

Eye on the World

April 22, 2017

This compilation of material for "Eye on the World" is presented as a service to the Churches of God. The views stated in the material are those of the writers or sources quoted by the writers, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Church of God Big Sandy. The following articles were posted at churchofgodbigandy.com for the weekend of April 22, 2017.

Compiled by Dave Havir

Luke 21:34-36—"But take heed to yourselves, lest your souls be weighed down with self-indulgence, and drunkenness, or the anxieties of this life, and that day come on you suddenly, like a falling trap; for it will come on all dwellers on the face of the whole earth. But beware of slumbering; and every moment pray that you may be fully strengthened to escape from all these coming evils, and to take your stand in the presence of the Son of Man" (Weymouth New Testament).



An article by Rory Tingle titled "City Under Siege: Latest Attack in Paris Would Be the Sixth Terrorist Strike on the French Capital in Three Years" was posted at dailymail.co.uk on April 20, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

French police have said tonight's attack was 'probably a terrorist act', and if so it would be at least the sixth terror strike on Paris in three years.

Most recently, on March 18, a convicted criminal with links to radical Islam shouted 'I am here to die for Allah, there will be deaths' seconds before he was shot dead during an attack at Orly airport.

And a month earlier, on February 3, a man was shot five times outside the Louvre museum in the heart of Paris after attempting to storm the historic art gallery.

Last year, on June 13, two police officers were murdered in their home just outside Paris in front of their 8-year-old son in an attack claimed by Islamic State.

By far the most deadly strike came on November 13, 2015, when ISIS militants killed 130 people in France's worst atrocity since World War II.

A series of suicide bomb and shooting attacks were launched on crowded sites in central Paris, as well as the northern suburb of Saint-Denis.

The majority of those killed were in the Bataclan concert hall where hostages were taken.

Islamic State extremists claimed responsibility and said it was in retaliation for French participation in airstrikes on the militant group's positions in Syria and Iraq.

It led to the declaration of a state of emergency in France with police powers greatly expanded.

And on January 7, two brothers killed 11 people inside the Paris building housing the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo in revenge for the publication of cartoons mocking the Prophet Muhammed.

More were killed subsequently in attacks on a kosher market in eastern Paris and on police. There were 17 victims in all, including two police officers. The attackers were killed.

The shooting on March 20 comes just two days after the arrest of two men found with a cache of weapons and explosives in Marseilles.

They were suspected of preparing an attack to disrupt the first round of the presidential election on Sunday.



An article by Matt Vespa titled "Former Secretary of Defense: Obama Sent Message of Weakness by Not Enforcing Red Line on Chemical Weapons" was posted at townhall.com on April 16, 2017. Following is the article.

Russia has warned the United States against more military strikes in Syria, which didn't worry former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta. Panetta served as Obama's defense secretary and CIA director.

He told MSNBC's Andrea Mitchell on Friday [April 14] that the U.S. is in a good position of leverage, noting the mounting intelligence reports that show that Syria was involved in this chemical weapons attack, and that the world now knows we're not hesitant to use military action. There's more than enough to keep up the pressure on the government of President Bashar al-Assad, who Panetta says needs to step down. We also need to keep up the fight against ISIS.

Concerning the red line that President Obama established, Panetta added that it's important for presidents to set red lines, but also enforce them, which the Obama administration failed to do.

"I think it's important when Presidents set red lines when they say we're going to do something, you've got to stand by your word. Otherwise, it sends a message of weakness to the world," he said.

On April 6, the U.S. launched a massive missile strike against Syria in response to the chemical weapons attack in Idlib Province earlier that week, which killed at least 80 people.



A letter to the editor by Reginald Killingley titled "Congress Should Act" was posted at news-journal.com (Longview, Texas) on April 15, 2017. Following is the letter.

Under what legal basis did we strike Syria? Such bombings are normally considered acts of war. Granted, there is emotional satisfaction in taking tough retaliatory action to deal with the callous brutality of Syrian dictator Bashar Assad (news stories, April 7). But is that reason enough to take military action against a country that is not at war with us?

One senator said the strike was authorized by the president's constitutional role as commander in chief. Really? Does that mean a president is authorized to take military action anywhere in the world?

The Constitution clearly states that declaring war is a congressional and not an executive prerogative. The president is not constitutionally authorized to embark on military action against other countries without congressional approval.

It may indeed be in our "vital national security interest . . . to prevent and deter the spread and use of chemical weapons," but that is not sufficient reason to attack other countries. We are not the world's policeman.

The president has limited powers by deliberate design. He is not an absolute monarch.

If presidents don't see this, it's high time Congress assumed its constitutionally mandated responsibilities and acted as a necessary check and balance against such usurpation of power.



An article by Conor Gaffey titled "War in Syria: Russia and Saudi Arabia Disagree Over What to Do About Assad" was posted at yahoo.com on April 17, 2017. Following is the article.

Saudi King Salman bin Abdulaziz met with the head of Russia's upper house Sunday in a meeting that emphasized the two sides' differences over the role of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad in a resolution to the Syrian civil war.

Valentina Matviyenko, who holds the third-highest political office in Russia, led a delegation of the Russian Federation Council to Riyadh and held talks with the 81-year-old monarch, Russian state-owned news agency Interfax reported.

Saudi Arabia is a staunch backer of Syrian rebels attempting to overthrow Assad, while Russia has supported the Syrian president diplomatically since

the beginning of the war and launched military operations in support of the Assad regime in September 2015.

A spokesman for the Russian delegation, Ilyas Umakhanov, told Interfax the Saudi king did not demand Assad's immediate departure but that there was a certain amount of "leeway" on the matter. Umakhanov said Saudi Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir proposed a transitional period, during which Assad could resign as Syrian president.

Matviyenko told King Salman that Russia was not in favor of keeping Assad in office at all costs, but objected to his violent removal, according to the Russian news agency. She added that the differences between the two sides were not of an "antagonistic" nature.

The Syrian civil war, now in its seventh year, has killed hundreds of thousands and displaced millions. The conflict began after a regime crackdown on protests calling for Assad, who has been in power since 2000, to step down, but has since morphed into an international proxy war.

- Assad, who hails from the minority Alawite branch of Shiite Islam, has received backing from Iran and the Lebanese Shiite group Hezbollah, as well as Moscow.
- Gulf nations including Saudi Arabia, which are predominantly Sunni, have backed anti-government rebels in Syria, including militants affiliated to al-Qaeda. Western nations, led by the United States, have sought to back moderate rebels, though the distinction is often minimal in the crowded battlefield in Syria.

Saudi Arabia's King Salman bin Abdulaziz Al Saud attends the 28th Ordinary Summit of the Arab League at the Dead Sea, Jordan, on March 29. Saudi Arabia has called for the removal of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. Mohammad Hamed/Reuters

The Trump administration has been unclear on its position on Assad's future. President Donald Trump—who had previously cautioned against U.S. intervention in Syria—said his attitude on Assad "had changed very much" following a suspected chemical attack earlier this month that killed at least 70 people, including children, in the rebel-held province of Idlib in northern Syria.

Trump sanctioned a strike of 59 missiles against a Syrian regime airbase near the city of Homs on April 7, in a move condemned by Assad and Moscow. Assad has described the allegations that his regime was responsible for the gas attack as "100 percent fabrication." Saudi Arabia said it "strongly supported" the "courageous" military action by the United States.

The U.S. secretary of state, Rex Tillerson, has recently emphasized that the Trump administration's top priority in Syria is defeating the Islamic State militant group and once that goal had been achieved, the Syrian people should be allowed to decide the fate of their president.

But the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki Haley, recently told CNN that there was "not any sort of option where a political solution is going to happen with Assad at the head of the regime."



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Tillerson on Iran Deal: 'Another Example of Buying Off a Power Who Has Nuclear Ambitions. . . Someone Has to Deal With It Later' " was posted at cnsnews.com on April 19, 2017. Following is the article.

Sharply criticizing previous administrations' approaches to dealing with rogue regimes, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson on Wednesday described the Iran nuclear deal as "another example of buying off a power who has nuclear ambitions."

"We buy them off for a short period of time and then someone has to deal with it later," he told reporters at the State Department.

"We just don't see that that's a prudent way to be dealing with Iran, certainly not in the context of all of their other disruptive activities."

Tillerson said the negotiated nuclear agreement known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) "fails to achieve the objective of a non-nuclear Iran; it only delays their goal of becoming a nuclear state."

Pointing to the long standoff over North Korea's nuclear weapons, he said the JCPOA "represents the same failed approach of the past that brought us to the current imminent threat we face from North Korea."

And in a swipe at the Obama administration, which touted the JCPOA as a major foreign policy success, Tillerson added, "The Trump administration has no intention of passing the buck to a future administration on Iran."

Tillerson said President Trump's administration is conducting a "comprehensive review" of its Iran policy, looking at the nuclear deal and other aspects of its conduct in the region.

"Once we've finalized our conclusions, we will meet the challenges that Iran poses with clarity and conviction."

The JCPOA gave Iran tens of billions of dollars in sanctions relief in return for implementing steps which the Obama administration said would prevent it from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

While negotiating the deal with its P5+1 partners—Britain, France, Russia, China and Germany—the administration agreed to leave off the table other issues of concern likely to have made reaching an agreement even more difficult, including Iran's terror-sponsorship, ballistic missile activities, and domestic human rights abuses.

It argued that although Iran's support for terror and other troubling regional activity was cause for serious concern, they had to be kept separate from the nuclear talks, where the goal was to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran that would be even more dangerous than it is now.

Tillerson characterized that as a mistaken approach.

"I think this was one of the mistakes in how that agreement was put together, is that it completely ignored all of the other serious threats that Iran poses."

Outlining those concerns, Tillerson cited Tehran's support for the Assad regime, Houthi rebels in Yemen, Palestinian terrorist groups and militant groups undermining security in Iraq.

He also pointed to Iranian ballistic missile launches, cyberattacks against the U.S. and Gulf states, harassment of U.S. Navy vessels in the Gulf, rights abuses and a crackdown on dissent at home, imprisonment of U.S. citizens, and a failed 2011 plot to assassinate the then-Saudi ambassador in Washington.

The Obama administration said the JCPOA was a diplomatic success, cutting off all pathways to an Iranian nuclear weapons capability. Critics, including some leading non-proliferation experts, say it could allow Iran to become a nuclear threshold state once various sunset provisions expire, after periods ranging from 10 to 25 years from the start of the deal's implementation on January 16 last year.

During the election campaign, Trump pledged repeatedly to dismantle or re-negotiate what he described as one of the worst deals he had ever seen.

European Union foreign policy chief Federica Mogherini, who serves as overseer of the JCPOA, has disputed that Trump could change the agreement. She pointed out that it is a multilateral deal, enshrined in a U.N. Security Council resolution.



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Pence Warns North Korea That 'The Sword Stands Ready'" was posted at cnsnews.com on April 19, 2017. Following is the article.

Vice President Mike Pence sent another clear warning to North Korea on Wednesday, telling personnel aboard a Japan-based U.S. aircraft carrier that "all options are on the table" when dealing with the Stalinist regime.

Pence said the U.S. would work with allies and others in the region to apply diplomatic and economic pressure on the regime in Pyongyang until it abandons its nuclear and ballistic missile programs.

"But as all of you know," he continued, "readiness is the key, and you—the instruments of American policy—should know, all options are on the table."

"History will attest the soldier does not bear the sword in vain," Pence said.

"Those who would challenge our resolve or our readiness should know: We will defeat any attack and meet any use of conventional or nuclear weapons with an overwhelming and effective American response."

"The United States of America will always seek peace," he added. "But under President Trump, the shield stands guard, and the sword stands ready."

Pence was addressing U.S. military personnel and guests including Japanese sailors on the flight deck of the aircraft carrier USS Ronald Reagan, which is forward-deployed with the U.S. Seventh Fleet at the U.S. Navy base in Yokosuka, 40 miles south of Tokyo.

He said the North Korean regime had for more than a generation sought to develop nuclear weapons and the missiles with which to fire them, impoverishing its people and embittering the region in the process.

Through three American administrations, the U.S. and its allies had worked tirelessly to peacefully dismantle the nuclear program and alleviate the suffering of the North Korean people.

But time and again, the regime had answered the overtures with "willful deception, with broken promises, and nuclear and missile tests," he said.

"As President Trump has made clear to the world, the era of strategic patience is over."

Pence's broader message was directed not just at North Korea, but at any other "enemies of our freedom."

He said Trump's "strength and resolve" had been evident for the world to see in recent weeks, citing the cruise missile strike on a Syrian regime airbase and the dropping of a Massive Ordnance Air Blast bomb on an ISIS location in Afghanistan.

"The enemies of our freedom and this alliance would do well not to test the resolve of this president or the capabilities of the armed forces of the United States of America and our allies," he said to cheers and applause from the assembled personnel.

Elsewhere in his remarks, Pence also emphasized that the U.S. would uphold freedom of navigation and overflight in the South China Sea—where China's actions in support of its disputed territorial claims have sparked tensions in recent years.

The vice president also said the U.S. would promote peaceful dialogue and defend human rights, "because the dignity and worth of every person is an eternal value of the United States."



An editorial by Allen West titled "The Ugly Face of Socialism" was posted at townhall.com on April 20, 2017. Following is the article.

■ "Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery."—Sir Winston Churchill

■ “The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other peoples’ money.”—British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher

■ “Socialism only works in two places: Heaven where they don’t need it and hell where they already have it.”—President Ronald Reagan

I had my first introduction to the South American Country of Venezuela as a young Army Second Lieutenant at my Artillery officer basic course, class 2-84, in Ft. Sill Oklahoma. There I had as my artillery tactics instructor an exchange officer from the Venezuelan Army, Captain Gonzales.

Now, I have to admit, having been born and raised in Georgia and educated at the University of Tennessee, I did struggle a tad at first with his heavy accent. After a week or so I had no problem and would come to admire this strapping professional officer who seemed to just know everything.

He was an exceptional representative of a beautiful Nation. When we had down time, Captain Gonzales would share with us the true beauty of Venezuela. We would all ask ourselves, why didn’t the U.S. Army have a duty assignment in this nation of resource richness and extravagant landscapes?

I have recently found myself asking how is Captain Gonzales doing?

If you have been paying attention to the news you will see the ugly face of socialism in Captain Gonzales’ native land. It is as if the aforementioned quotes are being played out right before our eyes, but should we be surprised?

Recall how so many entertainment elites flocked to Venezuela when the tyrant and socialist dictator Hugo Chavez came to power. Folks like Sean Penn, Oliver Stone, Harry Belafonte, and others celebrated and dreamed of this utopia.

However, if these individuals had taken the time to read and study political philosophy they would have realized that socialism is rooted in five basic principles, tenets—wealth redistribution, nationalizing of production, expansion of the welfare state, social egalitarianism, and secular humanism. In my estimation, these are principles not to be admired but feared.

Hugo Chavez promised to take from a certain class, let’s call them producers, and reallocate to the masses. The problem with that is as Margaret Thatcher expressed, and those producers did as suspected, they fled. I lived in South Florida for a little over a decade after retiring from the Army in the City of Plantation.

Not far away was another suburban city in Broward County called Weston. In the city of Weston, you will see the American flag and another flag very prominently flying . . . it is the Venezuelan flag. There are those who affectionately call Weston Florida, “Westenzuela.” It is there that the great economic producers and those who did not share the vision of socialist hell fled, and it is a beautiful city.

Venezuela is without a doubt one of the richest nations in the world because it is blessed with infinite oil resources.

Yet, when Mr. Chavez came to power he nationalized those mean, horrible private oil companies. Now, those companies and resources have been poorly managed, and Venezuela is suffering what is possibly the highest rate of inflation in the world.

Therefore, the promise of giving everyone the profits from a nationalized oil industry has failed, miserably. To see and read the reports of that Country which made Captain Gonzales so very proud now having citizens, no, subjects, eating from garbage cans, and stores not having basic necessities stocked is appalling.

But, where are the American entertainment elites and advocates of socialism now? Yes, crickets.

Hugo Chavez, and now President Nicolas Maduro (funny thing, Maduro used to be a bus driver) championed the principle of social egalitarianism. You know, everyone is equal so everyone should have an equal footing, meaning status.

That reminds me of a simple quote, "a free people are not equal and an equal people are not free."

Socialism does not understand the idea of equality of opportunity, it advances that which is antithetical to individual liberty and sovereignty, the equality of outcomes. Additionally, the outcomes are then determined by people like a Chavez, Maduro, Bernie Sanders, Barack Obama, or Elizabeth Warren.

Maduro was a bus driver, and just imagine, Bernie Sanders did not truly earn a paycheck until he was almost into his 40s. That fella has done very well in government positions, having a beautiful lake home in Vermont, has he not? Socialism is ripe with hypocrisy as well.

Churchill had it right in that the ugly face of socialism is a "gospel of envy." It creates a fever pitch atmosphere of hatred to a defined group, the 1 per-centers. Then should we not all strive to be champions, the best, exceptional? No, the ugly face of socialism wants to keep us ignorant in order to foster that equal sharing of misery . . . the result of the equality of outcomes.

And what happens if the people eventually see the ugly face of socialism and reject it? Well first, it is necessary to disarm the people in order to have complete control over them.

Adolf Hitler's rise to power, and remember Nazi stood for National Socialism, began with disarming the German people and unleashing the feared Brown Shirts (SA).

In Venezuela today, Maduro is arming his own supporters, creating a militia, to gun down the unarmed protesters against his rule and consolidation of power. And where are the voices of the American entertainment elite, or Bernie Sanders? Perhaps there is a reason why the progressive socialist left in America is so adamant about gun control.

There is nothing trendy, cool, or desirable about socialism. And those who advocate it are, well, let me be blunt, lying, deceptive jackasses—the symbol of the Democratic Party. The ugly face of socialism has destroyed the beauty of Venezuela, turning what could be termed a little piece of heaven on earth into hell.

Let us commit that the beauty that is America shall not fall to the ugliness of socialism. For if that happens, where do we go?



An editorial by Jonah Goldberg titled "Trump is Borrowing From the Lame-Duck Playbook" was posted at townhall.com on April 19, 2017. Following is the article.

One of the (many) things that makes the Trump presidency so hard to read is that the chapters are all out of order.

Traditionally, during the transition period, presidents-elect are out of the limelight. But while Barack Obama was still in the White House, Donald Trump announced "deals" and appointments that made it seem as if he were already in office, hitting the ground running to Make America Great Again.

On the entirely subjective calculus of wins, he probably had more before his inauguration than any president.

Conversely, the first 100 days are supposed to be a time of big domestic legislative achievements. Instead, they've looked more like the lame-duck period of a president's second term.

Once sworn in, rather than get a political honeymoon with the news media, Trump had an angry divorce. And instead of giving Trump a big gift-wrapped box of legislation, Congress has mostly given him the sorts of headaches presidents have to deal with when they've lost their clout.

The White House is touting its raft of executive orders as proof that things are getting done and promises are being kept. That's a fair spin. Trump campaigned on repealing a slew of Obama's executive orders and other "job-killing" regulations.

But that doesn't change the fact that presidents usually turn to executive orders when getting big stuff through Congress is impossible and to prove they still have their mojo. Hence Obama's famous quip in 2014 that he still had "a pen and a phone."

There's another thing presidents famously do in their second terms, when Congress isn't interested in the president's agenda: retreat to foreign policy.

- Ronald Reagan concentrated on dealing with the Soviets.
- Bill Clinton focused on peace negotiations in Northern Ireland and the Middle East and his air war in the former Yugoslavia.
- George W. Bush launched the surge in Iraq, gave a shot at Israeli-Palestinian peace talks and ramped up a massive humanitarian effort to fight AIDS in Africa.
- Obama's second term was dominated by his obsession with getting a nuclear deal with Iran.

■ And now President Trump, early in his first term, is trying the same trick.

That's because, according to numerous reports from inside the shockingly leaky White House (another feature of lame duck presidencies, when staffers look to their own political future), Trump is eager for "wins." As Trump informal adviser Larry Kudlow told the *Washington Post*, "The president wants W's—he wants wins."

His biggest "W" to date was the appointment of Neil Gorsuch to the Supreme Court, which came when he turned to seasoned pros who know how to get things done in Washington, namely Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell and Leonard Leo of the Federalist Society. His other big "W" was his missile strike on Syria, for which he also had seasoned pros to thank: Defense Secretary James Mattis and National Security Adviser H.R. McMaster.

It's early yet, but that strike, combined with Trump's authorization of a massive bomb drop on an alleged Islamic State compound in Afghanistan, has yielded other apparent foreign policy W's. China seems to be cooperating in the administration's effort to squeeze the North Korean regime. Domestically, these moves succeeded in sucking some of the oxygen out of the media's feeding frenzy over allegations that Trump's campaign colluded with Russia and claims that he is a "puppet" of Russian President Vladimir Putin.

It seems a fair guess that Trump's response will be "more, please." As Fox News anchor Bret Baier recently put it, Trump is "not that ideological. He is more practical and he is looking for W's, wins. If you turn to the Pentagon and say, 'give me some wins,' they have got a long list of things that can produce W's."

Trump's sudden transformation into a foreign policy president isn't necessarily sinister. Obama's policy of "strategic patience" and "leading from behind" left a lot of low-hanging fruit for Trump to pluck.

The question is, what happens when the list of easy W's runs out?

There's little evidence that Trump is operating with a coherent strategic vision, which means that he won't have a thought-out criteria for knowing when to say no to the generals he clearly admires. For a true lame-duck president, that may not matter—when the W's run out, he's out of office. For a first-term president who just acts like a lame-duck president, it's another story.



An editorial by Ed Klein titled "Saint Hillary Loses Her Halo" was posted at townhall.com on April 18, 2017. Following is the article.

If you want to know where the Democratic Party is headed, think about this:

I've been writing about Hillary Clinton for almost 20 years—ever since the Monica Lewinsky scandal—and it will hardly come as a surprise to those of you who have read my books that my critical opinion of Hillary has made me a pariah among liberals—especially among the liberal mainstream media.

Before I started writing about Hillary, I wrote several books about the Kennedys, and in those days I was a welcome guest on the *Today Show*, *Good Morning America*, Charlie Rose, Larry King—practically everywhere on TV.

However, once I started portraying Hillary for what she is—an angry, self-righteous politician, who blames everybody but herself for her problems—I was no longer invited to sit with my old friends in front of a TV camera and discuss the news.

Well, folks, that may be about to change.

Two card-carrying members of the liberal mainstream media—Amie Parness and Jonathan Allen—who wrote a gushy book about Hillary a couple of years ago, have apparently seen the light.

They are coming out with a book today that tells it like it is. The book is called *Shattered: Inside Hillary Clinton's Doomed Campaign*, and it portrays Hillary as—you guessed it!—an angry, self-righteous politician who blames everybody but herself for her problems.

And why do I think this is important?

For the simple reason that the same Amie Parness—on the day before publication of her new book—wrote a piece for *The Hill*, a political newspaper, in which she described Bernie Sanders—not Hillary Clinton—as the key to rebuilding the Democratic Party as it struggles to find its identity after the devastating defeat in 2016.

Mark this date: The liberal mainstream media is leaving Hillary and moving further and further to the left—away from Saint Hillary and into the arms of the socialist Bernie Sanders.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled “Worse Than Racists” was posted at jewishworldreview.com on April 19, 2017. Following is the article.

As a group, black Americans have made the greatest gains—over some of the highest hurdles and in a very short span of time—of any racial group in mankind’s history. What’s the evidence?

If one totaled up the earnings of black Americans and considered us as a separate nation with our own gross domestic product, we would rank among the 20 richest nations. It was a black American, Gen. Colin Powell, who once headed the world’s mightiest military. Black Americans are among the world’s most famous personalities, and a few are among the world’s richest people.

The significance of these and other achievements is that at the end of the Civil War, neither a slave nor a slave owner would have believed such progress would be possible in a little over a century—if ever.

As such, it speaks to the intestinal fortitude of a people. Just as importantly, it speaks to the greatness of a nation in which such gains were possible.

Nowhere else on the face of the earth would such progress be possible except in the United States of America. The big and thorny issue that confronts our nation is how these gains can be extended to the one-third or more of the black population for whom they have proved elusive.

A major part of the solution should be the elimination of public and private policy that rewards inferiority and irresponsibility. Chief among the policies that reward inferiority and irresponsibility is the welfare state.

When some people know that they can have children out of wedlock, drop out of school and refuse employment and suffer little consequence, one should not be surprised to see the growth of such behavior.

The poverty rate among blacks is about 30 percent. It's seen as politically correct to blame today's poverty on racial discrimination, but that's nonsense.

Why?

The poverty rate among black intact husband-and-wife families has been in the single digits for more than two decades. Does one want to argue that racists discriminate against female-headed families but not husband-and-wife families?

Education is one of the ways out of poverty, but stupid political correctness stands in the way for many blacks.

For example, a few years ago, a white Charleston, South Carolina, teacher frequently complained of black students calling her a white b—, white m—f—, white c— and white ho. School officials told her that racially charged profanity was simply part of the students' culture and that if she couldn't handle it, she was in the wrong school. The teacher brought a harassment suit, and the school district settled out of court for \$200,000.

To suggest that such disrespectful and violent behavior, though it's observed in many predominantly black schools, is part of black culture is an insulting lie. Worse than that is the fact that such destructive behavior and lack of respect for authority is rewarded. We can see some of the results by visiting some city public schools where violence, disorder and disrespect is the order of the day.

Many whites are ashamed and saddened by our history of slavery, Jim Crow and gross racial discrimination. As a result, they often hold blacks accountable to standards and conduct they would never accept from whites.

A recent example is black students at colleges such as NYU, UC Berkeley, UCLA and Oberlin demanding racially segregated housing. Spineless college administrators have caved to their demands. These administrators would never even listen to a group of white students demanding white-only housing accommodations. These administrators and other guilt-ridden whites have one standard of conduct for whites and a lower standard for blacks.

Black people can be thankful that racist forms of double standards and public and private policies rewarding inferiority and irresponsibility were not broadly accepted during the 1920s, '30s, '40s and '50s. There would not have been the kind of intellectual excellence and spiritual courage that created the world's most successful civil rights movement.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled "Your Choice: A Green America or a Brown America" was posted at anncoulter.com on April 19, 2017. Following is the article.

In celebration of Earth Day this Saturday, let's review how the Sierra Club sold its soul and screwed the Earth for a \$100 million donation. They must hate themselves for it, so why shouldn't we hate them, too?

After Teddy Kennedy's 1965 immigration act began dumping millions of Third-Worlders on the country, the Sierra Club talked of little else besides reducing immigration.

In 1970, the club adopted a resolution complaining that the country's growing population was polluting the "air, water and land"—to the point that "our very survival (is) threatened."

In 1978, the Sierra Club adopted a resolution urging Congress to "conduct a thorough examination of U.S. immigration laws," noting that the United States, Canada and Australia were the only countries admitting "more than a handful of permanent immigrants."

In 1980, the club dropped its promotion of birth control, in order to focus on immigration. "It is obvious," the club said, "that the numbers of immigrants the United States accepts affects our population size and growth rate," even more than "the number of children per family."

In 1989, the club's Population Report expressly called for reducing the number of immigrants.

In 1990, the club's grassroots leaders voted overwhelmingly to launch a major national campaign on the immigration problem.

Even people who don't live in yurts can't help but notice the environmental damage being done by hundreds of thousands of Latin Americans clamoring across the border every year, setting fires, dumping litter, spray-painting gang signs in our parks and defacing ancient Indian petroglyphs.

The problem isn't just the number of people traipsing through our wilderness areas; it's that primitive societies have no concept of "litter." That's a quirk of prosperous societies. The damage to our parks shows these cultural differences.

Writing in an environmental journal at New York University, Rosa P. Oakes described the "reprehensible" damage being done to "towering cactus, Joshua

trees, flowering cactus varieties, colorful wildflowers and rock formations” by illegals. With accompanying photos, she noted that the immigrants’ litter included “abandoned vehicles . . . used needles, drug paraphernalia, plastic grocery bags, paper products, empty water containers, blankets, clothing, used disposable diapers, among other things.”

The Mexican cultural trait of littering is apparently well known to everyone—except American journalists.

As usual, when it comes to anything that reflects negatively on Third World immigrants, you have to be Agatha Christie to get at the truth. If the media can hide Hispanic child rape, it’s child’s play for them to ignore the Hispanic littering problem.

The best way to find out about garbage being dumped all over by our vibrant recent immigrants is to look at local news stories from any town that contains a Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

Here are three from last year:

Local politicians in heavily Hispanic Allentown, Pennsylvania, wanted to suck up to their constituents by renaming Seventh Street “Calle Siete.” Then it turned out that the Hispanic merchants on “Calle Siete” had no interest in this idea. Their No. 1 issue? Litter.

Dorcas Derivera, an immigrant from Guatemala, said in perfect English that if politicians wanted to do something useful, they would deal with the litter problem on Seventh Street, which she said she must pick up from the sidewalk before clients arrive.

“It’s embarrassing,” she told a local newspaper. “How am I going to do business?”

Also last year, in a classic MSM Hide-the-Mexican story, there were media reports of “racist” graffiti targeting “Hispanics and African-Americans” in San Leandro, California’s Marina Park. Obviously, graffiti directed at “Hispanics and African-Americans” could only have been left by one of those white supremacist gangs so prevalent on “Law and Order”!

Nope. It was Mexicans, again: The Nortenos, a Mexican gang. By “Hispanics,” the media meant “Hispanics other than the ones doing the graffiti.”

Then last October, the parks and recreation department in Decatur, Alabama, was again forced to remove goals from the soccer field because of the mountains of garbage routinely left behind. In the past decade, the soccer games had become “an increasingly popular social event among the Hispanic community.”

Would any of this be of interest to an alleged environmental group? It used to be—until the early 2000s.

That was when the Sierra Club was given \$100 million by hedge fund billionaire David Gelbaum in exchange for never opposing immigration again. The club said, How dare you ask us to abandon our principles for filthy lucre!

Just kidding! It said, SURE! Did you bring the check?

Mass Third World immigration is a triple whammy for the environment because:

- 1) Millions more people are tromping through our country;
- 2) The new people do not share Americans' love of nature and cleanliness; and
- 3) We're not allowed to criticize them.

One big advantage of taking white Western European immigrants is that we're permitted to complain about their grating cultural habits without being accused of "racism." (Also, there aren't that many of them.)

The Sierra Club didn't anticipate the PC reasons for preferring non-Third World immigrants, but simply wanted to stop so many people pouring into our country and stepping on the flowers. Which is why the club used to be nearly monomaniacally focused on reducing immigration.

By now, it's been a quarter-century since the Sierra Club cared about the environment. As is the fate of most groups that stick around long enough, today it's just another left-wing, hate-America interest group. Unfortunately, among the things the Sierra Club hates about America are its rivers, mountains, hiking trails, parks and wildlife.



Isaiah 55:6-11—"Seek you the LORD while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; let him return to the LORD, and He will have mercy on him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon. 'For My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways My ways,' says the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain comes down, and the snow from heaven, and do not return there, but water the earth, and make it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall My word be that goes forth from My mouth; it shall not return to Me void, but it shall accomplish what I please, and it shall prosper in the thing for which I sent it."