

Eye on the World

June 10, 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 June 10, 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 editorial by Charles Krauthammer titled "Why Middle East Peace Starts in Saudi Arabia" was posted at washingtonpost.com on May 25, 2017. Following is the article.

Irving Kristol wrote: "Whom the gods would destroy, they first tempt to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict."

The quixotic American pursuit of Middle East peace is a perennial. It invariably fails, yet every administration feels compelled to give it a try. The Trump administration is no different.

It will fail as well. To be sure, no great harm has, as yet, come from President Trump's enthusiasm for what would be "the ultimate deal." It will, however, distract and detract from remarkable progress being made elsewhere in the Middle East.

That progress began with Trump's trip to Saudi Arabia, the first of his presidency—an unmistakable declaration of a radical reorientation of U.S. policy in the region. Message: The appeasement of Iran is over.

Barack Obama's tilt toward Iran in the great Muslim civil war between Shiite Iran and Sunni Arabs led by Saudi Arabia was his reach for Nixon-to-China glory. It ended ignominiously.

The idea that the nuclear deal would make Iran more moderate has proved spectacularly wrong, as demonstrated by its defiant ballistic missile launches, its indispensable support for the genocidal Assad regime in Syria, its backing of the Houthi insurgency in Yemen, its worldwide support for terrorism, its relentless anti-Americanism and commitment to the annihilation of Israel.

These aggressions were supposed to abate. They didn't. On the contrary, the cash payments and the lifting of economic sanctions—Tehran's reward for the nuclear deal—have only given its geopolitical thrusts more power and reach.

The reversal has now begun. The first act was Trump's Riyadh address to about 50 Muslim states (the overwhelming majority of them Sunni) signaling a wide Islamic alliance committed to resisting Iran and willing to cast its lot with the American side.

That was objective No. 1. The other was to turn the Sunni powers against Sunni terrorism. The Islamic State is Sunni. Al-Qaeda is Sunni. Fifteen of the 9/11 hijackers were Saudi. And the spread of Saudi-funded madrassas around the world has for decades inculcated a poisonous Wahhabism that has fueled Islamist terrorism.

Saudi Arabia and the other Gulf states publicly declaring war on their bastard terrorist child is significant. As is their pledge not to tolerate any semiofficial support or private donations. And their opening during the summit of an anti-terrorism center in Riyadh.

After eight years of U.S. policy hovering between neglect and betrayal, the Sunni Arabs are relieved to have America back. A salutary side effect is the possibility of a detente with Israel.

That would suggest an outside-in approach to Arab-Israeli peace: a rapprochement between the Sunni state and Israel (the outside) would put pressure on the Palestinians to come to terms (the inside). It's a long-shot strategy but it's better than all the others.

Unfortunately, Trump muddied the waters a bit in Israel by at times reverting to the opposite strategy—the inside-out—by saying that an Israeli-Palestinian deal would "begin a process of peace all throughout the Middle East."

That is well-worn nonsense. Imagine if Israel disappeared tomorrow in an earthquake. Does that end the civil war in Syria? The instability in Iraq? The fighting in Yemen? Does it change anything of consequence amid the intra-Arab chaos? Of course not.

And apart from being delusional, the inside-out strategy is at present impossible. Palestinian leadership is both hopelessly weak and irredeemably rejectionist. Until it is prepared to accept the legitimacy of the Jewish state—which it has never done in the 100 years since the Balfour Declaration committed Britain (and later the League of Nations) to a Jewish homeland in Palestine—there will be no peace.

It may come one day. But not now. Which is why making the Israel-Palestinian issue central, rather than peripheral, to the epic Sunni-Shiite war shaking the Middle East today is a serious tactical mistake. It subjects any now-possible reconciliation between Israel and the Arab states to a Palestinian veto.

Ironically, the Iranian threat that grew under Obama offers a unique opportunity for U.S.-Arab and even Israeli-Arab cooperation. Over time, such cooperation could gradually acclimate Arab peoples to a nonbelligerent stance toward Israel.

Which might in turn help persuade the Palestinians to make some concessions before their fellow Arabs finally tire of the Palestinians' century of rejectionism.

Perhaps that will require a peace process of sorts. No great harm, as long as we remember that any such Israeli-Palestinian talks are for show—until conditions are one day ripe for peace.

In the meantime, the real action is on the anti-Iranian and anti-terrorism fronts. Don't let Oslo-like mirages get in the way.



An article by Leah Barkoukis titled "Egypt's Christians Come Under Attack When Gunmen Storm Bus, Killing 26" was posted at townhall.com on May 26, 2017. Following is the article.

Christians came under attack in Egypt Friday [May 26] when eight to 10 gunmen dressed in military uniform stormed a bus, killing 26 and injuring 25 others.

No group has claimed responsibility for the attack but Coptic Christians in the country have increasingly been targeted by the Islamic State, which called them their "favorite prey" in a video released in February by an ISIS affiliate.

In December, a suicide bomber killed nearly 30 people in a crowded church. Then, in April, twin suicide bombings at Coptic churches in Alexandria and Tanta killed 47 people, injuring more than 100 others. ISIS claimed responsibility for all three attacks.

According to Egyptian state TV, the bus attack took place while the Christians were traveling to St. Samuel Monastery in Minya governorate, south of Cairo, Fox News reports.



An article by Lizzie Deardon titled "London Attack Latest: Footage Shows Terrorists Running Toward Armed Police Before Being Shot Dead" was posted at independent.co.uk on June 8, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Footage has emerged showing the moment armed police shot the three London Bridge attackers dead, stopping their bloody rampage.

Three officers arrived on the scene in Borough Market as a man was being stabbed by one of the assailants, while others attempted to enter a pub that had its doors barricaded shut.

Members of the public are seen throwing a chair and other missiles in an attempt to stop the stabbing when a City of London Police unit pulls up at speed.

The armed officers emerged and took aim at the three terrorists, shooting two dead in seconds as they ran towards them.

One of the terrorists, believed to be ringleader Khuram Butt, rushed towards an officer wielding a large knife, forcing him to retreat as he opened fire.

One of the officers tripped over a falling attacker before recovering and circling the terrorists' bodies as reinforcements from the Metropolitan Police arrived.

The vests worn by Butt, Rachid Redouane and Youssef Zaghba were afterwards revealed to be fake but the officers were praised for their bravery.

"I am humbled by the bravery of an officer who will rush towards a potential suicide bomber thinking only of protecting others," Assistant Commissioner Rowley said.

The trio of terrorists had already killed eight people and injured dozens more in an attack lasting just quarter of an hour.

Police said the rampage started at 9.58pm, when they rammed a hired van into pedestrians on London Bridge, before crashing the vehicle and emerging with large knives and attacking people at random in bars and restaurants surrounding Borough Market.

All three men were dead within eight minutes of the first call to police. The Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) has opened a routine investigation into their deaths, as well as the injury to a member of the public who was hit by a stray bullet.



An article by Thomas Erdbrink titled "At Least 12 Killed in Pair of Terrorist Attacks in Iran" was posted at nytimes.com on June 7, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Armed assailants, including some disguised as women, stunned Iran on Wednesday with brazen attacks on the Parliament building and the tomb of its revolutionary founder, the worst terrorist strike to hit the Islamic republic in years.

At least 12 people were killed and 46 were wounded in the near-simultaneous assaults, which lasted for hours, clearly took Iran's elite security forces by surprise and shattered the self-proclaimed image of calm in a turbulent region.

The six known attackers also were killed, official news media said, and five suspects were reported detained. Their identities were not made clear.

“We will avenge the blood of those martyred in today’s terrorism attacks,” said Brig. Gen. Hossein Salami, deputy commander of the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps, the country’s powerful paramilitary force.

In a statement, the Revolutionary Guards appeared to blame Saudi Arabia and the United States for the assaults even as responsibility for them was asserted by the Islamic State, the Sunni extremist group that has taken credit for terrorist attacks around the world in the past few weeks.

If the Islamic State’s claim is true, that would be its first successful attack in Iran, which is predominantly Shiite Muslim and regarded by Sunni militants as a nation of heretics. Iranian-backed forces in Iraq and Syria are helping battle the Islamic State.

Eleven people died in the Parliament building assault, and one at the mausoleum of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, father of the 1979 revolution, whose shrine is a magnet for visitors. Four of the assailants were killed at the Parliament building, official news media said, and two at the mausoleum. Five were men, and one mausoleum assailant was a woman.

The audacity of the assaults, and the hours it took to end them, suggested that Iranian security officials had been caught unprepared—especially for what seemed like a coordinated plan conceived well in advance.



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled “When YouTube Banned Me, But Not the Hate Imams” was posted at michellemalkin.com on June 7, 2017. Following is the article.

One of the many maddening takeaways from the London Bridge jihad attack is this: If you post videos on YouTube radicalizing Muslim viewers to kill innocent people, YouTube will leave you alone.

But if you post a video on YouTube honoring innocent people murdered by barbaric jihadists, your video will get banned.

I know. It happened to me in 2006. Eleven years later, the selective censors at Google-YouTube still can’t competently distinguish terrorist hate speech from political free speech. Islamic hate preachers such as Ahmad Musa Jibril, whose bloodthirsty rants against non-Muslims reportedly inspired the London Bridge ringleader, have flourished.

Meanwhile, other anti-jihad and conservative content creators have been throttled, flagged, demonetized and kicked off the site since the P.C. hammer first came down on me.

My two-minute clip, which I titled “First, They Came,” spotlighted authors, editors, politicians, and other targets of Islamic intolerance and violence.

Among those featured in the video on radical Islam's war on Western free speech were the following.

- Theo van Gogh, the Dutch filmmaker murdered by jihadist Mohammed Bouyeri for his outspoken criticism of Muslim misogyny
- Salman Rushdie, whom the Ayatollah Khomeini cast a fatwa upon after he published the "blasphemous" "The Satanic Verses"
- Oriana Fallaci, the fiery journalist put on trial in Italy for "defaming Islam"
- The editors of the Danish Jyllands-Posten newspaper, who faced death threats for publishing cartoons of Mohammed, which prompted violent riots and terror plots around the world.

I contrasted the plight of those killed with the hordes of Muslim protesters in London's safe spaces fearlessly waving their signs demanding that the faithful "Behead all those who insult Islam" and "Exterminate those who slander Islam."

Several months later, YouTube yanked the innocuous, harmless, nonviolent, nonprofane, nonhateful, and nonthreatening mini-film. The company informed me that the video contained "inappropriate content." I complained across social media—posting additional YouTube videos calling attention to the ban.

But "First, They Came" stayed deep-sixed on my YouTube channel. Other bloggers and video consumers tried to subvert the censors by posting the clip on their sites; it became a game of whack-a-mole as the YouTube police hunted it down.

Counterjihad activists nicknamed YouTube "JihadTube" or "Dhimmitube" to mock the censors' acquiescence to Islamist restrictions on acceptable speech by infidels—as Islamic radicalization videos festered on the site.

Three pieces in The New York Times covered my skirmish over the little video. Reporter Tom Zeller Jr. reported that YouTube had emailed him a statement suggesting that my video "violated the company's terms of service."

YouTube also told the newspaper, "Our customer support team reviews all flagged videos before removing them."

The statement "specifically referred to the part of the YouTube user agreement that forbids users from submitting material that is 'unlawful, obscene, defamatory, libelous, threatening, pornographic, harassing, hateful, racially or ethnically offensive, or encourages conduct that would be considered a criminal offense, give rise to civil liability, violate any law, or is otherwise inappropriate.' "

George Washington University law professor Jeffrey Rosen wrote in a New York Times magazine article on "Google's Gatekeepers" that he "watched the 'First, They Came' video, which struck me as powerful political commentary that contains neither hate speech nor graphic violence, and I asked why it was taken down. According to a YouTube spokesman, the takedown was a routine one that hadn't been reviewed by higher-ups."

Only after receiving fair exposure in *The New York Times* (my, how times and the *Times* have changed) did the video magically reappear on my channel.

Now, contrast Google/YouTube's ridiculous stifling of "First, They Came" with its hands-off treatment of murder-inciting videos of hate imams Ahmad Musa Jibril and Abu Haleema.

Their rancid rants encouraging jihad by the sword and murder of non-Muslims have racked up millions of views over the past five years. Millions. Counterterrorism officials in multiple countries have tied their social media poison to jihad plots. The company told *Conservative Review's* Jordan Schachtel that it had reviewed the hate imams' channels and "found that they do not violate YouTube's guidelines on extremist or hateful content."

The enlightened peace-and-love progressives of Silicon Valley don't just have egg on their faces. They have blood on their hands.



An article by Gage Cohen titled "Flashback: President Clinton Called for 'Deporting Twice As Many Illegal Aliens'" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 6, 2017. Following is the article.

In his 1995 State of the Union speech, then-President Bill Clinton repeatedly dared to repeatedly use the term "illegal aliens" while calling for tighter border security and doubling deportations.

In his speech, Clinton recognized that people "are rightly disturbed by the large numbers of illegal aliens entering our country." He called for the border to be secured, hiring a record number of border guards, and "deporting twice as many illegal aliens as before."

Clinton even expressed umbrage that illegal aliens were stealing jobs from actual U.S. citizens.

"The jobs they hold might otherwise be held by citizens or legal immigrants. The public services they use impose burdens on our taxpayers," Clinton told the audience. "We are a nation of immigrants, but we are also a nation of laws."

Clinton received a large standing ovation for his remarks.

His wife, Former U.S. senator (D-NY) and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, as recently as 2006, was also in support of securing the border. As a senator, Clinton voted in support of building a wall on the southern border.

Much of what Clinton stated and proposed in his 1995 speech has been echoed by President Donald Trump.

However, the Democratic Party's platform on illegal immigration has shifted drastically from where it was under President Clinton.

The Democrat Party's official website states: "Democrats in Congress and in states and cities across the country are already standing up to Trump's hatred and bigotry to defend their immigrant neighbors."

In 2014, Hillary Clinton said that deportation "makes no sense."

Many Democrats have supported sanctuary cities, where existing immigration law is not enforced by city officials.

In January, Rep. Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), House Minority Leader, said that illegal immigrants in sanctuary cities aren't breaking the law, calling them "law-abiding citizens."



An article by the Newsbusters Staff titled "Bozell Demands CNN Cut Ties With Aslan After Profanity-Laced Tirade Against Trump" was posted at newsbusters.org on June 5, 2017. Following is the article.

CNN host Reza Aslan went on a profanity-laced tirade against Donald Trump over the weekend. Media Research Center President Brent Bozell called out Aslan and the liberal cable network.

He issued the following statement: "It's up to CNN President Jeff Zucker to cut ties with Mr. Aslan and ensure he will no longer have a show on CNN, which still lists him as a host on its website. We will call on him to do so and report back to the public what CNN's formal position is. Certainly, Mr. Zucker would sever ties if a CNN host had said the same thing about President Obama. The Media Research Center continues to put all media personalities on notice: we will publicly call out your media outlets—and the decision makers at those outlets—in the event of any personal, character assassination attacks."

In March, Aslan shamefully tried to connect bomb threats against Jewish community centers to "rhetoric that's coming out of the White House."

In September of 2015, he derided the Republican Party's "Muslim bashing" and "xenophobia."



A video and an article titled "Tucker: Kathy Griffin is 'Perfect Embodiment of What the Modern Left Believes' " were posted at foxnews.com on June 2, 2017. Following is the article.

Kathy Griffin held a news conference on Friday [June 2] to discuss the fallout after she posed with a likeness of President Donald Trump's severed head.

Griffin addressed the backlash that followed the photo being published on Tuesday, claiming the Trump family “mobilized their armies” against her.

“I’m not afraid of Donald Trump,” Griffin said. “He’s a bully. I’ve dealt with older, white guys trying to keep me down my whole life, my whole career.”

She said she’s receiving multiple death threats, and she doesn’t believe she will have a career after this incident.

Tucker Carlson said on his program tonight that Griffin is the “perfect embodiment of what the modern left believes.”

“Griffin publicly fantasizes about violently murdering the president, yet she holds a press conference to announce she’s the one who’s been wronged,” Tucker said.

He said that her remarks aren’t surprising, however, as liberals are always playing the victim.

“The most remarkable thing about victimhood is that it allows the alleged victims to commit the very offenses they are complaining about,” Tucker said.

“Victimhood has more benefits, it turns out, than AAA, and it’s free,” he continued. “It means never having to say you’re sorry. It also means being right, even when you’re wrong.”



A video and an article titled “Coulter Slams Hillary, Obama and Others for Their Hypocrisy on Climate Change” were posted at foxnews.com on June 2, 2017. Following is the article.

Following President Donald Trump’s decision to pull the U.S. out of the Paris Climate Accord, many politicians, pundits and celebrities decried withdrawing from the pact.

Ann Coulter joined Tucker Carlson tonight to discuss the “awesome hypocrisy” of some of these reactions.

Billionaires Richard Branson, Elon Musk and Bill Gates called Trump’s decision dangerous, yet they all own private jets.

Leonardo DiCaprio said leaving the pact “threatens the livability” of our planet, but he flew back and forth to Cannes, France, in a private jet. . . to accept a climate award.

Hillary Clinton called it a “historic mistake,” yet she took a private jet just 20 miles from Martha’s Vineyard to Nantucket for a fundraiser.

Meantime, former President Barack Obama has taken more than his fair of private jets and helicopters since leaving the White House, but he still criticized Trump for pulling out of the agreement.

Coulter said all these people may talk a big game global warming, but their actions go to show that they either don't believe in it or they simply don't care.

"If you tell us that CO2 emissions are destroying the world and you're flying a private jet, it's obviously not about CO2 emissions for you," Tucker said. "What is it really about?"

Coulter argued that for many liberals climate activism is their "religion," and that's why they're so upset at Trump for his decision to pull the U.S. out of the Paris agreement.



A video and an article titled "Katie Hopkins: Paris Accord is 'Complete Fraud,' US 'Signed Away Billions' " were posted at foxnews.com on June 2, 2017. Following is the article.

DailyMail.com global columnist Katie Hopkins called the Paris climate deal an "absolute fraud," and said President Trump has shown "true leadership" by ditching it.

"All the United States is doing with the Paris accord is signing away billions of dollars to developing countries that create most of the emissions," Hopkins told host Abby Huntsman.

The president pulled the United States out of the Paris climate accord on Thursday, saying it was a bad deal for the country and would hurt American workers.

The agreement, signed by former president Obama and almost 200 other countries in 2015, committed the United States to reducing carbon emissions 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2025. Meanwhile China and developing countries receive billions of dollars from the United States but are under no immediate obligation to cut emissions.

Hopkins related that back when she worked in the United Kingdom meteorological office she observed scientists "scare-mongering" and "using data in interesting ways to make the problem seem worse."

They were "virtually on their knees begging for grants," she recalled.

People should stop "dressing as polar bears" and start backing Trump, Hopkins concluded.



A video and an article titled "US Paid \$1B to Green Climate Fund, Top Polluters Paid \$0" were posted at foxnews.com on June 3, 2017. Following is the article.

The United States contributed \$1 billion to the global Green Climate Fund, but the world's top polluters contributed nothing, David Asman reported.

Asman said on "Forbes on Fox" that China, Russia and India contributed no money to the Green Climate Fund, yet that international community pressured the U.S. to join the Paris Climate Accord.

Steve Forbes said that the billion-dollar payment is another reason why President Trump was smart to withdraw the U.S. from the Paris agreement.

"It would have a devastating impact on our economy," Forbes said.

He said that America already reduces Carbon emissions better than any other nation in the world.

Mike Ozanian pointed out that the funds for the Paris accord would be controlled by the United Nations, which often works against U.S. domestic interests.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Dems' Hoodwinking of Blacks" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on June 7, 2017. Following is the article.

Ask any black person which political party has been black people's political ally. With near unanimity, blacks would answer the Democratic Party.

Asked which political party has been hostile to blacks, they'd say the Republican Party with similar unanimity.

For better answers, check out Prager University's five-minute clip "The Inconvenient Truth About the Democratic Party," by Carol Swain, professor of political science at Vanderbilt University.

Since its founding in the late 1820s, the Democratic Party has defended slavery, started the Civil War and opposed Reconstruction. The Democratic Party imposed segregation. Its members engaged in the lynchings of blacks and opposed the civil rights acts of the 1950s and '60s. During Reconstruction, hundreds of black men were elected to Southern state legislatures as Republicans, and 22 black Republicans served in the U.S. Congress by 1900. The Democratic Party did not elect a black man to Congress until 1935.

President Woodrow Wilson was a Progressive Democrat and an avowed racist who shared many views with the Ku Klux Klan. He re-segregated the federal civil service. He screened the racist film "The Birth of a Nation," originally titled "The Clansman," at the White House; it was the very first movie ever played at the White House.

What was the party of Orval Faubus, the Arkansas governor who blocked the desegregation of Little Rock schools and defied the U.S. Supreme Court's unanimous 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision? What was the party of Theophilus Eugene Connor, known as Bull Connor, who, as city commissioner, set vicious dogs, fire hoses and billy clubs on black civil rights demonstrators in Birmingham, Alabama?

Connor said: "You can never whip these birds if you don't keep you and them separate. I found that out in Birmingham. You've got to keep your white and black separate."

If you answered that Faubus and Connor were Democrats, go to the head of the class. By the way, it was Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower who sent troops to ensure that black students could attend Little Rock's Central High School.

What was the political party of Alabama Gov. George Wallace, who, during the 1960s civil rights movement, declared that he stood for "segregation now, segregation tomorrow and segregation forever" and blocked black students from entering the University of Alabama?

A few years later, the only serious congressional opposition to the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 came from Democrats. Eighty percent of Republicans in the House of Representatives supported the bill. Less than 70 percent of Democrats did. Democratic senators, led by ex-Klansman Robert Byrd's 14-hour filibuster, kept the bill tied up for 75 days, until Republicans mustered enough votes to break the filibuster.

Labor unions have always been allied with the Democratic Party and have a history of racism. Most of today's black leaders give unquestioned support to labor unions and their policies that harm black workers, but yesteryear's black leaders saw things differently.

■ Frederick Douglass, in his 1874 essay "The Folly, Tyranny, and Wickedness of Labor Unions," argued that unions were not friends of blacks.

■ W.E.B. Du Bois called unions "the greatest enemy of the black working man." Booker T. Washington also opposed unions because of their adverse impact on blacks.

Today, Democrats use diplomacy to hoodwink blacks. They tell blacks to be against those—such as Education Secretary Betsy DeVos—who are for school vouchers that enable black parents to get their children out of rotten schools run by Democrats at the National Education Association.

Democrats are using black congressmen to go after Milwaukee County Sheriff David Clarke, who is a high-profile conservative, champion of law and order, and supporter of President Donald Trump's. They view Clarke as a threat to Democratic Party interests. Indeed, if Democrats lost just 25 percent of the black vote, they would be in deep political trouble.

By the way, none of what I've said should be taken as an argument that blacks should rush to become Republicans. I'd like to see the black community acting the way most Japanese and Chinese communities do—not getting into a tizzy over which political party is in power.



An editorial by John Stossel titled "Chomsky's Venezuela Lesson" was posted at townhall.com on May 31, 2017. Following is the article.

Venezuela descends into chaos. Its people, once the wealthiest in Latin America, starve. Even The New York Times runs headlines like "Dying Infants and No Medicine."

My Venezuelan-born friend Kenny says his relatives are speaking differently. Cousins who once answered "Fine" or "Good" when asked, "How are you?" now say, "We're eating."

Eating is a big deal in the country that's given birth to jokes about a "Venezuelan diet." A survey by three universities found 75 percent of Venezuelans lost an average 19 pounds this year.

So are American celebrities who championed Venezuela's "people's revolution" embarrassed? Will they admit they were wrong?

"No," says linguist and political writer Noam Chomsky. "I was right."

Sigh.

- Actor Sean Penn met with Hugo Chavez several times and claimed Chavez did "incredible things for the 80 percent of the people that are very poor."
- Oliver Stone made a film that fawned over Chavez and Latin American socialism. Chavez joined Stone in Venice for the film's premiere.
- Michael Moore praised Chavez for eliminating "75 percent of extreme poverty."

Hello?! In Venezuela, Chavez and his successor, Nicolas Maduro, created extreme poverty.

Chomsky, whose anti-capitalist teachings have inspired millions of American college students, praised Chavez's "sharp poverty reduction, probably the greatest in the Americas." Chavez returned the compliment by holding up Chomsky's book during a speech at the U.N., making it a best-seller.

Is Chomsky embarrassed by that today? "No," he wrote me. He praised Chavez "in 2006. Here's the situation as of two years later." He linked to a 2008 article by a writer of Oliver Stone's movie who said, "Venezuela has seen a remarkable reduction in poverty."

I asked him, "Should you now say to the students who've learned from you, 'Socialism, in practice, often wrecks people's lives'?" Chomsky replied, "I never described Chavez's state capitalist government as 'socialist' or even hinted at such an absurdity. It was quite remote from socialism. Private capitalism remained . . . Capitalists were free to undermine the economy in all sorts of ways, like massive export of capital."

What? Capitalists "undermine the economy" by fleeing?

I showed Chomsky's email to Marian Tupy, editor of HumanProgress.org. I like his response: "If lack of private capitalism—I assume he means total abo-

lition of private enterprise and most private property—is his definition of socialism, then only North Korea and Kampuchea qualify.”

Tupy also asks how Chomsky thinks “capitalists sabotaged the economy by taking money out if capitalists are superfluous to a functioning economy.”

Good questions. Chomsky’s arguments are absurd.

As Tupy wrote elsewhere about another socialist fool, “As much as I would like to enjoy rubbing (his) nose in his own mind-bending stupidity, I cannot rejoice, for I know that Venezuela’s descent into chaos—hyperinflation, empty shops, out-of-control violence and the collapse of basic public services—will not be the last time we hear of a collapsing socialist economy. More countries will refuse to learn from history and give socialism ‘a go.’ ‘Useful idiots,’ to use Lenin’s words . . . will sing socialism’s praises until the last light goes out.”



An editorial by John Stossel titled “Prosperity Cities” was posted at town-hall.com on June 7, 2017. Following is the article.

Lovers of socialism didn’t like my column last week. I wrote that Venezuela’s collapse shows the cluelessness of celebrities like Michael Moore, Oliver Stone and Noam Chomsky, who’d praised Venezuela’s leader.

Chomsky called me “an utter coward” for mocking him and said he expected “an abject apology.”

He won’t get one. As Venezuelan-born filmmaker Thor Halvorssen puts it, “Chomsky provided cover for a regime where 11,500 infants died from lack of medical care.”

But assigning blame matters less than what should be done now. After the regime collapses, what comes next?

How about trying capitalism?

That’s what Erick Brimen suggests. Brimen grew up in Venezuela, then moved to America, where he started NeWAY Capital, a firm dedicated to creating what he calls “prosperity cities,” small places that create “the environment for success.”

Venezuela desperately needs that. “Last week I helped my mother escape,” writes Brimen. “The violence is getting too intense, and, in one of the most agriculturally rich countries in the world, it is . . . increasingly difficult to find food.”

Capitalists like Brimen aren’t just motivated by greed. They want to rescue others from the tragedy of centrally planned economies.

“Living in Venezuela made me realize the traditional approach to politics is too often ineffective,” explains Brimen. “If successful countries, like Vene-

zuela and Greece, can be turned into basket cases by demagogues promising things they can't deliver, we have a systemic problem . . . (W)e must find a new approach."

His plan: Because it's usually impossible to convince central planners to give up power, just get them to give up a little bit of power, in one small location at a time, as an experiment.

Similar ideas have been pushed with different names—free trade zones, empowerment zones, charter cities—but I like Brimen's term: prosperity cities.

These are small places where government leaves people mostly free to pursue their own interests. Government keeps the peace, protects people's bodies and property, but doesn't impose high taxes or burdensome rules.

Hong Kong is a prosperity city. It was once little more than a rock in the sea near China, but because the island was ruled by the British when Communists took over the rest of China, Hong Kong became a haven for freedom-seeking people.

The British enforced rule of law—they punished people who stole or killed. But then they did something unusual, something wonderful, something politicians rarely do: They left people alone.

By doing that, the British allowed Chinese entrepreneurs to try new things. Free people created astounding wealth. By the end of the 20th century, Hong Kong had a higher per capita income than Great Britain itself.

So we know what works: rule of law, plus economic freedom. Yet billions remain in poverty because politicians won't allow them that freedom.

In poor countries, bureaucrats micromanage almost everything. Writes Brimen, "Resolving a dispute in Sub-Saharan Africa takes 655 days. It is no surprise Sub-Saharan Africa has remained mired in poverty."

Today, Dubai could be called a prosperity city. Dubai is not free in all the ways I would like, but because the Dubai International Financial Centre is mostly free, it became rich in a decade.

Even the Communist Chinese experiment with free zones. "Shenzhen, for example, grew from a small fishing village to a metropolitan area with 16 million people largely because of the creation of a special economic zone."

Now Brimen wants to replicate that. "We target uninhabited areas near major population centers and infrastructure and collaborate with the host government to enact the necessary reforms for economic growth . . . Instead of riots, there would be festivals. Instead of empty supermarkets, there would be feasts."

Puerto Rico could host a prosperity city. Instead of wallowing in debt and begging the mainland for handouts, the people of Puerto Rico would teach the rest of us lessons.

Likewise, the United States could turn Guantanamo Bay into a prosperity city, showing the Cuban people the power of freedom.

If freedom and markets worked well for Hong Kong, and a poor country once called colonial America, then why not liberate the whole world?



An article by Patrick McGreevy titled "Single-Payer Healthcare Plan Advances in California Senate—Without a Way to Pay It's \$400-Billion Tab" was posted at latimes.com on June 1, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

A proposal to adopt a single-payer healthcare system for California took an initial step forward Thursday when the state Senate approved a bare-bones bill that lacks a method for paying the \$400-billion cost of the plan.

The proposal was made by legislators led by Sen. Ricardo Lara (D-Bell Gardens) at the same time President Trump and Republican members of Congress are working to repeal and replace the federal Affordable Care Act.

"Despite the incredible progress California has made, millions still do not have access to health insurance and millions more cannot afford the high deductibles and co-pays, and they often forgo care," Lara said during a floor debate on the bill.

The bill, which now goes to the state Assembly for consideration, will have to be further developed, Lara conceded, adding he hopes to reach a consensus on a way to pay for it.

Republican senators opposed the bill as a threat to the state's finances.

"We don't have the money to pay for it," Sen. Tom Berryhill (R-Modesto) said. "If we cut every single program and expense from the state budget and redirected that money to this bill, SB 562, we wouldn't even cover half of the \$400-billion price tag."

Berryhill also said the private sector is better suited to provide healthcare.

"I absolutely don't trust the government to run our health system," he said. "What has the government ever done right?"

Lara's bill would provide a Medicare-for-all-type system that he believed would guarantee health coverage for all Californians without the out-of-pocket costs. Under a single-payer plan, the government replaces private insurance companies, paying doctors and hospitals for healthcare.

The California Nurses Assn., which sponsored the bill, released a fiscal analysis this week that proposed raising the state sales and business receipts taxes by 2.3% to raise \$106 billion of the annual cost, with the rest proposed to come from state and federal funding already going to Medicare and Medicaid services.



An article by Patrick J. Buchanan titled "The Impeach-Trump Conspiracy" was posted at wnd.com on June 8, 2017. Following is the article.

Pressed by Megyn Kelly on his ties to President Trump, an exasperated Vladimir Putin blurted out, "We had no relationship at all . . . I never met him . . . Have you all lost your senses over there?"

Yes, Vlad, we have.

Consider the questions that have convulsed this city since the Trump triumph, and raised talk of impeachment.

Did Trump collude with Russians to hack the DNC emails and move the goods to WikiLeaks, thus revealing the state secret that DNC chair Debbie Wasserman Schultz was putting the screws to poor Bernie Sanders?

If not Trump himself, did campaign aides collude with the KGB?

Now, given that our NSA and CIA seemingly intercept everything Russians say to Americans, why is our fabled FBI, having investigated for a year, unable to give us a definitive yes or no?

The snail's pace of the FBI investigation explains Trump's frustration. What explains the FBI's torpor? If J. Edgar Hoover had moved at this pace, John Dillinger would have died of old age.

We hear daily on cable TV of the "Trump-Russia" scandal. Yet, no one has been charged with collusion, and every intelligence official, past or present, who has spoken out has echoed ex-acting CIA Director Mike Morrell: "On the question of the Trump campaign conspiring with the Russians here, there is smoke, but there is no fire, at all . . . There's no little campfire, there's no little candle, there's no spark."

Where are the criminals? Where is the crime?

As for the meetings between Gen. Mike Flynn, Jared Kushner, Sen. Jeff Sessions and Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak, it appears that Trump wanted a "back channel" to Putin so he could honor his commitment to seek better relations with Russia.

Given the Russophobia rampant here, that makes sense. And while it appears amateurish that Flynn would use Russian channels of communication, what is criminal about this?

Putin is not Stalin. Soviet divisions are not sitting on the Elbe. The Cold War is over. And many presidents have used back channels. Woodrow Wilson sent Col. Edward House to talk to the Kaiser and the Brits. FDR ran messages to Churchill through Harry Hopkins.

As for Trump asking Director James Comey to cut some slack for Flynn, it is understandable in human terms. Flynn had been a loyal aide and friend and Trump had to feel rotten about having to fire the man.

So, what is really going on here?

All the synthetic shock over what Kushner or Sessions said to Kislyak aside, this city's hatred for President Trump, and its fanatic determination to bring him down in disgrace, predates his presidency.

For Trump ran in 2016 not simply as the Republican alternative. He presented his candidacy as a rejection, a repudiation of the failed elites, political and media, of both parties. Americans voted in 2016 not just for a change in leaders but for a revolution to overthrow a ruling regime.

Thus, this city has never reconciled itself to Trump's victory, and the president daily rubs their noses in their defeat with his tweets.

Seeking a rationale for its rejection, this city has seized upon that old standby. We didn't lose! The election was stolen in a vast conspiracy, an "act of war" against America, an assault upon "our democracy," criminal collusion between the Kremlin and the Trumpites.

Hence, Trump is an illegitimate president, and it is the duty of brave citizens of both parties to work to remove the usurper.

The city seized upon a similar argument in 1968, when Richard Nixon won, because it was said he had colluded to have South Vietnam's president abort Lyndon Johnson's new plan to bring peace to Southeast Asia in the final hours of that election.

Then, as now, the "T" word, treason, was trotted out.

Attempts to overturn elections where elites are repudiated are not uncommon in U.S. history. Both Nixon and Reagan, after 49-state landslides, were faced with attempts to overturn the election results.

With Nixon in Watergate, the elites succeeded. With Reagan in Iran-Contra, they almost succeeded in destroying that great president as he was ending the Cold War in a bloodless victory for the West.

After Lincoln's assassination, President Andrew Johnson sought to prevent Radical Republicans from imposing a ruthless Reconstruction on a defeated and devastated South.

The Radicals enacted the Tenure of Office Act, stripping Johnson of his authority to remove any member of the Cabinet without Senate permission. Johnson defied the Radicals and fired their agent in the Cabinet, Secretary of War Edwin Stanton.

"Tennessee" Johnson was impeached, and missed conviction by one vote. John F. Kennedy, in his 1956 book, called the senator who had voted to save Johnson a "Profile in Courage."

If Trump is brought down on the basis of what Putin correctly labels "non-sense," this city will have executed a nonviolent coup against a constitutionally elected president. Such an act would drop us into the company of those

Third World nations where such means are the customary ways that corrupt elites retain their hold on power.



An article by Rich Noyes titled “Flashback: Media Hated Investigations Into Clinton’s Obstruction of Justice” was posted at newsbusters.org on June 8, 2017. Following are excerpts the article.

In today’s political climate, an observer would be roundly mocked if they suggested President Trump is the victim of a “spiteful witch hunt,” or that investigations must take a back seat because the White House must “get on with the business of governance;” and that the media need to say they’re “sorry” to the President because after all of the coverage, no “impeachable offenses” have been found.

But during the Clinton impeachment drama in 1998 and 1999, liberal journalists trotted out all of those claims as a way to deflect and defend a Democratic President who was impeached for, among other things, obstruction of justice—the same transgression journalists are associating with President Trump. Here’s just a quick sample of media spin from that era:

■ “Has anybody in the history of America, any President certainly, had his character so trashed, so publicly, for so long? I think the answer is no and I think Mr. Clinton is probably personally damaged by that.”—Correspondent Bruce Morton on CNN’s *The World Today*, April 1, 1998.

■ “We don’t live in Salem and I think the country is sick of the witch hunt.”—*Newsweek*’s Eleanor Clift on the McLaughlin Group, April 4, 1998.

■ “Will all of the media, including NBC, give even a fraction of the airtime and the newsprint that we gave to these allegations to the fact that no impeachable offenses were found? When are we going to say to the President of the United States, ‘we’re sorry’?— Host Geraldo Rivera on CNBC’s *Rivera Live*, September 14, 1998.

■ “Didn’t I say to you that we are marching off the cliff? Reason tells you we should stop this and get on with the business of governance. But, there is precious little. I mean, I spent most of today and yesterday half on the phone while I was covering this thing, with Senators Republican and Democratic, and at the moment everybody’s fondest hope is that the two week hiatus, between now and the new year, in that period, impeachment will sink in and sanity will prevail and we’ll avoid a trial. But there are a lot of people that don’t want that to happen.”—National Public Radio’s Nina Totenberg, December 19, 1998 *Inside Washington*.

■ “Why are you convinced of that [that the Senate trial would be speedy], because many people have been talking about a long, protracted trial taking attention away from the important issues in this country that people really care about?”—NBC’s *Today* co-host Katie Couric to Senator Mitch McConnell, December 21, 1998.

■ “It [impeachment] was a spiteful action, an action that they performed absolutely in violation of the framers intent. It was a legislative coup d etat, and it has been rejected utterly by the American people, 73 percent of whom now say they approve of the President’s performance in office.”—CNBC’s Geraldo Rivera on NBC’s *Today*, December 22, 1998.

■ “When you talk to other Senators, particularly older Senators —those who’ve been around for a bit—is or is there not some concern of the public, concern in some quarters, not all of them Democratic, that this is in fact a kind of effort at a quote ‘coup,’ that is you have a twice-elected, popularly-elected President of the United States, and so those that you mentioned in the Republican Party who dislike him and what he stands for, having been unable to beat him at the polls, have found another way to get him out of office.”—CBS Evening News anchor Dan Rather to former Senator Warren Rudman during CBS coverage of the impeachment trial swearing in, January 7, 1999.

■ “I think there are real questions about separation of powers and I don’t think he [Clinton] should go up there [appear before the Senate]. And second of all, that herd of managers from the House, I mean frankly all they were missing was white sheets. They’re like night riders going over.”—Newsweek’s Eleanor Clift, January 9, 1999 McLaughlin Group.



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.”