

Eye on the World

June 24, 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 24, 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 Jennefer Van Lear titled "Iran Launches Missiles Into Syria" was posted at townhall.com on June 18, 2017. Following is the article.

Iran has launched several missiles into eastern Syria in retaliation for June 7 attacks in Tehran that killed 18 people, according to the Revolutionary Guard's website. In those attacks, ISIS-linked fighters stormed Parliament and a shrine to Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini.

A statement on the website said, "In this operation, several ground-to-ground midrange missiles were fired from IRGC bases in Kermanshah Province and targeted Takfiri [ISIS] forces in the Deir Ezzor region in Eastern Syria. The spilling of any pure blood will not go unanswered."

Iran is allied with Syrian President Bashar al-Assad in the ongoing Syrian civil war.



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Report: Iran Collaborating With N. Korea on Extensive Ballistic Missile Development" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 21, 2017. Following is the article.

Iran has intensified its development of ballistic missiles in recent years, particularly since the conclusion of the nuclear deal, and is doing so with significant collaboration with fellow pariah state North Korea, according to the exiled opposition National Council of Resistance of Iran (NCRI).

The regime has established at least 42 facilities for the production, testing and launching of ballistic missiles, the NCRI reported on Tuesday, revealing for the first time information on 12 previously-unknown sites.

The report was released by Alireza Jafarzadeh, deputy director of the NCRI's Washington office, at a briefing in Washington.

The revelations come at a critical time, days after the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) for the first time fired ballistic missiles from Iranian territory at targets in Syria—ostensibly at ISIS terrorist positions. It's believed to be the first time Iran has fired missiles at targets beyond its borders since the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s.

Jafarzadeh said the missiles fired at targets in Syria were launched from an underground IRGC facility called Panj Pelleh, an older site in Kermanshah province in western Iran which he said had been the launchpad for missiles fired at targets in Iraq during the Saddam era.

The new NCRI report also comes shortly after the U.S. Senate passed, by a 98-2 vote, sanctions legislation targeting both Iran's ballistic missile programs and the IRGC. The Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act, which Jafarzadeh praised as a good step, has been sent to the House.

The information released Tuesday, based on the opposition group's sources inside the regime and IRGC, points to Iran having established missile facilities based on North Korean models, with the help of visiting North Korean experts.

"These North Korean experts who were sent to Iran, trained the main IRGC missile experts in IRGC garrisons, including the Al Mehdi Garrison situated southwest of Tehran," the report says.

The IRGC has built a special residence in Tehran for the North Korean experts, who have been involved in helping develop warhead and guidance systems for Iranian missiles.

IRGC Aerospace Force personnel regularly visit North Korea to exchange knowledge, the report says.

Defying international condemnation, North Korea's nuclear-armed regime has carried out a series of missile launches and Kim Jong-un has threatened to soon test an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

The NCRI report includes satellite imagery and information on the locations of many of 42 identified IRGC-controlled missile-related facilities across Iran—including 12 which the group says have been hitherto-unknown.

The sites include missile manufacturing plants, launching pads, training facilities, missile storage and maintenance units. Some are located or partly located underground, or in mountainous areas.

None of the sites are in eastern Iran. Most are in the central region, or in Iran's western and southern provinces. The locations of missile launch sites have evidently been selected taking into account potential targets in the Gulf or westward towards Israel and Europe.

"The sites that are involved with deployment, launching operations and testing are on the western side or on the southern border, here, with a clear objective of threatening the neighbors," Jafarzadeh noted, pointing at the map, observing that Europe and the West lie in that direction too.

"Western countries as well as countries in the region, those are the countries that they threaten, and have been threatening," he said.

Jafarzadeh said the objective of the ballistic missile program is two-pronged—to deploy shorter-range missiles to threaten their neighbors in the region, and to develop the capability of putting a nuclear warhead on a longer-range missile.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), the nuclear deal negotiated between Iran and six powers, did not touch on the missile program—at Tehran's insistence—but the Obama administration asserted that by placing verifiable restrictions on Iran's nuclear program it shut off all paths to developing a nuclear weapon.

In response to a question, Jafarzadeh said the NCRI does not link the expanding missile work directly to the JCPOA, but "when you lose leverage you want to make up for it somewhere else," he said of the regime. "There is more emphasis on their missile program now than there was a few years ago."

He pointed out that the JCPOA left Iran with a lot of "room to maneuver" when it comes to ballistic missile activity, and that international reaction to its missile tests has been "mild, to say the least."

Of the facilities discussed on Tuesday, one extensive complex (Semnan), in a mountainous area south-east of Tehran, is actively associated with the Organization of Defensive Innovation and Research (Persian acronym SPND), which is believed to be a body tasked with the development of a nuclear weapons capability.

SPND's existence was first unveiled by the NCRI in 2011, and in August 2014 the U.S. Treasury Department added the organization to its "specially designated nationals" list, making it subject to U.S. sanctions.

"The Iranian regime has remained in power in Iran by relying on two pillars: internal repression and external export of Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism," the report states, lumping the ballistic weapons program into the latter "pillar."

"As the regime becomes more isolated domestically and its grip on Iranian society weakens,

it resorts more frantically to the second pillar of its bid to keep power," it says.

The report noted that Iran re-asserted its intention to continue advancing its missile program after the U.S.-Arab-Islamic summit in Riyadh last month. The summit saw the U.S. and most of the world's Sunni Muslim states take a hard line on Iran.

The NCRI called for effective and comprehensive sanctions targeting the ballistic missile program; the designation of the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization; and for IRGC and proxy militias to be evicted from countries in the region, especially Syria and Iraq.

The NCRI and affiliated People's Mujahedeen Organization of Iran (MEK) has in the past provided valuable intelligence to the West, including pivotal information in 2002 that exposed nuclear activities Tehran had hidden from the international community for two decades.

The NCRI/MEK was designated a foreign terrorist organization under U.S. law until 2012, and is reviled by the clerical regime in Tehran, not least because it supported Saddam Hussein in his bloody eight year-long war against Iran in the 1980s.

It enjoys strong support from some current and former policymakers from both parties in Washington, as evidenced by the list of confirmed speakers at the NCRI's annual convention, scheduled for July 1 in Paris.

Among them are former U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. John Bolton, former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, former Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge, former FBI Director Louis Freeh, former Attorney General Michael Mukasey, former Sen. Joe Lieberman, former New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson and former Marine Corps commander Gen. (Ret.) James Conway.



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Saudi's New King-In-Waiting Accused by Tehran of Promoting Anti-Iran Terror" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 22, 2017. Following is the article.

Weeks after the Iranian regime was infuriated by provocative comments made by the second-in-line to the Saudi throne, the target of that anger was promoted Wednesday to the position of king-in-waiting. The move could worsen the already seething rivalry between the Sunni and Shi'ite near-neighbors.

King Salman, by royal decree, dismissed his 57-year-old nephew, Mohammed bin Nayef, who had been crown prince for a little over two years, and elevated his own 31-year-old son, Mohammed bin Salman bin Abdulaziz, to the position. (Salman has 12 sons and a daughter.)

The decree also had bin Salman replace bin Nayef as deputy prime minister. The new crown prince will retain the portfolio of defense minister, which he has held since the day his father assumed the throne in January 2015.

Bin Nayef not only loses the titles of crown prince and deputy prime minister, but was also dismissed as interior minister.

The reasons for the demotions are unclear, but bin Nayef is viewed as being close to the rulers of Qatar, and Saudi Arabia is currently leading a campaign to isolate and punish Qatar for its alleged support for extremists and for Riyadh's nemesis, the regime in Tehran.

Mohammed bin Salman has been seen as the architect of the anti-Qatar drive. He is also vocally anti-Iran, making waves when he said in early May he would work to ensure that the fight for regional influence takes place "inside Iran, not in Saudi Arabia."

Iran at the time called the remarks a direct threat, and after a deadly June 7 terrorist attack in Tehran Iranian officials suggested that Saudi Arabia was implicated. (Saudi Arabia denied the charges, ISIS claimed responsibility, and on Sunday Iran fired ballistic missiles at what it said were ISIS targets inside Syria in retaliation.)

Iran also reviles bin Salman for his leading role in the Saudi-led military intervention in Yemen, where Saudi Arabia is supporting its internationally-recognized government and Iran is backing the Shi'ite Houthi rebels. (Iran and Saudi Arabia are also backing opposing forces in the civil war in Syria.)

The article quoted extensively from an analysis by an academic at the London School of Economics, Madawi al-Rasheed, who called the new crown prince's remarks last month about Iran "a statement that ultimately amounts to a declaration of war."

Rasheed also described bin Salman as being more likely to light more fires in the region than extinguish those already burning.

A senior advisor to Iran's foreign minister, Hossein Sheikholeslam, was quoted by the semi-official Fars news agency as linking bin Salman's elevation to a "deal" made with President Trump.

Fars also cited Sheikholeslam as saying that that "the crimes and massacres in the region are all rooted in bin Salman's thirst for power."

Iranian state television also used the "soft coup" term in a headline—"Soft coup in Saudi Arabia/Son becomes the successor of the father"—according to a Reuters report.

President Trump, who hosted bin Salman at the White House in March, offered his congratulations in a phone conversation Wednesday.

"The president and the crown prince committed to close cooperation to advance our shared goals of security, stability, and prosperity across the Middle East and beyond," said a White House readout. "The two leaders discussed the priority of cutting off all support for terrorists and extremists, as well as how to resolve the ongoing dispute with Qatar."



An article by Christine Rousselle titled "Canadian Sniper Sets New Record After Shooting An ISIS Fighter Two Miles Away" was posted at townhall.com on June 22, 2017. Following is the article.

A Canadian sniper set a new record for the longest confirmed kill last month after he shot and killed an ISIS insurgent in Iraq that was 3,450 meters away. (That's more than two miles.)

The sniper, who has not yet been identified, made the shot from a high rise building, and the bullet took about ten seconds to actually reach the target. He is a member of Joint Task Force 2, a special forces unit that deals with counter-terrorism, hostage rescue, and snipers.

This new record is nearly a thousand meters more than the previous record of 2,475 meters, which was held by British sniper Craig Harrison.

The location of the shot was also not released, presumably for security reasons.

■ The kill was independently verified by video camera and other data, *The Globe and Mail* has learned.

■ "Hard data on this. It isn't an opinion. It isn't an approximation. There is a second location with eyes on with all the right equipment to capture exactly what the shot was," another military source said.

■ A military insider told *The Globe*: "This is an incredible feat. It is a world record that might never be equalled."

■ The world record was previously held by British sniper Craig Harrison, who shot a Taliban gunman with a 338 Lapua Magnum rifle from 2,475 metres away in 2009.

The sniper's bullet stopped an ISIS attack on Iraqi security forces. Canadian military officials said that the use of a sniper was more effective and safer than using a bomb, which could have killed civilians. Plus, the ISIS insurgent did not see the bullet coming, which is another advantage.



An article by John Hirschauer titled "Pathetic: 'The View' Suggests Cuba, U.S. Have Same Human Rights Record" was posted at newsbusters.org on June 19, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

It's often disheartening to hear some of the despicable things the audience of ABC's *The View* will applaud for.

Whoopi Goldberg and her compatriots talked about Cuban relations on Monday and parroted loony moral equivocations between human rights in America and Cuba made by Cuban officials. The audience, eager to shower their undying loyalty, erupted in applause as Whoopi repeated the Communist regime's talking points.

Goldberg: "Well on Friday the White House also announced that they are reversing the Obama administration's steps to normalize relations with Cuba because of their (laughing) human rights violations. Forget about the fact he has shaken the hands of some of the biggest despots out there. We won't point that out because that would be wrong of me. And because of their ties to hostile nations like North Korea. But Cuban officials said 'really?' Because the U.S. is in no condition to lecture us about human rights given the racial discrimination happening in America now." (applause)

Such a moral thoroughfare is flatly absurd. Cuba has been under the thumb of Communist despots for decades, and their ongoing legacy of abusing human rights is rife with mass incarceration of dissidents, execution of political opponents, and internment of homosexuals. Whatever your perception of the domestic controversy over law enforcement abuses, such a statement is an obfuscation of Noam Chomsky degree.

There was also a detectable level of contempt for Trump voters by the progressive panelists, most evidently Joy Behar's bit of nihilism: "Well, the other thing is that he didn't really do that much and he didn't undo what Obama did 100%, but did just enough to say to his base, you see, I undid what Obama did."

That's all Trump voters want, after all- to decimate the Obama legacy, just to be mean. They aren't up to Joy Behar's intellectual snuff, so they could never have legitimate policy disagreements on Cuban-American relations.

Sunny Hostin was next, prefacing her blatant comparison of Cuba and the United States by saying "I'm not going to compare the United States to Cuba":

Hostin: "We know that Cuba has had a lot of problems but the point they made about the problems that we are having here with racial discrimination, they talked about police brutality, remember, just on Friday the officer that murdered Philando Castile was found not guilty. He shot that man in front of his fiance and her 4-year-old daughter and he had a license to carry and told the officer he was going to reach for his license to carry. That he was armed and he shot him anyway. And so Cuba has somewhat of a point when they talk about a lot of if problems that we have here in the United States."

No. They have no point. The tragic and inexcusable Castile case, or any perception of systematic racial discrimination in American law enforcement (whose undergirding complaints are contested), gives the Cuban people no leverage to have a moral spar with America.

Whoopi then began interjecting strange comments that, with no nuance, literally accused Trump of the behavior of third world tyrants.

To be clear, Whoopi suggested that, in order for her to get on board with these charges, President Trump first ought to release political prisoners (that he isn't holding), hold free and fair elections (which is outside of his purview), and enable private citizens to break the chains of oppressive communism (which don't exist). This is lunacy.

The whole segment was an inextricable insult to Cuban families who have made their way to America and know firsthand that any attempt to loop the U.S. in with the thuggish Cuban regime can only come from the mouth of someone who has never seen real tyranny.



An article by Bernard Goldberg titled "The Liberal Media's Double Standard" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on June 19, 2017. Following is the article.

In 2011, after a lunatic in Tucson, Arizona, shot Democratic Congresswoman Gabby Giffords, wounded almost 20 more, and killed six, including a 9-year old girl, it took the liberal media elite a nanosecond to pin the crime on—who else?—conservative Republicans and their supposed "toxic rhetoric."

While police were still scouring the crime scene, Paul Krugman, the New York Times hard left columnist wrote: "Where's that toxic rhetoric coming from? Let's not make a false pretense of balance: it's coming, overwhelmingly, from the right."

An editorial in the *Times* also pinned the Tucson violence on Republicans: "It is facile and mistaken to attribute this particular madman's act directly to Republicans or Tea Party members. But it is legitimate to hold Republicans and particularly their most virulent supporters in the media responsible for the gale of anger that has produced the vast majority of these threats, setting the nation on edge."

Matt Bai wrote in the *New York Times* that conservatives who use words like "tyranny" to describe politicians "shouldn't be blind to the idea that Americans legitimately faced with either enemy would almost certainly take up arms."

In Politico, Michael Kinsley, a quasi intellectual of the progressive left, wrote that, "The suggestion, finally, is that the right is largely responsible for a political atmosphere in which extreme thoughts are more likely to take root and flower."

They blamed Glen Beck and Bill O'Reilly and Fox News in general and Sarah Palin in particular. Never mind that the gunman was mentally ill - and not just a little bit. Never mind that there was not a shred of evidence that he ever heard the name Sarah Palin or any of the others. That, to elite media liberals, was irrelevant. The only point they cared about was linking conservatives to a crime committed by a mentally unstable young man.

Now it's 2017 and we have the shooting on the baseball field. And we have lots of people on both sides saying it's time to tone down the rhetoric.

Sounds good. But before we attempt that, a few questions are worth asking:

Where were the liberal elites when Madonna said she wanted to burn down the White House?

Where were the liberal elites when so-called progressives took to the streets with their signs that said Donald Trump was Adolf Hitler?

Where were the liberal elites when Democrats said Donald Trump was not a legitimate president and that he was a threat to the United States of America?

Where were they when Maxine Waters, the progressive Democratic congresswoman from California, said Mr. Trump's cabinet was composed of "scumbags"?

Where were they when, progressives said Republican policies would, as Mollie Hemingway writes in the *Federalist* "destroy the planet, enslave women, or kill sick people"?

Where were they, Ms. Hemmingway asks, when mainstream media outlets routinely imply that the President of the United States is a "Russian stooge committing treason, or simply suggest that he needs to be removed from his duly elected office by whatever means."

Yes, the liberals along with conservatives were there when Kathy Griffin figured that given the non-stop barrage aimed at President Trump she could safely and without consequence take a picture of herself holding a bloody decapitated head of you know who in her hand.

But where were the liberal elites when progressives decided it was just the right time to stage "Julius Caesar" in New York's Central Park with the lead character resembling none other than Donald Trump—who is stabbed to death on stage.

Oh, the liberals loved that one. Besides, they said, the assassination of Caesar (or Trump) shows "the disastrous effects of violence" as one liberal supporter of the play put it.

I'm sure they'd say the same thing if conservatives staged "Julius Caesar" starring a Barack Obama lookalike. I'm sure they'd brush off the assassination scene, once again, as (with apologies to the Bard) much ado about nothing.

Let's be clear: The producers of "Julius Caesar" aren't responsible for the shooting on the baseball field; neither are Madonna or Maxine Waters or the progressives who believe Trump is Hitler or liberals who think he's not a legitimate president.

But the man who is responsible, James Hodgkinson wasn't a raving lunatic like the killer in Tucson. Hodgkinson was an anti-Trump zealot who hated Republicans and loved Bernie Sanders and Rachel Maddow and more than a few more progressive media elites. And, no, they're not responsible for the shooting, either.

But before we go to the surefire "both sides must tone down the rhetoric" routine—something, by the way, that won't last long if history is any indication—let's be as clear as the liberal media elite were in 2011. While hard-right Republicans have crossed the rhetorical line more than a few times, much of the angry rhetoric today is coming from liberals and progressives. They're the ones who are creating an atmosphere where something horrible could, and did, happen.

To change just one word in Paul Krugman's column right after the Tucson massacre: The suggestion, finally, is that the left is largely responsible for a political atmosphere in which extreme thoughts are more likely to take root and flower.

Only the gunman is responsible for what happened the other day in Virginia. But it's not only time for the crazies on the left to tone down the rhetoric, it's way past

time for the liberal media elite to hold their fellow progressives as accountable in 2017 as they held conservatives in 2011—for a crime they had nothing to do with.



An article by L. Brent Bozell and Tim Graham titled “Decades of Blaming Violence on the Right” was posted at cnsnews.com on June 16, 2017. Following is the article.

The radical leftist fanaticism over Rep. Steve Scalise’s alleged shooter has been an integral part of the news coverage, as it should be.

James Hodgkinson’s ties to the Bernie Sanders campaign have been reported (if sometimes buried) by most news outlets, and the pundits are virtually universal in their belief that the socialist senator should not be held responsible.

These journalists were about a quarter of a century late to the dance. Theirs has been a decades-long exercise in hypocrisy. If an act of violence could be blamed on a Republican or, even better, on a conservative, the press would do it, even if they needed to play a Six Degrees of Kevin Bacon-style game.

Recall Timothy McVeigh, the Oklahoma City bomber. Some journalists like then-NBC anchor Bryant Gumbel immediately blamed “right-wing radio jocks,” naming Rush Limbaugh, Ollie North, Michael Reagan, Gordon Liddy and Bob Grant. He said, “the extent to which their approach fosters violence is being questioned by many observers.”

Think of the bombing of an abortion clinic in Atlanta in 1997. The anti-abortion movement was immediately put on trial and forced to defend itself against the media’s charge that it was responsible. Ditto with the shooting of late-term abortion doctor George Tiller in Kansas.

Consider the shooting of then-Rep. Gabby Giffords in 2011. Right up to present day, the leftist media has cast blame on former Gov. Sarah Palin and her followers, even though the charge has been proven to be false.

What about liberal Democrats? The media covered Ted Kaczynski, the Unabomber, because it was ongoing terror and they couldn’t ignore it. But how many blamed the environmental movement for his radicalism, which included an embrace of then-Vice President Al Gore and his book “Earth in the Balance”?

Think of the endless exercises in destructive behavior perpetrated by Greenpeace and so many of the radical environmental organizations. Have the policies of the Democratic Party been blamed?

What about the Black Lives Matter movement?

The coverage has been intense and sympathetic no matter how much violence is perpetrated, smearing the police and causing a crime wave that has led to dramatic increase in murders. Has any Democrat, from former President Oba-

ma on down, been held to account? In recent months, the radical left's violence, and its call to violence by its leaders, has reached a frightening level because of President Donald Trump. But where have the news media been?

Where were the news media at the Women's March on Washington when Madonna said "f— you" to her detractors, and then proudly proclaimed, "I have thought an awful lot about blowing up the White House"? ABC, CBS and NBC gave this large feminist event 129 times more coverage than the 2016 March for Life. ABC touted Madonna's "A-list" appearance and shamelessly censored any mention of her profanity or violent fantasies.

In New York City, Shakespeare in the Park is running a rendition of "Julius Caesar" in which a very Trump-like Caesar is viciously stabbed to death. Where is the liberal media condemnation? ABC and NBC have mostly ignored it, while CBS has defended it for three minutes. CNN host Fareed Zakaria called it brilliant and urged the public to go view it. The New York Times is actually sponsoring Shakespeare in the Park, calling itself "an institution that believes in free speech for the arts as well as the media."

Snoop Dogg is one of the hippest celebrities on the scene today. In a recent music video, he is depicted shooting a clown dressed as President Trump in the head. Do you recall any coverage? Any condemnation?

The very bizarre rock singer Marilyn Manson also has a music video in which a facsimile of Trump is seen decapitated, blood everywhere, soon after Manson tears a Bible apart. Where was the coverage and condemnation?

Before he was canceled, "The Nightly Show" host Larry Wilmore pledged to suffocate Trump. He said: "I don't want to give him any more oxygen. That's not a euphemism, by the way. I mean it literally. Somebody get me the pillow they used to kill Scalia and I'll do it—I'll do it!" He was previously honored by the White House Correspondents' Association to perform a "roast" (think toast) of Obama. Where was the coverage and condemnation of this "joke"?

There's been a lot of coverage of Stephen Colbert's gay slur of Trump. But do you recall him showing a depiction of Trump aide Stephen Miller's severed head placed on a spike a la "Game of Thrones"?

There is a legion of examples. The coverage has been virtually nonexistent. The condemnation has been nowhere to be found. It is well to remember this when considering the media's present outrage at the shooting of Republican Rep. Steve Scalise.

Maybe, just maybe, they need to do some soul-searching themselves.



A video and an article by Rick Moran titled "MSNBC Host Labels Rep. Scalise an 'Extremist' While He Lies in Hospital Bed" were posted at pjmedia.com on June 18, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

It's hard to determine whether some liberals are tone deaf or just downright mean. MSNBC hostess Joy-Ann Reid almost certainly falls into the latter category.

Reid was on with NAACP board member Rev. William J. Barber II when the conversation turned to Rep. Steve Scalise, who was lying in a hospital bed in critical condition at the time.

The host and her guest accused Scalise of "extremism" because he wants marriage to be between a man and a woman, he voted for the House health care bill, and he co-sponsored a bill to repeal the ban on semi-automatic weapons.

No, really.

If you want to describe "extremism" as advocating the fringe position on issues, you're out of luck with Scalise. His position on each of those issues above enjoys the support of large pluralities of Americans. Support for traditional marriage hovers between 35-40%—by any definition, a mainstream position. And only 36% of Americans support a ban on "assault rifles."

But Reid wasn't finished. After attacking Scalise while he fought for his life in a hospital, she then blamed Republicans for "divisive rhetoric."

From the *The Daily Caller*:

- MSNBC host Joy Ann Reid had the gall to blame Republicans for divisive rhetoric just a day after she took cheap shots at shooting victim Rep. Steve Scalise.
- On her show Saturday, Reid alleged that Scalise, who has undergone multiple surgeries after being shot at the GOP baseball practice, may be a racist and a homophobe.
- "Because he is in jeopardy and everybody is pulling for him, are we required in a moral sense to put that aside in the moment?" Reid asked.



An article by Brent Bozell titled "Joy Reid's Immoral Moment" was posted at townhall.com on June 21, 2017. Following is the article.

America was stunned when Jared Lee Loughner pulled out a gun in a Tucson, Arizona, supermarket parking lot in 2011 and shot then-Rep. Gabrielle Giffords in the head at point-blank range and killed six others. No one recalls a TV pundit wondering whether the people should root for Giffords to survive—or anyone with the gall to imply her head wound was "self-inflicted."

That was not the case with the shooting of House Majority Whip Steve Scalise and four others last week. Outgoing "CBS Evening News" anchor Scott Pelley proclaimed, "It's time to ask whether the attack on the United States Congress yesterday was foreseeable, predictable and, to some degree, self-inflicted." Wrong. It was time for Pelley to evacuate the anchor chair.

On Saturday morning, MSNBC “AM Joy” host Joy Reid brought on leftist Rev. Dr. William Barber so he could preach his usual sermon about villainous Republicans who “crucify voting rights” and enact other legislative evils. The MSNBC screen promised a “Moral Moment.”

Reid set up the reverend by saying, “it’s a delicate thing because, you know, obviously everybody is wishing the congressman well and hoping that he recovers.” She didn’t stop there.

She continued: “But Steve Scalise has a history that we’ve all been forced to sort of ignore on race. He did come to leadership after some controversy over attending a white nationalist event, which he says he didn’t know what it was. He also co-sponsored a bill to amend the Constitution to define marriage between a man and a woman. He voted for the House health care bill, which, as you said, would gut health care for millions of people, including three million children. And he co-sponsored a bill to repeal the ban on semiautomatic weapons . . . Are we required in a moral sense to put that aside at the moment?”

This shameless program was supported by the following advertisers over the weekend: AT&T, Duluth Trading Co., Ensure, Purina, Crest, Gas-X, Infiniti and ZipRecruiter.

The Twitter account for Reid’s “AM Joy” show seconded her emotion, saying, “Rep. #Scalise was shot by a white man with a violent background, and saved by a black lesbian police officer, and yet . . .” A graphic listed his votes for the House health care bill, a marriage amendment to the Constitution and a repeal of the liberal gun control law.

Common decency means we all hope and pray for the recovery of a public servant, as in the Giffords shooting. It’s not the time to quibble about their same-sex marriage voting score. Greg Gutfeld on Fox said it best: “Let me ask you this. A woman is raped. Do you feel compelled afterward to dredge up her stance on abortion or global warming?”

NBC and MSNBC weren’t going to address Reid’s immoral moment. They had the audacity to skip over that and applied their outrage instead to a Republican PAC that made a disreputable ad for the Georgia special election. It refers to the shooting and alleges that the “unhinged left” applauded the shooting, and that the violence won’t stop “if Jon Ossoff wins.” Everyone can denounce that—and they did—as the other networks put the ad flap into heavy rotation leading up to the election.

But Joy Reid’s uncivil rudeness—do we have to root for Scalise to survive?—went unaddressed. All the networks that aired this ad, deplored it and declared it “beyond offensive” were the same networks that shamelessly publicized the false liberal claim that former Gov. Sarah Palin was somehow responsible for Gabby Giffords getting shot. Civility is never a two-way street for the left.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled "The Left Has One More Argument: Kill Them!" was posted at townhall.com on June 21, 2017. Following is the article.

After a Bernie Sanders supporter tried to commit mass murder last week—the second homicidal Bernie supporter so far this year—the media blamed President Trump for lowering the bar on heated political rhetoric by calling his campaign opponents cruel names like "Crooked Hillary" and "Lyin' Ted."

As soon as any conservative responds to Trump's belittling names for his rivals by erupting in murderous rage, that will be a fantastically good point. But until then, it's idiotic. Unlike liberals, conservatives aren't easily incited to violence.

What we're seeing is the following: Prominent liberals repeatedly tell us, with deadly seriousness, that Trump and his supporters are: "Hitler," "fascists," "bigots," "haters," "racists," "terrorists," "criminals" and "white supremacists," which is then followed by liberals physically attacking conservatives.

To talk about "both sides" being guilty of provocative rhetoric is like talking about "both genders" being guilty of rape.

Nearly every op-ed writer at The New York Times has compared Trump to Hitler. (The conservative on the op-ed page merely called him a "proto-fascist.") If Trump is Hitler and his supporters Nazis, then the rational course of action for any civilized person is to kill them.

That's not just a theory, it's the result.

A few months ago, 38-year-old Justin Barkley shot and killed a UPS driver in a Walmart parking lot in Ithaca, New York, then ran over his body, because he thought he was killing Donald Trump. During his arraignment, Barkley told the judge: "I shot and killed Donald Trump purposely, intentionally and very proudly."

In the past year, there have been at least a hundred physical attacks on Trump supporters or presumed Trump supporters. The mainstream media have ignored them all.

Schoolchildren across the country are being hospitalized from beatings for the crime of liking Trump. In Pasco, Oregon, a 29-year-old Trump supporter was stabbed in the throat by a Hispanic man, Alvaro Campos-Hernandez, after a political argument.

Last month, the anti-jihad scholar Robert Spencer was poisoned in Iceland by a Social Justice Warrior pretending to be a fan, sending Spencer to the hospital.

It's become so normal for leftist thugs to assault anyone who likes Trump that, in Meriden, Connecticut, Wilson Echevarria and Anthony Hobdy leapt out of their car and started punching and hitting a man holding a Trump sign, rolling him into traffic right in front of a policeman.

If any one of these bloody attacks had been committed by a Trump supporter against a Muslim, a gay, a Mexican, a woman or a Democrat, the media

would have had to drop its Russia conspiracy theory to give us 24-7 coverage of the epidemic of right-wing violence.

The liberal response to this ceaseless mayhem toward conservatives is to produce a single nut, who fired a gun in the Comet Ping Pong pizzeria in Washington, D.C., last December (hurting no one) to “rescue children,” after reading on obscure right-wing blogs that the restaurant hid a Democratic pedophilia ring. (They’ve also hyped a long list of “hate crimes” that were utter hoaxes.)

Congratulations, liberals! You got one. And some tiny number of girls raped men last year. QED: Both sexes have a rape problem.

Liberal aggression has ratcheted up dramatically since the dawn of Trump, as has the dehumanizing rhetoric, but epic violence from the left is nothing new.

We don’t have to go back more than century to note that every presidential assassin and attempted presidential assassin who had a political motive was a leftist, a socialist, a communist or a member of a hippie commune. (Charles J. Guiteau, Leon Czolgosz, Giuseppe Zangara, Lee Harvey Oswald, Lynette “Squeaky” Fromme and Sara Jane Moore.)

Instead, we’ll start in the 1990s. Al Sharpton’s speeches helped inspire people to murder two people in Crown Heights in 1991 and seven people at Freddie’s Fashion Mart in 1995. As scary as David Duke and Richard Spencer are, I’ve never heard of anyone committing murder after listening to one of their speeches.

During the 2008 presidential campaign, among other acts of violence, Obama supporters Maced elderly volunteers in a McCain campaign office in Galax, Virginia. They threw Molotov cocktails at, stomped and shredded McCain signs on a half-dozen families’ front yards around Portland. Another Obama supporter broke the McCain sign of a small middle-aged woman in midtown Manhattan, then hit her in the face with the stick.

(All this for John McCain!)

At the Republicans’ convention that year, hundreds of liberals were arrested for smashing police cars, slashing tires and breaking store windows. Police seized Molotov cocktails, napalm bombs and assorted firearms from the protesters. Elderly convention-goers were Maced and sent to the hospital after protesters threw bricks through the windows of convention buses. On the first day alone, the cops made 284 arrests, 130 for felonies.

That same year, California voters approved Proposition 8, banning gay marriage. In response, left-wing opponents of the measure ferociously attacked Mormon and Catholic churches, smashing glass doors, spray-painting the churches and burning holy books on their front steps. The mayor of Fresno and his pastor received death threats serious enough to require around-the-clock police protection.

(Although the measure would not have passed without the support of black voters, liberals held black people blameless for their opposition to gay marriage. Mormons and Catholics were a much funner target.)

In 2009, one conservative had his finger bitten off at a Tea Party rally in Thousand Oaks, California, by a man at a MoveOn.org counter-protest. At a St. Louis Tea Party rally, an African-American selling anti-Obama bumper stickers was beaten up by two Service Employees International Union thugs, resulting in charges.

For the past few years, the media have enthusiastically promoted Black Lives Matter, hoping to galvanize the black vote. The mother of Michael Brown was even invited to appear on stage at the Democrats' convention. But, as the British discovered with their Indian auxiliaries during the Revolutionary War, having ginned them up, they couldn't calm them down.

As a result of the media's tall tales about homicidal, racist cops, Black Lives Matter enthusiasts staged sneak attacks, executing two policemen in Brooklyn, five in Dallas and three in Baton Rouge.

Liberals know damn well that their audience includes a not-insignificant portion of foaming-at-the-mouth lunatics, prepared, at the slightest provocation, to smash windows, burn down neighborhoods, physically attack and even murder conservatives. But instead of toning down the rhetoric, the respectable left keeps throwing matches on the bone-dry tinder, and then indignantly asks, "Are you saying conservatives don't do it, too?"

No, actually. We don't.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "A New Twist on Teaching Economics" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on June 21, 2017. Following is the article.

Greg Caskey is a 27-year-old Abington, Pennsylvania, native who is a social sciences teacher at Delaware Military Academy. The academy is a thriving charter high school in Wilmington, Delaware, that was founded in 2003 by two retired military officers, Charles Baldwin and Jack Wintermantel.

Students from all socio-economic backgrounds attend the school, which is doing a stellar job of teaching reading, writing and arithmetic and, just as importantly, moral character and self-discipline.

Mr. Caskey is one of the school's standout teachers. He has developed an innovative way of teaching the principles of economics to the school's students—a curriculum that he calls "HipHonomics," in which he uses original rap music as the basis for his lesson plans. His favorite rap artists are Nas, Eminem, Talib Kweli, Mos Def, The Notorious B.I.G. and Tupac Shakur.

Being in my 82nd year of life, I don't generally find hip-hop music or its lyrics that attractive. Part of the reason for my distaste is that it's difficult for me to decipher what the performers are saying, not to mention the constant annoying boom boom. I've been told that I benefit from not understanding what they are saying. But given my background in economics, Caskey's HipHonomics music is largely decipherable to me.

But much more importantly, it appears to be an excellent technique to excite and enlighten younger people, who may have alien and hostile minds to learning free market economic principles. That's vital, given all of the anti-freedom indoctrination that so many of our young people receive.

Caskey, who likes to refer to himself as M.C. Caskey, is in the process of making his work available for all to see and hear on his website, at <https://www.hiphoponomics.com>, and SoundCloud. He's developed an album centered around the 18th-century Scottish philosopher Adam Smith, who is known as the "Father of Economics."

Smith is much-maligned. People often see him as an advocate for selfishness. But to the contrary, Smith saw laissez-faire as a moral agenda and free markets as a tool to protect the rights of natural law. So the prelude "Who Was Adam Smith?" starts out with a short discussion by my colleague Dr. Russ Roberts and ends with lyrics highlighting Smith's arguments, all set to a hip-hop beat.

Then there's discussion of what's called the emergent order. It begins with a highly understandable statement by the greatest 20th-century economist, Nobel laureate Milton Friedman. After that, Caskey puts Friedman's ideas to hip-hop music and talk.

These ideas serve as the foundation for more HipHoponomics music—on principles such as free trade and comparative advantage, which most economists accept as advantageous to a nation.

Among important economic titles set to Caskey's HipHoponomics music are "Free Enterprise System," "New Deal or Raw Deal?," "What's up with the Fed?," "The 20s Were The Good Dayz" and "Demand & Supply Bars," and more are in the works.

He has even set to hip-hop music a title called "Debatin' the Wage," which features yours truly and Bernie Sanders on the minimum wage. I should note that I had zero involvement with it, but I understand that it's pretty good.

Caskey's goals are ambitious and laudable. He is inspiring great interest in economics among young people, who typically have little interest in such a rigorous academic subject. Caskey's goal is to reach the urban student with the relevance of the economic way of thinking.

He says, "I want to inspire zeal for the discipline of economics among young people, but particularly among urban young people, a historically underserved population, especially in the educational sense."

By the way, high schoolers are not the only people who can benefit from the lessons of HipHoponomics. I'd recommend it to our political leadership on both sides of the aisle, media people and teachers.

What Greg Caskey's put together is a nonthreatening approach to economics for the novice—and for those who believe they are beyond the novice level.



An article by Mike Adams titled “When a Free Press Opposes Free Speech” was posted at townhall.com on June 22, 2017. Following is the article.

The *Charlotte Observer* recently ran an editorial, which seeks to intentionally misinform the public about HB527—a bill to restore free speech on campuses in the UNC system.

- Let me be as clear as I possibly can: The editors who wrote this piece are not confused about what HB527 says.
- They are intentionally misrepresenting what it says because they oppose free speech.

That’s a bold statement, which I intend to back by reprinting the worst parts of their editorial followed by my own observations.

Charlotte Observer: “The move by North Carolina and a handful of other states to enact laws that enhance punishment for students who disrupt speeches is a solution that would be worse than the problem. Despite what happened to (Ann) Coulter and the likes of Tom Tancredo over his immigration views, UNC Wilmington Professor Mike Adams and his conservatism, and Spike Lee, who faced death and bomb threats when he spoke in North Carolina years ago, free speech is well-protected on college campuses. The proposed law, which passed the House in Raleigh late last week, may end up undercutting some forms of free expression to purportedly enhance the protection of other forms.”

Comments: The editors have managed to put three unsupported assertions into the same paragraph. They twice assert that HB527 may hurt free speech but they don’t tell us how. As bad as that is, it pales by comparison to the utterly absurd assertion that “free speech is well-protected on college campuses.” Such nonsense is on a par with saying that due process is well protected in North Korea. If the editors really believed that they would need to be hospitalized for severe intellectual hernia. But they don’t really believe that. In fact, no one believes that. The question is not whether there is a free speech crisis on our campuses. The question is whether it is a problem. The answer to that question depends upon two factors: 1) Your politics and 2) Your character.

If you are a conservative or an honest liberal you know there is a free speech problem on college campuses. Obviously, there are no conservatives or honest liberals working on the editorial board of *The Charlotte Observer*.

Charlotte Observer: “There has to be space for Coulter, despite her ugly rhetoric, which included saying Muslim countries needed to be invaded, their leaders killed and Muslims forced to convert to Christianity after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. There also has to be room for students and others to confront her—as long as violence and other threats are not used. Coulter has the right

to make audiences uncomfortable, and those audiences have the right to make her uncomfortable, too.”

Comments: That last paragraph was written as if the editors did not even read HB527. Of course, we know that they did read it—but they are just misrepresenting what it says. Furthermore, the paragraph has no relevance to the HB527 debate—unless, of course, the bill purports to provide a constitutional right of comfort for conservatives like Coulter while denying a corresponding right to those who “confront” her.

The plain language of HB527 says, “It is not the proper role of any constituent institution to shield individuals from speech protected by the First Amendment, including, without limitation, ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive.”

In other words, HB527 nullifies campus speech codes that purport to create a constitutional right to comfort—and it protects potentially offensive speech on a viewpoint neutral basis. Thus, the editors use feigned support of a specific provision of HB527 as a reason to oppose HB527. This is Soviet style journalism.

Charlotte Observer: “Critics of House Bill 527, also called “Restore/preserve campus free speech,” rightly note that it is based on model legislation from a conservative think tank and is overly vague, leaving too much room for abuse. Who gets to define how “disruptive” is too disruptive? Some of the country’s most important and effective social movements have involved in-your-face activists disrupting meals while sitting at segregated lunch counters, disrupting the flow of traffic, disrupting speeches on campus and elsewhere.”

Comments: There are two dangerous admissions in this paragraph.

First, the editors admit that their real reason for opposing HB527 is that it came from conservatives. According to the editors, free speech is not a problem on campuses. But if there was one the editors couldn’t let conservatives solve it because that would deprive them of the ability to depict conservatives as the real enemies of free speech.

Second, the editors actually equate lying down in the middle of a public road and blocking the flow of traffic with protected speech. It must hurt to be this intellectually constipated. Nothing more need be said.

Charlotte Observer: “There are already plenty of laws against violence and trespassing, as well as court-based remedies for those who have been wrongly silenced. (Adams sued and won when he was denied a promotion.) Colleges and universities everywhere have conduct codes that deal with unruly students.”

Comments The “Adams won and so can you” argument is simply hysterical. The editors do not mention that it took me seven years and over a million dollars in attorney fees to win in federal court. Nor do they mention that before I went to court I was already a campus free speech activist connected with the best First Amendment attorneys in America. The average student does not have my connections or my resources. In fact, none of them do.

Furthermore, by claiming that “conduct codes” are a solution (to the free speech problem they already denied) the editors show their deep ignorance of university policy. Codes such as UNCW’s “disorderly conduct” policy have been used as weapons against free speech.

Case in point: In 2015, a UNCW student faced expulsion for sending a single campus email referring to UNCW administrators as “punk asses.” While crude, this is constitutionally protected speech. Fortunately, the student contacted me asking for assistance. I called the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education who came in and saved the day by defending the student and getting the charges dropped.

Obviously, the “disorderly conduct” code was there to protect university administrators from being offended. HB527 does away with that. Under the new bill, students can’t be prosecuted for offending government agents with their speech. They can only be prosecuted for disrupting the speech of other citizens simply because they were offended. This distinction is so simple that even a newspaper editor could understand it.

Charlotte Observer: “The solution isn’t another ill-advised law; it’s better education about why free speech is a cornerstone of our democracy and a more robust adherence not only to the letter of the First Amendment, but its spirit.”

Comments: This is more intentional deception by the editors. HB527 states that, “All constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina shall include in freshman orientation programs a section describing the policies regarding free expression consistent with this Article.” In other words, HB527 educates incoming freshman about proper respect for free speech as well as the university’s refusal to tolerate those who obstruct it.

These editors are not confused. They are in bed with corrupt administrators and rioting “progressives.” They have no journalistic integrity.



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.”