

Eye on the World

May 13, 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 May 13, 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 Bridget Johnson titled "Remedial ISIS Tutorial Steers Jihadists Toward Heavier, Deadlier Truck Attacks" was posted at pjmedia.com on May 5, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

The Islamic State just published a remedial step-by-step pictorial for lone jihadists on how to use a heavy vehicle to kill, walking would-be terrorists through how to acquire a vehicle and which targets to strike.

ISIS' monthly *Rumiyah* magazine, which publishes online in 10 languages including English, last covered vehicle attacks in their November issue "Just Terror Tactics" segment, using Mohamed Lahouaiej-Bouhlel, who plowed a cargo truck through a crowd of Bastille Day revelers in Nice, France, last summer, as their key example.

In that article, ISIS encouraged shying away from budget sedans and "off-roaders, SUVs, and four-wheel drive vehicles" that "lack the necessary attributes required for causing a blood bath" as "smaller vehicles lack the weight and wheel span required for crushing many victims." They recommended trucks with double wheels for "giving victims less of a chance to escape being crushed by the vehicle's tires." Long semi trucks were discouraged because of the possibility of jack-knifing.

The terror group encouraged jihadists to find a vehicle with a “metal outer frame which are usually found in older cars, as the stronger outer frame allows for more damage to be caused when the vehicle is slammed into crowds, contrary to newer cars that are usually made of plastics and other weaker materials.” A picture of a U-Haul truck was shown with the caption “an affordable weapon.” A picture of the Macy’s Thanksgiving Day parade was shown with the words “an excellent target.”

Shortly after the article was published, a ram-and-stab attack by Ohio State student Abdul Razak Ali Artan on a sidewalk full of students and faculty caused several injuries, but no fatalities. He used a silver sedan in the attack.

In December, Anis Amri hijacked a Polish semi truck and killed the driver, then plowed the big rig into a Christmas market in Berlin, killing 11.

This March, Khalid Masood rented the Hyundai Tuscon he used to run over five pedestrians on Westminster Bridge before crashing into the palace fence and stabbing a police officer. Last month, Rakhmot Akilov stole a beer truck and drove it down a busy Stockholm shopping street, killing four.

Eager to build on those attacks no matter the IQ of the jihadist, ISIS this week published the how-to with pictures—trying to steer terrorists toward vehicles more like Berlin and Stockholm.

“The ideal vehicle,” says the page, has a “slightly raised chassis and bumper,” is a “double-wheeled, load-bearing truck” that “large in size, heavy in weight” and is “fast in speed or rate of acceleration.”

Then comes the very remedial lesson on where to get the attack vehicle (“kafir” means disbeliever, while “murtadd” means apostate Muslim).

The suggestions for ideal targets also illustrates examples. Corresponding to “large outdoor festivals, conventions, celebrations, and parades” is a photo of an LGBT event.

A busy London street next to an Underground stop is shown as the “pedestrian-congested streets” example. After “outdoor markets,” ISIS suggests “outdoor rallies,” and uses a photo of a 2012 May Day rally in Paris.

After the Ohio State attack in which no one suffered life-threatening wounds, ISIS published a similar remedial pictorial telling lone jihadists how to go on stabbing sprees.

In the December issue of Rumiya, ISIS told knife jihadists to aim for the neck, chest or stomach and to pick a suitable blade while not choosing targets above their skill level.



An article by James M. Dorsey titled “Pakistan Caught in Middle As China’s OBOR Becomes Saudi—Iranian—India Battleground” was posted at huffpost.com on May 5, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Pakistani General Raheel Sharif walked into a hornet's nest when he stepped off a private jet in Riyadh two weeks ago to take command of a Saudi-led, 41-nation military alliance. Things have gone from bad to worse since.

General Shareef had barely landed when Saudi Deputy Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman dashed the Pakistani's hopes to include Iran in the alliance that nominally was created to fight terrorism rather than confront Iran.

The general's hopes were designed to balance Pakistan's close alliance with Saudi Arabia with the fact that it shares a volatile border with Iran and is home to the world's second largest Shiite Muslim community. General Sharif's ambition had already been rendered Mission Impossible before he landed with Saudi Arabia charging that Iran constitutes the world's foremost terrorist threat.

In a recent interview with the Saudi-owned Middle East Broadcasting television network, Prince Mohammed, who also serves as the kingdom's defense minister, has toughened Saudi Arabia's stance. Prince Mohammed appeared in line with statements by a senior US military official to hold out the possibility of exploiting aspirations of ethnic minorities in Iran to weaken its Islamic regime.

In doing so, Prince Mohammed and General Joseph L. Voltel, head of US Central Command, seemed to raise the spectre of increased violence in Balochistan, a volatile, once independent region that straddles both sides of the Iranian-Pakistani border, as well as in the Iranian province of Khuzestan, the Islamic republic's oil-rich region that is home to Iranians of Arab descent.

Ethnic and sectarian proxy wars could embroil rivals China and India in the Saudi-Iranian dispute. The deep-sea port of Gwadar in Balochistan is a lynchpin of China's One Belt, One Road initiative, and a mere 70 kilometres from the Indian-backed port of Chabahar in Iran, viewed by Saudi Arabia as a potential threat to one of the most important sea routes facilitating the flow of oil from the Gulf to Asia.

The risk of China's initiative as well as its regional rivalry with India becoming a Saudi-Iranian battleground appeared to increase with Prince Mohammed's warning that the battle between the two regional powers would be fought "inside Iran, not in Saudi Arabia."

In his interview, Prince Mohammed not only ruled out talks with Iran but painted the two countries' rivalry in sectarian terms. The prince asserted that Iran, a predominantly Shiite country, believes that "the Imam Mahdi (the redeemer) will come and they must prepare the fertile environment for the arrival of the awaited Mahdi and they must control the Muslim world . . ." "How do you have a dialogue with this?" Prince Mohammed asked.

Saudi Arabia had already signalled its support for Iranian dissidents when last July former Saudi intelligence chief and ambassador to the United States and Britain, Prince Turki al-Faisal, attended a rally in Paris organized by the exiled People's Mujahedin Organization of Iran or Mujahedin-e-Khalq, a militant left-

wing group that advocates the overthrow of Iran's Islamic regime and traces its roots to resistance against the shah who was toppled in the 1979 revolution. "Your legitimate struggle against the (Iranian) regime will achieve its goal, sooner or later. I, too, want the fall of the regime," Prince Turki told the rally.

Since then, General Voltel, avoiding any reference to sectarianism, told the US Senate Armed Services Committee, that "in order to contain Iranian expansion, roll back its malign influence, and blunt its asymmetric advantages, we must engage them more effectively in the 'grey zone' through means that include a strong deterrence posture, targeted counter-messaging activities, and by building partner nations' capacity . . . (We) believe that by taking proactive measures and reinforcing our resolve we can lessen Iran's ability to negatively influence outcomes in the future," General Voltel said.

Prince Mohammed did not spell out how he intends to take Saudi Arabia's fight to Iran, but a Saudi think tank, the Arabian Gulf Centre for Iranian Studies (AGCIS) argued in a recent study that Chabahar posed "a direct threat to the Arab Gulf states" that called for "immediate counter measures."

Written by Mohammed Hassan Husseinbor, identified as an Iranian political researcher, the study, published in the first edition of AGCIS' Journal of Iranian Studies, argued that Chabahar posed a threat because it would enable Iran to increase greater market share in India for its oil exports at the expense of Saudi Arabia, raise foreign investment in the Islamic republic and increase government revenues, and allow Iran to project power in the Gulf and the Indian Ocean.

Mr. Husseinbor suggested Saudi support for a low-level Baloch insurgency in Iran could serve as a countermeasure. "Saudis could persuade Pakistan to soften its opposition to any potential Saudi support for the Iranian Baluch . . . The Arab-Baluch alliance is deeply rooted in the history of the Gulf region and their opposition to Persian domination," Mr. Husseinbor said.

Noting the vast expanses of Iran's Sistan and Baluchestan Province, Mr. Husseinbor went on to say that "it would be a formidable challenge, if not impossible, for the Iranian government to protect such long distances and secure Chabahar in the face of widespread Baluch opposition, particularly if this opposition is supported by Iran's regional adversaries and world powers."

Saudi Arabia may already have the building blocks in place for a proxy war in Balochistan. Saudi-funded ultra-conservative Sunni Muslim madrassas operated by anti-Shiite militants dominate Balochistan's educational landscape.

Iran has accused the United States, Saudi Arabia and Pakistani intelligence of supporting anti-Iranian militants in Balochistan, including Jundallah (Soldiers of God), an offshoot of Sipah. Jundallah, founded by Abdolmalek Rigi, a charismatic member of a powerful Baloch tribe, was one of several anti-Iranian groups that enjoyed US and Saudi support as part of US President George W. Bush's effort to undermine the government in Tehran.

The spectre of ethnic proxy wars threatens to further destabilize the Gulf as well as Pakistan. The Baloch insurgency in Pakistani Balochistan has complicated Chinese plans to develop Gwadar and forced Pakistan to take extraordinary security precautions. A stepped-up proxy war could embroil Indian-backed Chabahar in the conflict. The wars could, moreover, spread to Iran's Khuzestan and Saudi Arabia's Eastern Province.

Writing in 2012 in *Asharq Al Awsat*, a Saudi newspaper, Amal Al-Hazzani, an academic who has since been dropped from the paper's roster after she wrote positively about Israel, asserted in an op-ed entitled "The oppressed Arab district of al-Ahwaz" that "the al-Ahwaz district in Iran . . . is an Arab territory . . . Its Arab residents have been facing continual repression ever since the Persian state assumed control of the region in 1925 . . . It is imperative that the Arabs take up the al-Ahwaz cause, at least from the humanitarian perspective." Other Arab commentators have since opined in a similar fashion.

Fuelling ethnic tensions risks Iran responding in kind. Saudi Arabia has long accused Iran of instigating low level violence and protests in its predominantly Shiite oil-rich Eastern Province as well as being behind the brutally squashed popular revolt in majority Shiite Bahrain and intermittent violence since. Rather than resolving conflicts, a Saudi-Iranian war fought with ethnic and religious proxies threatens to escalate violence in both the Gulf and South Asia.



A Reuters article by Tom James and Scott DiSavino "Tunnel Collapses at Washington Nuclear Waste Plant: No Radiation Released" was posted at reuters.com on May 9, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

A tunnel partly collapsed on Tuesday at a plutonium-handling facility at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington state, but there was no indication workers or the public were exposed to radiation, federal officials said.

Workers evacuated or took cover and turned off ventilation systems after damage was discovered in the wall of a transport tunnel about 170 miles (270 km) east of Seattle, officials with the Department of Energy's Hanford Joint Information Center said.

The damage was more serious than initially reported, and the take-cover order was expanded to cover the entire facility after response crews found a 400-square-foot section of the decommissioned rail tunnel had collapsed, center spokesman Destry Henderson said in a video posted on Facebook.

"The roof had caved in, about a 20-foot section of that tunnel, which is about a hundred feet long," he said.

"This is purely precautionary. No employees were hurt and there is no indication of a spread of radiological contamination," Henderson said of the shelter order.

No spent nuclear fuel is stored in the tunnel, Energy Department officials said. Energy Department Secretary Rick Perry has been briefed on the incident.

Tom Carpenter, the executive director with watchdog organization Hanford Challenge who has spoken with workers at the site since the incident, called the tunnel collapse worrisome and said the evacuation was the correct call.



An article by Sarah Stites titled “All Quiet on the Feminist Front: Sexist Attacks on Women in the Trump Administration” was posted at newsbusters.org on May 8, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Incest. Prostitution. Brainless beauty. Liberal media people have accused prominent women in the Trump administration of these and more. Yet, hypocritically, feminists have been slow to defend Kellyanne Conway, Ivanka and Melania Trump against these blatantly sexist attacks.

The most recent example: on May 5, *Real Time* host Bill Maher suggested that the first daughter was in a sexual relationship with her father—Maher’s second televised joke about incest between Donald and Ivanka Trump.

- Feminists made no outcry, revealing a striking fact about the girls’ club—While feminists claim to advance women, many discount conservatives, revile them or ignore sexist attacks against them.

- The message is clear: only progressive women deserve defense.

Kellyanne Conway

Conway made history as the only victorious female presidential campaign manager and then became a senior counselor to the president. Feminists, who should applaud her accomplishments and high position in the administration, instead despise her.

The career woman and mother of four has been subject to base attacks from liberal media, including *Saturday Night Live*, the *New York Times* and other outlets. Now, she’s been characterized as a slut and a stalker. Talk show host Chelsea Handler even joked about putting her in the microwave.

In February, *SNL* regular Kate McKinnon assumed her Conway persona in a controversial sketch parodying Glenn Close in the movie *Fatal Attraction*. Implying that the political counselor was so hungry for exposure that she would grant sexual favors to news correspondents in exchange for airtime, lingerie-clad McKinnon attempted to seduce Jake Tapper (Beck Bennett), even holding a knife to his throat.

Many journalists, including the hosts of ABC’s *Good Morning America*, agreed that the sketch went “too far.”

But Whoopi Goldberg and her fellow hosts of ABC's *The View* clearly found it amusing. Smiling, Goldberg called it a "great thing," while co-host Sunny Hostin found it "really, really well done."

Feminist media like *Cosmo* and *Teen Vogue*—outlets that are usually quick to point out sexism—were remarkably silent.

Vanity Fair's Joanna Robinson called the short video *SNL*'s "edgiest take on Trump's top adviser," but she proffered no criticism of the hyper-sexualized, violent content.

Similarly, although *Vox*'s Caroline Framke did concede that the video was a "little bit sexist," she chose to focus on *SNL*'s new manner of portraying Conway as "a ruthlessly ambitious extension of Trump . . . willing to do what it takes to get her way."

While Chelsea Clinton admirably defended Conway, her mother did not. And as Carpenter noted, Jake Tapper gave Nancy Pelosi an on-air opportunity to condemn Richmond's insult, but the House Minority Leader instead shrugged that she didn't know the details of the situation.

Conway has truly received the worst of both kind of female-directed attacks—she is either sexualized or ridiculed for her appearance. While some feminists have been logically consistent, defending Conway from the latter, others have not.

In a piece titled "What Do Feminists Owe Kellyanne Conway?" Jezebel writer Stassa Edwards condemned sexism but was simultaneously reticent to defend Trump's counselor. "I'm not certain that expending energy on defending Conway is in the best interest of 'all women' or if it's simply in the interest of maintaining the sanctity of the white feminine body," she wrote.

Ivanka Trump

When the Wharton-educated first daughter is not the target of incest jokes, media people have called her offensive names, reduced her to her appearance and condemned her as a faux feminist. Presumably, feminists only guard "their own" against sexist digs, as few have come to Ivanka's defense.

On their respective talk shows, hosts Bill Maher and Trevor Noah both implied indecency between Ivanka and Donald Trump. Maher's recent incest quip, involving a suggestive hand gesture, is not his first. In February, while discussing Nordstrom's discontinuation of Ivanka's clothing line, he crudely joked: "You know what, of all the people, Mr. Businessman, he should understand, they dropped it because the merchandise just wasn't moving. The only one interested in getting in Ivanka's pants is him."

Noah echoed the vulgarity. "I feel the first rule of Ethics Club is 'Don't hire your daughter,' " he stressed on the *Daily Show*. "This is one of those stories that goes so deep: Nepotism, conflicts of incest, compromise of national security."

Buzzfeed Senior Culture Writer Anne Petersen did not go quite so far, but she was similarly critical. Analyzing pictures of the father and daughter together,

she wrote: "These photos aren't proof of an improper relationship, but they connote a certain type of relationship: in which Ivanka was trained, from an early age, to think of herself as either a possession or a prop."

Despite Ivanka's successes and her degree from Pennsylvania's prestigious Wharton Business School, the former model has been continually denigrated for her good looks.

On one hand, few liberal journalists take her seriously.

Yet while they ridicule the first daughter, feminists can't stand her successes.

Elle's Sady Doyle went full force against the first daughter in a December 15 hit piece actually condemning her for her triumphs. "Trumpism is unsurvivable for women who do not happen to be exceptional Iivankas," Doyle wrote. "The goal of Trumpism is not to benefit women. The goal is to benefit one woman, Ivanka, or the one type of woman she represents."

Doyle went on to denounce Trump's feminism as "femvertising." In the same vein, Petersen attacked the first daughter for her "insidious brand of post-feminism" in a piece ominously titled: "Don't Cry for Ivanka—Fear Her."

Melania Trump

Liberal media people have primarily slandered the first lady for her appearance and modeling career, calling her everything from an "Instagram first lady" to a "hooker."

Last month, the *Daily Mail* issued an official apology to Melania Trump, agreeing to pay the former model nearly \$3 million in damages for promoting the claim that she worked as an escort—hardly the only libelous claim Trump has faced.

During a segment with Rachel Maddow, *New York Times* Pulitzer Prize winning reporter David Cay Johnston commented that Trump had done "very sleazy porn." Although Maddow objected with a "Hey hey hey," the media ignored the slanderous accusation.

In February, model Emily Ratajkowski tweeted that a *New York Times* journalist had called Trump a "hooker." The reporter, Jacob Bernstein, later apologized, but not all feminists came to Trump's defense. "No woman ever should be called a 'hooker'—but it is fair game to call out Melania Trump as a slut-shaming enabler," *Teen Vogue* writer Emily Lindin tweeted.

When it comes to the First Lady's looks, the *Washington Post's* Robin Givhan was quick to critique Trump's official portrait, taken by photographer Regine Mahaux. "Mahaux has given the public a two-dimensional version of Trump: just the gloss, just the façade. Trump is the fantasy, the dream . . . An Instagram first lady."

In a piece titled "Inside the Trump Marriage: Melania's Burden," *Vanity Fair* contributing editor Evgenia Peretz suggested that the first lady married for money. "Until November 8," Peretz wrote, "Melania Trump's marriage provid-

ed her with a golden Fifth Avenue fortress, at a price—putting up with her husband’s humiliations and boorishness.”

Stephanie Grisham, Melania’s spokesperson, firmly condemned the negative suppositions. “*Vanity Fair* chose to publish not only a false story, but one that is degrading to women,” she wrote in an email to *The Huffington Post*. “When you consider it is a magazine that is tailored to women, it becomes even more offensive.”

And that is exactly the problem.



An article by Terry Jeffrey titled “Repeal Bill Doesn’t Repeal Statutory Basis of Abortifacient Mandate” was posted at townhall.com on May 10, 2017. Following is the article.

The Obamacare repeal bill the Republican-controlled House passed last week—the American Health Care Act—does not repeal the section in the Obamacare law that created the statutory authority for the Executive Branch to issue a regulation requiring most health insurance plans to cover contraceptives, sterilizations and abortion-inducing drugs and devices.

Even if the Republicans enact their “repeal,” the most outrageous part of the Obamacare law will stand.

That part of President Barack Obama’s Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is a classic example of covert legislation.

It is discretely titled: “Coverage of preventive health services.” It never uses the words “contraceptive” or “sterilization” or “abortifacient.”

What it does say is: “A group health plan and a health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage shall, at a minimum provide coverage for and shall not impose any cost sharing requirements for . . . with respect to women, such additional preventive care and screenings not described in paragraph (1) as provided for in comprehensive guidelines supported by the Health Resources and Services Administration for purposes of this paragraph.”

How many Americans have ever heard of the Health Resources and Services Administration?

Yet, empowered by one passage in the Obamacare law, this federal agency issued a regulatory mandate that became the greatest attack on freedom of conscience in the history of the United States.

It said most health insurance plans must cover: “All Food and Drug Administration approved contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures, and patient education and counseling for all women of reproductive capacity.”

All FDA approved “contraceptive methods” included abortion-inducing drugs and IUDs. Contraceptive “education and counselling” included government-compelled morally objectionable speech.

In a 2011 letter to the Department of Health and Human Services, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops argued that this regulation not only violated the freedom of conscience of religious organizations but also of individuals and insurance providers.

“Individuals with a moral or religious objection to these items and procedures will now be affirmatively barred by the HHS mandate from purchasing a plan that excludes those items,” said the Catholic bishops.

“Religiously affiliated insurers with a moral or religious objection likewise will be affirmatively barred from offering a plan that excludes them to the public, even to members of their own religion,” the bishops said.

In defense of its contraception-sterilization-abortifacient regulation, the Obama administration took the Little Sisters of the Poor all the way to the Supreme Court. It sought to force an order of nuns—whose mission is to care for the elderly poor—to be complicit in the taking of innocent life through the distribution of abortifacients.

There is one word for this: Evil.

Last week, President Donald Trump had members of the Little Sisters of the Poor with him when he signed an executive order “promoting free speech and religious liberty.”

“With this executive order, we are ending the attacks on your religious liberty, and we are proudly reaffirming America’s leadership role as a nation that protects religious freedom for everyone,” Trump told the Little Sisters.

But Trump’s order itself did not nullify—or unambiguously call for the complete nullification—of the Obamacare contraception-sterilization-abortifacient regulation.

“The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services,” said the relevant part, “shall consider issuing amended regulations, consistent with applicable law, to address conscience-based objections to the preventive-care mandate promulgated under section 300gg-13(a)(4) of title 42, United States Code.”

The section of the U.S. Code referenced here is precisely the section of the Obamacare law that authorized the contraception-sterilization-abortifacient regulation in the first place.

And Trump’s executive order did not tell the secretaries of Treasury, Labor and HHS to terminate the regulation the Obama administration based on this section of the law, it merely told them “to consider issuing amended regulations.”

HHS Secretary Tom Price issued a statement about Trump’s order that said the department would be taking action to protect the conscience rights of employers who buy insurance for their workers. But he did not mention indi-

vidual Americans who, under the existing regulation, are forced to buy insurance in the individual market that covers contraceptives, sterilizations and abortifacients.

“We will be taking action in short order to follow the president’s instruction to safeguard the deeply held religious beliefs of Americans who provide health insurance to their employees,” said Price.

The Kaiser Family Foundation has published a comparison of the Obamacare law and the AHCA the Republican House passed to repeal it. This comparison notes that the requirement “for individual and group plans to cover preventive benefits, such as contraception . . . with no cost sharing is not changed.” A Republican congressional aide familiar with the legislation confirmed that this is the case.

That is not good enough. Even if the Trump administration issues “amended regulations” that completely protect the freedom of conscience of every American from the Obama-era contraception-sterilization-abortifacient mandate, those amended regulations could be reversed by the next Democratic administration—so long as the underlying law is not repealed.

The Republican leaders of this Congress promised America they would repeal Obamacare. As of now, they are not planning to repeal even the most outrageous part of it.



An article by Bernard Goldberg titled “President Trump’s Secret Weapon” was posted at townhall.com on May 9, 2017. Following is the article.

He can’t go 10 minutes without saying something—let’s be diplomatic here and call it . . . provocative.

He, of course, is President Trump, who has said some—more diplomacy—interesting things of late.

First, there’s Trump’s understanding of American history. He said he believes that President Andrew Jackson saw the Civil War coming and was angry about it.

Could be, but Andrew Jackson died 16 years before the war started.

Trump also said that Jackson, “Would never have let it happen!”

Could be, again, but Andrew Jackson owned slaves in his native Tennessee and might very well have let it happen. And many historians believe the war was inevitable, given how long bad blood between the North and South had been simmering.

Then there’s North Korea.

President Trump said he would be willing to meet with Kim Jong Un “under the right circumstances” to defuse tensions over North Korea’s nuclear pro-

gram. "If it would be appropriate for me to meet with him, I would absolutely, I would be honored to do it," Trump said.

A meeting is one thing—diplomacy is always a good place to start. But honored to do it?

Honored . . . to meet with a despot who threatens the United States every chance he gets? Honored . . . to meet with a tyrant who doesn't tolerate anything resembling dissent and isn't averse to murdering his opponents?

Maybe the president was just being polite. Or maybe he was just shooting from the lip, improvising foreign policy on the fly.

So let's leave North Korea and go to the Philippines—and another authoritarian leader our president would like to sit down with (at the White House).

Maybe President Trump isn't aware that since Philippines President Rodrigo Duterte took office nearly a year ago, he has overseen a campaign of extrajudicial executions of suspected drug addicts and drug dealers that has claimed more than 7,000 lives.

So, is a sit-down with a despot like Duterte—at the White House no less—a meeting that would give him a patina of legitimacy, good policy? Off the top of my head, I'd say no.

Despite all the needless turmoil he stirs up, President Trump has a secret weapon, unintended allies in unexpected places. They're the Trump-hating progressives on the loony left who are doing their best to make him look good.

If it isn't Stephen Colbert's vulgar rant on national television aimed at the president, or left-wing masked anarchists violently disrupting May Day rallies, or liberal thugs on college campuses shutting down conservative speakers they don't like—when they're not yelling about "inappropriate" Halloween costumes, then it's really important stuff—like accusing the president of bigotry because he calls their progressive heroine Senator Elizabeth Warren . . . Pocahontas.

Note to the crazy left: As a general rule, unhinged doesn't play well among moderates who live between the coasts.

But now progressives have taken their anger to a whole new level: Some have actually canceled their subscriptions to the newspaper they have long accepted as their progressive bible—*The New York Times*.

What ghastly sin did the *Times* commit? They hired former *Wall Street Journal* columnist Bret Stephens, a Pulitzer Prize-winning conservative and a member of the never-Trump club.

If only, in his first column for the *Times*, Stephens had stuck it to the despised Trump. But he didn't.

Instead, he had the gall to challenge the liberal party line on one of the left's holiest of sacred cows—global warming.

“While the modest (0.85 degrees Celsius, or about 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit) warming of the Northern Hemisphere since 1880 is indisputable,” Stephens wrote, “as is the human influence on that warming, much else that passes as accepted fact is really a matter of probabilities. That’s especially true of the sophisticated but fallible models and simulations by which scientists attempt to peer into the climate future.”

In other words, we can be sure of what’s happening now and what’s already happened but we can’t be certain of what’s going to happen years and years into the future.

Because of his blasphemy, many *Times* readers had a meltdown of nuclear proportions. Taking to Twitter they said:

- “Bret Stephens first op-ed for the *NYT* is an abomination.”
- “It’s really a shame what has happened to this once-great newspaper.”
- “Democracy dies in the darkness. So, too, the climate. Thanks, *Times*, for spreading fake opinion.”
- David French put it elegantly in *National Review Online*: “The only people who can’t recognize that our nation has a ‘smug liberal’ problem are smug liberals.”

But these smug liberals may wind up being Donald Trump’s ace in the hole, because a lot of Americans—whether they like Donald Trump or not—find left wing smugness far more annoying than the president.

Crazy as it sounds, they may turn out to be Donald Trump’s most potent political allies, as we get closer to 2018.

Stay tuned.



An article by Katie Pavlich titled “10 Times Democrats Slammed James Comey, Called for His Firing” was posted at townhall.com on May 10, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

A number of Democrats in Washington D.C. this morning are expressing outrage over President Trump’s firing of FBI Director James Comey. But it wasn’t long ago that many of them called Comey unfit for public office, said they lacked confidence in his ability to lead the Bureau and called for his firing.

Here is a listing of the 10 people.

1. Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer
2. Democrat Rep. Jerry Nadler
3. Former MSNBC host Keith Olbermann

4. Democratic National Committee
5. Former Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta
6. Think Progress (founded by John Podesta) Justice Editor Ian Millhiser
7. Liberal *Newsweek* columnist Kurt Eichenwald
8. House Leader Nancy Pelosi
9. Former Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid
10. Former head of the Congressional Black Caucus G.K. Butterfield



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.”