not ask *how* we will worship Him but *whether* we will worship Him.

We desperately need to heed His warnings against coveting, lust, hate, murder, and putting anything in life before Him. As Garner Ted Armstrong said, "God does not ask *how* we will worship Him but *whether* we will worship Him." While every individual has free moral agency, the ability to do, say, or think whatever they wish, God is the arbiter of what is right and wrong. Human action will be judged accordingly even though man, in his vanity, often considers himself more righteous than God. Trust in self or institutions is misplaced if truths so basic as to be "self evident" are rejected.

Can man do it alone, without God's guidance and contrary to His plan? The founders of this country knew it to be impossible. Samuel Adams wrote, "The sum of all is, if we would most truly enjoy the gift of Heaven, let us become a virtuous people; then we shall both deserve and enjoy it. While, on the other hand, if we are universally vicious and debauched in our manners, though the form of our Constitution carries the face of the most exalted freedom, we shall in reality be the most abject slaves." James Madison also asked, "Is there no virtue among us? If there be not, we are in a wretched situation. No theoretical checks, no form of government, can render us secure."

The onus is on us. Do we wish for peace? Do we wish for prosperity, for posterity to enjoy the ascendancy among nations and the personal blessings many have known in their own lives? Then study God's word. Expound its truths to the uninitiated. Exemplify its ideals, providing proof of its relevance in every action. If we the people of the United States look for solutions, we need look no further than the mirror. Let us take hold of the wisdom in Proverbs 3, "My son, forget not my law; but let thine heart keep my commandments; for length of days, and long life, and peace, shall they add to thee." ❑

The United States of America should be the great HOPE for the world, instead of an example of every kind of hedonistic abandon. Will we ever see an end to the attacks against the Constitution and the family? Will we see honor, dignity, integrity and Godly humility once again in the highest office in the land? Will Americans shed their cynicism and acknowledge that every great gift of freedom and prosperity comes from GOD?

Call, write, or visit us online for your FREE brochure,

UNELECTABLE

Why Our Founding Fathers Wouldn't Stand a Chance in Today's America

by Garner Ted Armstrong

Garner Ted Armstrong Evangelistic Association
PO Box 232 Sandy Bay Tasmania 7006
Phone: 1300 885 066
www.gtaaustralia.org
gta.info@ozemail.com/au