

Eye on the World

Dec. 3, 2016

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 Dec. 3, 2016.

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).



A Reuters article by El Gamal, Parisa Hafezi and Dmitry Zhdannikov titled “Exclusive: How Putin, Khamenei and Saudi Prince Got OPEC Deal Done” was posted at reuters.com on Dec. 1, 2016. Following is the article.

Russian President Vladimir Putin played a crucial role in helping OPEC rivals Iran and Saudi Arabia set aside differences to forge the cartel’s first deal with non-OPEC Russia in 15 years.

Interventions ahead of Wednesday’s OPEC meeting came at key moments from Putin, Saudi Deputy Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman and Iran’s Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and President Hassan Rouhani, OPEC and non-OPEC sources said.

Putin’s role as intermediary between Riyadh and Tehran was pivotal, testament to the rising influence of Russia in the Middle East since its military intervention in the Syrian civil war just over a year ago.

It started when Putin met Saudi Prince Mohammed in September on the sidelines of a G20 gathering in China.

The two agreed to cooperate to help world oil markets clear a glut that had more than halved oil prices since 2014, pummeling Russian and Saudi government revenues. Oil prices are up 10 pct this week topping \$53 a barrel.

The financial pain made a deal possible despite the huge political differences between Russia and Saudi over the civil war in Syria.

“Putin wants the deal. Full stop. Russian companies will have to cut production,” said a Russian energy source briefed on the discussions.

In September, OPEC agreed in principle at a meeting in Algiers to reduce output for the first time since the 2008 financial crisis.

But the individual country commitments required to finalize a deal at Wednesday’s Vienna meeting still required much diplomacy.

Recent OPEC meetings have failed because of arguments between de facto leader Saudi Arabia and third-largest producer Iran. Tehran has long argued OPEC should not prevent it restoring output lost during years of Western sanctions.

Proxy wars in Syria and Yemen have exacerbated decades of tensions between the Saudi Sunni kingdom and the Iranian Shi’ite Islamic republic.

Brinkmanship

Heading into the meeting, the signs were not good. Oil markets went into reverse. Saudi Prince Mohammed had repeatedly demanded Iran participate in supply cuts. Saudi and Iranian OPEC negotiators had argued in circles in the run-up to the meeting.

And, then, just a few days beforehand, Riyadh appeared back away from a deal, threatening to boost production if Iran failed to contribute cuts.

But Putin established that the Saudis would shoulder the lion’s share of cuts, as long as Riyadh wasn’t seen to be making too large a concession to Iran. A deal was possible if Iran didn’t celebrate victory over the Saudis.

A phone call between Putin and Iranian President Rouhani smoothed the way. After the call, Rouhani and oil minister Bijan Zanganeh went to their supreme leader for approval, a source close to the Ayatollah said.

“During the meeting, the leader Khamenei underlined the importance of sticking to Iran’s red line, which was not yielding to political pressures and not to accept any cut in Vienna,” the source said.

“Zanganeh thoroughly explained his strategy . . . and got the leader’s approval. Also it was agreed that political lobbying was important, especially with Mr. Putin, and again the Leader approved it,” said the source.

On Wednesday, the Saudis agreed to cut production heavily, taking “a big hit” in the words of energy minister Khalid al-Falih—while Iran was allowed to slightly boost output.

Iran’s Zanganeh kept a low profile during the meeting, OPEC delegates said. Zanganeh had already agreed the deal the night before, with Algeria helping mediate, and he was careful not to make a fuss about it.

After the meeting, the usually combative Zanganeh avoided any comment that might be read as claiming victory over Riyadh.

"We were firm," he told state television. "The call between Rouhani and Putin played a major role . . . After the call, Russia backed the cut."

Iraq last-minute hitch

But OPEC would not be OPEC without a last-minute quarrel threatening to derail the deal. Iraq became a problem.

As ministerial talks got underway, OPEC's second-largest producer insisted it could not afford to cut output, given the cost of its war against Islamic State.

But, facing pressure from the rest of OPEC to contribute a cut, Iraqi Oil Minister Jabar Ali al-Luaibi picked up the phone in front of his peers to call his prime minister, Haider al-Abadi.

"Abadi said: 'Get the deal done.' And that was it," one OPEC source said.



An article by Adam Kredo titled "Congress Passes New Iran Sanctions, Ignoring Obama Administration Threats" was posted at freebeacon.com on Dec. 1, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Congress unanimously voted on Thursday to level new sanctions on Iran, sending a clear message that lawmakers stand opposed to the Obama administration's continued concessions to Tehran in the final months before it leaves office, according to comments provided to the Washington Free Beacon.

The Obama administration, including Secretary of State John Kerry, made a final push in recent weeks to convince lawmakers to abandon the new sanctions, but lawmakers remained firm on Thursday, voting 99-0 to approve the new sanctions. Even Democrats who have supported the White House's diplomacy voted in favor of the sanctions.

Senior Iranian officials have been adamant that new sanctions would violate last summer's nuclear agreement and have threatened multiple times in recent months to walk away from the deal if the United States does not meet all of its demands under the deal.

A State Department official told the Free Beacon the department is focused on ensuring that Iran continues to implement its nuclear-related commitments under the JCPOA when asked about its position on the sanctions bill.

While President Barack Obama has threatened to veto the new sanctions, sources told the Free Beacon that mounting opposition to the deal may make this difficult for the White House, which has been working in its final months to preserve the diplomatic agreement before President-elect Donald Trump assumes control.

As lawmakers pave the way for Trump to undo the deal, the Obama administration is working furiously in its final days to preserve a deal that officials describe as a signature piece of Obama's time in office.

The White House worked fiercely to stop the new sanctions from coming to a vote, according to sources familiar with the situation. However, the administration could not stem a growing sense in Congress that Iran has continued to embrace terrorism and foster chaos in the region since the nuclear deal was inked.

Iran's continued aggression against U.S. forces in the region and ongoing demands that America give it greater access to financial resources have angered many on Capitol Hill, who told the Free Beacon that continued appeasement is no longer an option to rein in the regime's behavior.



An article by Benjamin Haas and Tom Phillips titled "Pope's Possible Deal With China Would 'Betray Christ', Says Hong Kong Cardinal" was posted at the-guardian.com on Nov. 27, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

The most senior Chinese Catholic has slammed a potential rapprochement between the Vatican and Beijing, saying it would be "betraying Jesus Christ", amid a thaw in more than six decades of bitter relations.

Talk of a deal between the two sides has been building for months, with some saying the diplomatic coup for Pope Francis would be resolving the highly controversial issue of allowing China's Communist government to have a hand in selecting bishops.

But Cardinal Joseph Zen, the 84-year-old former bishop of Hong Kong, has been an outspoken critic, saying any agreement where Beijing would have a hand in approving clergy would be "a surrender."

"Maybe the pope is a little naive, he doesn't have the background to know the Communists in China," Zen said at the Salesian school in Hong Kong where he still teaches. "The pope used to know the persecuted Communists [in Latin America], but he may not know the Communist persecutors who have killed hundreds of thousands."

Chinese Catholics are free to go to mass and attend government-sanctioned churches, but barred from proselytising. The state-controlled China Catholic Patriotic Association controls the church and appoints bishops, currently without any input from the Vatican.

An "underground" Catholic church exists, with some estimates saying it is larger than the official one, and its members and clergy have faced persecution by authorities.

Protestant Christians also face similar challenges, and a recent campaign by authorities in eastern China has seen more than 1,200 crosses removed from buildings and churches demolished.

Zen complained that most supporters of the deal did not truly know China, lacking first-hand experience with the state of the church under the Communists. He spent seven years frequently teaching in cities across China in the wake of the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre, a bloody crackdown on pro-democracy protesters that was followed by severe tightening of freedom of expression and religion.

One motivation for the Vatican is the relatively small number of Catholics in a country filled with people who are increasingly searching for meaning in their lives. There are roughly 10 million Catholics, just a 10th of the overall number of Christians in the country.

With “fake freedom” under a proposed deal, priests could more easily preach and more churches would open, Zen predicted, but “it’s only the impression of freedom, it’s not real freedom, the people sooner or later will see the bishops are puppets of the government and not really the shepherds of the flock.”

“The official bishops are not really preaching the gospel,” Zen added “They are preaching obedience to Communist authority.”



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled “France Debates Bill to Criminalize Online Pro-Life Advocacy” was posted at cnsnews.com on Dec. 1, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

French lawmakers on Thursday will debate and vote on a Socialist government-backed draft law that could criminalize online pro-life advocacy. The legislation would extend the ambit of already-illegal “interference” in abortion to cover digital media.

Any website carrying material that is deemed to be “deliberately misleading, intimidating and/or exerting psychological or moral pressure” aimed at persuading a mother not to abort her child could face criminal charges, with punishments of two years in prison and a fine of 30,000 euros (\$31,800).

France legalized abortion on demand until the end of the 12th week of pregnancy—or what is known officially as “voluntary interruption of pregnancy” (L’interruption volontaire de grossesse or IVG)—in 1975.

In 1993 another law was passed, creating the offense of hindering or interfering in an abortion—aimed at preventing pro-life activists from physically blocking access to, or occupying or otherwise targeting abortion facilities.

The law was later broadened to cover “moral and psychological pressure” aimed at dissuading abortion, and the legislation now under consideration seeks to widen that further into the digital realm.

In the new law’s crosshairs are websites like IVG.net, which offers counselling, practical support, and resources that include information about medical and psychological risks entailed in having an abortion.

The French Ministry of Social Affairs and Health's official abortion website warns women about sites of that nature.

In other recent abortion-related developments in France, judicial authorities recently ruled that a video featuring children with Down syndrome could not be broadcast on public television on the grounds that the children's smiles may "disturb" women who have had abortions.

Earlier this year, a mandatory one-week waiting period before abortion was abolished.

France has long had liberal abortion policies, In 1988 it became the first country to introduce the abortion pill RU-486 (mifepristone), and in 2012—in line with a Hollande campaign pledge—parliament voted to reimburse the full cost of abortions, a measure that came into force the following year.

(Update: The French National Assembly on Thursday adopted the controversial bill, with the support of leftists and a majority of centrists, while right wing lawmakers opposed it. The measure now goes to the Senate. Family Minister Laurence Rossignol argued during the debate that "freedom of expression should not be confused with manipulating minds.")



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "A Minute of Silence for Fidel Castro, Then UN Resumes Condemnation of Israel" was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 30, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

After a minute of silence in honor of Fidel Castro, United Nations member-states on Tuesday turned to the regular General Assembly agenda item entitled "the question of Palestine," in preparation for votes on several resolutions condemning Israel.

"I'm deeply saddened by the passing of Fidel Castro," began the president of the General Assembly, Peter Thomson of Fiji. He described the Cuban dictator as "one of the iconic leaders of the 20th century, with a great love for his homeland and the Cuban people, he dedicated his life to their welfare and development."

"A tireless advocate for equity in the international arena, he was an inspirational figure for developing countries in particular," Thomson added.

Representatives then stood in silence for a minute.

On a day when the U.N. marks its annual "International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People," a number of delegates sported Palestinian flags, scarves and keffiyehs—including Thomson himself, for some of the time.

Amid concerns about how the looming Trump administration may deal with both the Israel-Palestinian issue and the United Nations at large, speakers warned that a "two-state solution" was slipping out of reach.

For U.N. Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson, the Israel-Palestinian conflict was not merely one of many around the world, but a “long-standing, gaping wound that has fed tension and conflict throughout the Middle East and beyond.”

Others described it as being “at the heart of tensions” in the region (Jordan), among its “most pressing crises” (Venezuela), and the “origin” of regional tensions (Iran).

At both a special “Day of Solidarity” event and subsequent General Assembly plenary session, speaker after speaker accused Israel of violating Palestinian rights and destroying chances of peace by expanding settlements in disputed territory.

The Palestinian representative, Riyad Mansour, referred to “apartheid,” and Venezuela’s envoy accused Israel of committing “war crimes.” The Nicaraguan delegate declared that any country supporting Israel is perpetuating Palestinian “suffering.”

Israel’s ambassador to the U.N., Danny Danon derided the event as the U.N.’s annual “cynical Israel-bashing festival.”

The General Assembly will later this week vote on six resolutions condemning Israel, all having already been endorsed at committee level by large vote margins, Four of the resolutions fall under the “question of Palestine” agenda item, and two under a separate agenda item also focusing on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, “the situation in the Middle East.”

Five of the six relate to the Palestinian issue, while the sixth focuses on the “occupied Syrian Golan,” calling on Israel to return the strategic ridge, which it has controlled since 1967 and annexed in 1981, to the Assad regime.

The resolution does not refer to the civil war raging in Syria, the abuses committed by the Assad regime or other parties and the massive loss of life. But it does demand that Israel stop “its repressive measures against the population of the occupied Syrian Golan.”

“It’s astonishing,” Hillel Neuer, executive director of U.N. Watch, a Geneva-based NGO, said earlier. “At a time when the Syrian regime is killing its own people by the hundreds of thousands, how can the U.N. call for more human beings to be placed under Assad’s rule? The timing of today’s text is morally galling, and logically absurd.”

The International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People is held on November 29 each year to mark the anniversary of the day in 1947 when the General Assembly passed a measure (resolution 181) dividing the territory between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River into a Jewish state and an Arab one.

A number of delegates decried the fact that, 69 years on, the so-called “Partition Plan” resolution’s realization remains incomplete, since no Palestinian state exists.

An official U.N. news item explained: “The date 29 November was chosen for this Day of Solidarity because on that day in 1947, the U.N. General Assembly

adopted the Partition Resolution which provided for the establishment of a 'Jewish State' and an 'Arab State' within Palestine . . . So far, only the Jewish State of Israel has come into existence."

Unmentioned both in the news item and by most speakers during Tuesday's discussions was the fact that Jewish leaders accepted the 1947 resolution at the time, while Arab and Palestinian leaders violently rejected it.

Immediately after the State of Israel was declared the following spring, five Arab armies attacked it in what Arab League head Azzam Pasha described as "a war of annihilation." The effort failed to wipe out the fledgling state, but cost the lives of some 4,000 Israeli soldiers and 2,000 civilians, amounting to one percent of the then population.



An article by John Stonestreet titled "Goodbye, Fidel Castro" (with a subtitle "Why Utopianism Always Fails") was posted at breakpoint.com on Nov. 29, 2016. Following is the article.

On Friday [Nov. 25], Fidel Castro died at the age of ninety, far older than many of his opponents lived to be. If you've been subjected to the fawning epitaphs of many in the media (or read about one NFL quarterback's ridiculous defense of Castro) please keep this in mind: While exact numbers are difficult to come by, the number of Cubans murdered by Castro's regime numbers in the tens of thousands, if not more.

In 1998, I found myself standing less than a hundred yards away from Castro. I'd spent a year in Jamaica right after college, and while I was there, Castro came for a visit. Looking back, knowing what I now know about Castro, the esteem in which he was held was amazing: He was met with a hero's welcome by both public officials and the people . . . not to mention, streets and sidewalks that had been in disrepair for decades were fixed, and gutters were finally unclogged and cleaned up to honor him.

The obvious question was: Why? And the best answer my Jamaican friends could come up with when I asked was that Castro had "stood up" to the United States for decades.

Implicit in their answer is the idea that Castro had stood up to them because he had the best interests of the Cuban people in mind. A sentiment shared by Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau when he called Castro "a larger than life leader who served his people for almost half a century."

But what twaddle that is! Castro certainly was larger than life, and as I learned that day, an amazing public speaker. But oratorical skills cannot mitigate the consequences of evil ideas. Only people who didn't actually have to live under Castro's rule would call his treatment of the Cuban people "ser-

vice." The Cuba Archive has identified at least 15,000 Cubans who were shot, hanged, bombed or otherwise died in Castro's notorious prisons.

This is the legacy of the man that today's version of what Lenin once dubbed "useful idiots" are praising.

In addition, Castro's idea of "service" included making Cuba a satellite of the Soviet Union. He allowed the USSR to place nuclear missiles on the island, thus giving his people a potential front-row seat for Armageddon.

And then of course, there's Cuba's horrendous human rights record. According to Human Rights Watch, "During Castro's rule, thousands of Cubans were incarcerated in abysmal prisons, thousands more were harassed and intimidated, and entire generations were denied basic political freedoms."

If this is "service," I'd hate to see "evil."

But let's be clear: what happened in Castro's Cuba is fully consistent with the historical record of communism and all other attempts at man-made utopias, a word which, you should recall, means "no place."

All utopian visions attempt to reinvent man and refashion him along ideologically-inspired lines by force of state-level coercion. And that never works. Human nature just isn't that malleable.

The 2001 film "Enemy at the Gates," about the siege of Stalingrad during World War II, offers one of the clearest and concise critiques of communism I've ever heard. As he lays dying, Danilov, a commissar whose job it was to try and create this "new Soviet man," tells the hero, "I've been such a fool, Vassili. Man will always be man. There is no new man. We worked so hard to create a society that was equal, where there'd be nothing to envy your neighbour. But there's always something to envy. A smile, a friendship, something you don't have and want to appropriate."

Danilov is only mistaken on one point: there is a "new man." But humans are only made new by a means that Castro tried so hard to destroy during his entire reign: the Christ of Christianity. And I pray this lesson isn't lost on the rest of us.



An editorial by Ben Shapiro titled "Why Does the Left Go Easy on Dictators?" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 30, 2016. Following is the article.

When evil Cuban dictator Fidel Castro finally died last Friday [Nov. 25], the left seemed deeply ambivalent. President Obama noted "the countless ways in which Fidel Castro altered the course of individual lives, families, and of the Cuban nation," as though Castro had been some sort of high school guidance counselor.

Former President Jimmy Carter recalled all the wonderful times he spent by the sea with Castro, the sun gleaming off the waves. He said, "We remember fondly our visits with him in Cuba and his love of his country."

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau—aka handsome Bernie Sanders—described Castro as “remarkable . . . a larger than life leader who served his people for almost half a century.”

Meanwhile, around the world, dictators wept in solidarity with Castro.

Palestinian Authority dictator Mahmoud Abbas, who is currently in the 11th year of a four-year term in office, ordered the flags dropped to half-staff around his trashed territory.

Russian dictator Vladimir Putin sent a telegram to Cuban President Raul Castro, saying, “Free and independent Cuba, which (Fidel Castro) and his allies built, became an influential member of the international community and became an inspiring example for many countries and nations.”

Chinese dictator Xi Jinping called Castro “a close comrade and a sincere friend,” adding, “His glorious image and great achievements will be recorded in history forever.”

What were Castro’s great achievements?

He presided over the economic destruction of one of the most quickly developing countries in Latin America; he arrested and imprisoned hundreds of thousands of dissidents; he caused the self-imposed exile of millions of Cubans; he watched and participated in the drowning of thousands of Cubans attempting to escape his prison island; he worked with mass murderer Che Guevara to murder political opponents. Castro was, simply put, one of the worst people in a century full of awful human beings.

So why did the left emerge to pay its respects this week?

Because at least Castro sought utopia.

Radical leftism believes that the quest for a utopian world, a world free of unfairness, justifies any cruelty against individuals. Individual rights are obstacles to communal greatness. The bricks of the tower of Babel will be mortared with the blood of those sacrificed on behalf of the vision. That’s because the state—which is really just an extension of “the people,” who only exist en masse, never as individuals—is the source of all rights. No rights can be violated if the state declares them defunct.

That’s why the left only pays token homage to those who suffer at the hands of history’s greatest monsters—as Josef Stalin apocryphally put it, you can’t make an omelet without breaking eggs. No wonder the left defended Stalin all the way until news broke in 1956 that Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev had criticized Stalin’s purges.

Until then, Walter Duranty of The New York Times had whitewashed the murder of millions in the Ukrainian Holodomor—he declared that he had seen the future, and it worked. And Hollywood even portrayed Stalin’s show trials in a positive light in “Mission to Moscow.”

Today, Hollywood produces fawning biopics like “Che” (directed by Steven Soderbergh) and “The Motorcycle Diaries” (produced by Robert Redford), and *The New York Times* titled its obituary for Castro, “A Revolutionary Who Defied the U.S. And Held Cuba in His Thrall.”

Dictators everywhere are safe so long as leftism reigns. And leftism will continue to reign so long as men dream of a collective heaven on Earth rather than of individual rights protected from such utopian totalitarians.



An editorial by Laura Hollis titled “What Does the Left Really Want?” was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 1, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

I was appalled—but not surprised—to see the glowing reviews of El Comandante’s life and work splattered across traditional and social media.

■ Green Party presidential candidate Jill Stein posted this tweet: “Fidel Castro was a symbol of the struggle for justice in the shadow of empire. Presente!”

■ The Communist Party of the USA posted a tribute which closed with, “Always in our hearts, we remember Comrade Fidel Castro Ruz, presente!”

■ Black Lives Matter’s statement was even worse. It said, “We are feeling many things as we awaken to a world without Fidel Castro . . . Although no leader is without their flaws, we must push back against the rhetoric of the right and come to the defense of El Comandante.”

Good grief—Castro’s excesses are mere “flaws”? Let’s take a look at some of those “flaws,” shall we?

Homosexuals in Castro’s Cuba were rounded up and sent to forced labor camps, where they were beaten, buried alive, tied up naked with barbed wire and starved. Political opponents were imprisoned and tortured, fed watery soup laced with shards of glass.

Mothers and wives of political prisoners formed the “Ladies in White,” who peacefully protested after Sunday Mass; Castro responded by arresting and imprisoning them as well. Castro was infamous for his firing squads.

Thousands on this tiny island country died at the hands of Castro and his murderous thugs. Nearly half a million were able to flee to the United States. Many died trying. The rest lived in fear and poverty.

But it’s all cool, right? Because everyone got “free education” (aka propaganda and indoctrination) and equal access to lousy health care.

The accolades for Fidel Castro are part and parcel of a disturbing propensity of the American left to ignore egregious human rights abuses as long as they’re being done in the name of “the people.” Isolated academics, dopey Hollywood millionaires and the press are among the worst offenders.

Consider Walter Duranty, a reporter for The New York Times, whose articles about the Soviet Union under Josef Stalin won him a Pulitzer Prize in 1932. Duranty's reports were filled with glowing praise for the dictator's egalitarian aspirations.

But Duranty refused to tell the truth about Stalin's murderous, oppressive policies, his purges, the thousands he sent to die in gulags or his collectivization plans that caused widespread famine in Ukraine, killing millions (referred to by Ukrainians as Holodomor, or "murder by hunger"). Though the Times has since issued statements denouncing Duranty's regurgitation of Soviet propaganda, his Pulitzer has never been revoked.

All told, nearly 100 million people died under dozens of communist regimes across the globe during the 20th century: at least 45 million of these were in China alone; nearly a third of the entire population of tiny Cambodia was killed under the Khmer Rouge.

Every single one of these regimes was purportedly established "for the people" to bring about "equality."

What does it take for the left to acknowledge that there is no utopia under these collectivist ideologies? Political oppression, poverty, misery and death are the rule, not the exception. (And will someone on the left please explain why, if these systems are so great, no one is allowed to leave?)

Comparisons between America's left and the world's communists are dismissed as hysteria. I'm not so sure. Consider just some of what we've seen this election cycle:

- The overwhelmingly left-leaning national press was exposed as little more than a propaganda arm for the Democratic Party.
- Democratic operatives bragged about vote fraud.
- Trump supporters were subjected to brutal mob violence, simply for attending a rally.
- After Trump won the election, there were riots; the 62 million Americans who voted for Trump were denounced using every conceivable slur. I personally observed people calling Trump voters "bad people," "evil" and "filled with hate." (When we get to "enemies of the people," the propaganda conversion is complete.)
- Now there are calls to eliminate the Electoral College, which was put in place to protect the rights of small population states. Electors are receiving death threats.
- Witnesses to the violence both before and after the elections have made the same observation: "I don't feel like I'm living in America anymore."

Here's what troubles me: The same people who are singing Fidel Castro's praises want control of our government.



An editorial by Thomas Sowell titled "Backward-Looking 'Progressives' " was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Nov. 22, 2016. Following is the article.

People who call themselves "progressives" claim to be forward-looking, but a remarkable amount of the things they say and do are based on looking backward.

One of the maddening aspects of the thinking, or non-thinking, on the political left is their failure to understand that there is nothing they can do about the past. Whether people on the left are talking about college admissions or criminal justice, or many other decisions, they go on and on about how some people were born with lesser chances in life than other people.

Whoever doubted it? But, once someone who has grown up is being judged by a college admissions committee or by a court of criminal justice, there is nothing that can be done about their childhood. Other institutions can deal with today's children from disadvantaged backgrounds, and should, but the past is irrevocable.

Even where there are no economic differences among various families in which children are raised, there are still major differences in the circumstances into which people are born, even within the same family, which affect their chances in later life as adults.

For example, among children of the same parents, raised under the same roof, the first born, as a group, have done better than their later siblings, whether measured by IQ tests or by becoming National Merit Scholarship finalists or by various other achievements.

The only child has also done better, on average, than children who have siblings. The advantage of the first born may well be due to the fact that he or she was an only child for some time, perhaps for several formative years.

By the time people have grown up and apply to college, all that is history. Nothing that a college admissions committee can do will change anything about their childhoods. The only things these committees' decisions can affect are the present and the future. This is not rocket science.

Nevertheless, there are people who urge college admissions committees to let disadvantaged students be admitted with lower test scores or other academic indicators.

Those who say such things seldom even attempt to see what the actual consequences of such policies have been. The prevailing preconceptions—sometimes called what "everybody knows"—are sufficient for them.

Factual studies show that admitting students to institutions whose standards they do not meet often leads to needless academic failures, even among students with above average ability, who could have succeeded at other institutions whose standards they do meet.

The most comprehensive of these studies of Americans is the book "Mismatch" by Sander and Taylor. Similar results in other countries are cited in my own book, *Affirmative Action Around the World*.

When it comes to criminal justice, there is much the same kind of preoccupation on the left with the past that cannot be changed. Murderers may in some cases have had unhappy childhoods, but there is absolutely nothing that anybody can do to change their childhoods after they are adults.

The most that can be done is to keep murderers from committing more murders, and to deter others from committing murder. People on the left who want to give murderers "another chance" are gambling with the lives of innocent people. That is one of many other examples of the cruel consequences of seemingly compassionate decisions and policies.

Ironically, people on the left who are preoccupied with the presumably unhappy childhoods of murderers, which they can do nothing about, seldom show similar concern about the present and future unhappy childhoods of the orphans of people who have been murdered.

Such inconsistencies are not peculiar to our time, though they seem to be more pervasive today. But the left has been trying, for more than 200 years, to mitigate or eliminate punishments in general, and capital punishment in particular. What is peculiar to our time is the degree to which the views of the left have become laws and policies.

A long overdue backlash against those views has begun in some Western nations, of which the recent election results in the United States are just one symptom. How all this will end is by no means clear. Just as the past cannot be changed, so the future cannot be predicted with certainty.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Let's Fight Tyranny" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Nov. 30, 2016. Following is the article.

For more than a half-century, it has become abundantly clear that our nation faces increasing irreconcilable differences. At the root is the fact that there is one group of Americans who mostly want to be left alone and live according to the rule of law and the dictates of the U.S. Constitution while another group of Americans wants to control the lives of others and ignore both the rule of law and constitutional restraints on the federal government.

Should those Americans who favor the rule of law and constitutional government fight against or yield to those Americans who have contempt for the rule of law and constitutional government? Let's look at a few of those irreconcilable differences.

Some Americans prefer to manage their own health care needs. Others wish to have the federal government dictate their health care. Some Americans want their earnings to be taxed only for the constitutionally mandated functions of the federal government, which are outlined in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution. Others think American earnings should be taxed for anything on which Congress can muster a majority vote.

Though there is no constitutional authority for federal involvement in public education, some Americans want the federal government involved. The list of irreconcilable differences among the American people is nearly without end. These differences survive because of the timidity of those offended and the brute power of the federal government.

I think reconciliation is impossible; therefore, separation is the only long-term peaceful solution. Separation and independence do not require that liberty-loving Americans overthrow the federal government any more than they required Gen. George Washington to overthrow the British government in order to secede or required his successor secessionist, Confederate President Jefferson Davis, to overthrow the U.S. federal government.

You say, "All those government acts that you say violate the rule of law and the Constitution have been ruled constitutional by the courts!" That's true. The courts have twisted the Constitution, but Thomas Jefferson warned, "To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions (is) a very dangerous doctrine indeed and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

State governors and legislators ought to summon up the courage our Founding Fathers had in their response to the fifth Congress' Alien and Sedition Acts in 1798. Written by Jefferson and James Madison, the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions of 1798 and 1799 stated that those states' legislatures considered the Alien and Sedition Acts unconstitutional.

They said, "Resolved, That the several States composing, the United States of America, are not united on the principle of unlimited submission to their general government . . . and . . . whensoever the general government assumes undelegated powers, its acts are unauthoritative, void, and of no force."

The 10th Amendment to our Constitution holds, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The federal government should not be permitted to determine the scope of its own powers. Alexander Hamilton, in Federalist No. 28, said, "The State governments will, in all possible contingencies, afford complete security against invasions of the public liberty by the national authority."

One response to federal encroachment is for state governments to declare federal laws that have no constitutional authority null and void and refuse to obey them.

In other words, they should nullify federal laws that violate the Constitution. In good conscience, liberals could not object to nullification. There are hundreds of so-called sanctuary cities in the U.S.—liberal places that have chosen to nullify federal immigration laws and harbor immigrants who are here illegally.

Former slave Frederick Douglass advised: “Find out just what any people will quietly submit to and you have found out the exact measure of injustice and wrong which will be imposed upon them . . . The limits of tyrants are prescribed by the endurance of those whom they oppress.”

We Americans appear to have very limited endurance in the face of tyrannical oppression.



An article by Cortney O’Brien titled “Hollywood Not Interested in the ‘Controversial’ Gosnell Movie” was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 30, 2016. Following is the article.

You’d think Hollywood would jump at the chance to help tell the story of “America’s most prolific serial killer,” as ABC’s Terry Moran described him. Yet, the film about late-term abortionist Kermit Gosnell, who was convicted of killing babies born alive in his Philadelphia abortion clinic, is being shunned by many Hollywood distributors as too “controversial,” according to the film’s producers.

Phelim McAleer and Ann McElhinney have faced constant pushback when trying to get Hollywood distributors to show their film. Despite it breaking IndieGogo crowdsourcing records and scoring high grades at test screenings, studios and distributors have passed on the Gosnell movie. The film easily could have been rated R, but the producers kept it PG-13 so it could reach a wider audience. Every film distributor they asked still said no thanks.

McElhinney was quick to point out that Hollywood has had no problem promoting films with a pro-abortion message.

“Obvious Child was a romantic comedy where a likeable couple bond over her aborting their child. Grandma—starred veteran actor Lily Tomlin—as a grandmother on a road trip trying to gather together enough money for her granddaughter’s abortion,” McElhinney is quoted in a press release.

“These films were nominated for awards and praised by critics for ‘tackling abortion.’ Now the idea that GOSNELL, a film based on a true story—with much of it based on courtroom transcripts—is “too controversial” is laughable. This is continuing the media cover-up—they don’t want anything that asks difficult questions about abortion.”

The “cover-up,” the producers surmise, is because both the mainstream media and mainstream Hollywood “hate” pro-life, middle class America.

To solve the problem, the Gosnell Movie team has decided to release the film independently next year.



An article by Justin Holcomb titled "Mark Wahlberg: 'Hollywood is Living in a Bubble . . . Out of Touch With Reality' " was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 1, 2016. Following is the article.

Actor Mark Wahlberg criticized his peers in an interview on Tuesday, saying that Hollywood is out of touch with reality and that people in the industry should keep their opinions to themselves.

"A lot of celebrities did, do, and shouldn't [talk politics]," he told Task & Purpose magazine. "They might buy your CD or watch your movie, but you don't put food on their table. You don't pay their bills. A lot of Hollywood is living in a bubble. They're pretty out of touch with the common person, the everyday guy out there providing for their family."

Wahlberg said that he has spent most of his life around the common person.

"Me, I'm very aware of the real world. I come from the real world and I exist in the real world," he said. "And although I can navigate Hollywood and I love the business and the opportunities it's afforded me, I also understand what it's like not to have all that."



A video and an article by Kerry Pickett titled "Flashback: Clinton Said Not Accepting Election Results was 'Horrifying' " were posted at dailycaller.com on Nov. 26, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Hillary Clinton, now a private citizen after conceding the election to Donald Trump, wants in on the recount effort Green Party nominee Jill Stein launched Friday [Nov. 25], even though she previously called such a notion "horrifying."

During the final debate between Clinton and Donald Trump last month in Las Vegas, Fox News Channel's Chris Wallace asked Trump if he would honor the results of the election even if he lost.

"I will look at it at the time. I'm not looking at it now. What I've seen is so bad," Trump responded.

Wallace pressed the question further, and Trump replied, "What I'm saying is I will tell you at the time."

"I'll keep you in suspense," Trump said.

Clinton, apparently taken aback by Trump's response to the matter, hit back "That's horrifying."

She went on to say, "That's not the way our democracy works. We've been around 240 years. We've had free and fair elections and we've accepted the outcomes when we may not have liked them and that is what must be expected of anyone standing on a debate stage during a general election. President Obama said the other day that when you're whining before the game is even finished it just shows you're not even up to doing the job."

She added, "And let's be clear about what he's saying and what he means. He's denigrating—he's talking down our democracy. I for one am appalled that somebody who is the nominee of one of our major two parties would take that kind of position."

Clinton was later asked by reporters about Trump's statement at the debate and she said, "I truly doubt he has ever read the Constitution."



An article by Leah Barkoukis titled "Even the Green Party Has Turned Against Jill Stein" was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 1, 2016. Following is the article.

than a waste of time and energy, as many on both the left and right have noted. But now even the Green Party itself wants nothing to do with Stein.

"There are significant electoral reforms needed to make elections more democratic and more representative of the people. While we support electoral reforms, including how the vote is counted, we do not support the current recount being undertaken by Jill Stein," a statement on the Party's website reads.

"The decision to pursue a recount was not made in a democratic or a strategic way, nor did it respect the established decision making processes and structures of the Green Party of the United States (GPUS)," it continued.

The Party argues that Stein's effort blurs the line between the Green and Democratic Parties given the states that Stein chose to target for a recount—Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania—are those that Hillary Clinton lost. Other close races where Clinton won, like in New Hampshire, were ignored.

"As a candidate, Dr. Stein has the right to call for a recount. However, we urge the GPUS to distance itself from any appearance of support for either Democrats or Republicans. We are well aware of the undemocratic actions taken during the primaries by the DNC and the Clinton campaign. Greens cannot be perceived to be allied with such a party."



An article by Michelle Hickford titled "These Numbers Should Shut Up Liberals About the Electoral College Once And for All" was posted at allenbwest.com on Nov. 29, 2016. Following is the article.

The keening and caterwauling we've been treated to by the left since Hillary Clinton's defeat has been monumental.

Most entertaining has been the snowflake retreat to "safe spaces" with puppies and coloring books to assuage their anguish.

Less entertaining were the violent protests which were paid for erupted in cities across the nation.

Putting aside Jill Stein's quixotic effort to force a recount, the left has been loudest with its demands to dismantle the Electoral College.

After all it's unfair: Hillary Clinton won the "popular vote" so she should win, right? Wrong.

Our Founders in their infinite wisdom created the Electoral College to ensure the states were fairly represented. Why should one or two densely populated areas speak for the whole of the nation?

The following list of statistics has been making the rounds on the Internet and it should finally put an end to the argument as to why the Electoral College makes sense.

Share this with as many whiners as you can.

- There are 3,141 counties in the United States.
- Trump won 3,084 of them.
- Clinton won 57.
- There are 62 counties in New York State.
- Trump won 46 of them.
- Clinton won 16.
- Clinton won the popular vote by approx. 1.5 million votes.
- In the 5 counties that encompass NYC, (Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Richmond & Queens) Clinton received well over 2 million more votes than Trump. (Clinton only won 4 of these counties; Trump won Richmond)
- Therefore these 5 counties alone, more than accounted for Clinton winning the popular vote of the entire country.
- These 5 counties comprise 319 square miles.
- The United States is comprised of 3, 797,000 square miles.

- When you have a country that encompasses almost 4 million square miles of territory, it would be ludicrous to even suggest that the vote of those who inhabit a mere 319 square miles should dictate the outcome of a national election.
- Large, densely populated Democrat cities (NYC, Chicago, LA, etc) don't and shouldn't speak for the rest of our country.

Amen.



An editorial by Victor Davis Hanson titled "Beware the Law of Unintended Consequences" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Dec. 1, 2016. Following is the article.

The mix of politics and culture is far too complex to be predictable. Even the best-laid political plans can lead to unintended consequences, both good and bad—what we sometimes call irony, nemesis or karma.

Take the election of 2008, which ushered Barack Obama and the Democrats into absolute control of the presidency, House and Senate, also generating popular goodwill over Obama's landmark candidacy.

Instead of ensuring a heralded generation of Democratic rule, Obama alienated both friends and foes almost immediately. He rammed through the unworkable Affordable Care Act without a single Republican vote. He prevaricated about Obamacare's costs and savings. Huge budget deficits followed. Racial polarization ensued. Apologies abroad on behalf of America proved a national turnoff.

By the final pushback of 2016, the Obama administration had proven to be a rare gift to the Republican Party. The GOP now controls the presidency, Congress, governorships and state legislatures to a degree not seen since the 1920s. "Hope and change" ebullition in 2008 brought the Republicans salvation—and the Democrats countless disasters.

The Republican establishment hated Donald Trump. So did the conservative media. His unorthodox positions on trade, immigration and entitlements alienated many. His vulgarity turned off even more. Pundits warned that he had brought civil war and ruin to the Republican Party.

But instead of ruin, Trump delivered to the Republicans their most astounding political edge in nearly a century. The candidate who was most despised by the party unified it in a way no other nominee could have.

Obama proved Israel's best friend—even though that was never his intention. By simultaneously alienating Israel and the Sunni moderates in Jordan and Egypt, and by warming up to the Muslim Brotherhood, appeasing Iran and issuing empty red lines to the Assad regime in Syria, Obama infuriated but also united the entire so-called moderate Middle East.

The result was that Arab nations suddenly no longer saw Israel as an existential threat. Instead, it was seen as similarly shunned by the U.S.—and as the only military power capable of standing up to the soon-to-be-nuclear theocracy in Iran that hates Sunni Arabs and Israelis alike.

Today, Israel is in the historic position of being courted by its former enemies, as foreign fuel importers line up to buy its huge, newly discovered deposits of natural gas. As the Arab Spring and the Islamic State destroyed neighboring nations, Israel's democracy and free market appeared as an even stronger beacon in the storm.

Almost every major initiative that Obama pushed has largely failed. Obamacare is a mess. He nearly doubled the national debt in eight years. Economic growth is at its slowest in decades. Reset with Russia, the Asian pivot, abruptly leaving Iraq, discounting the Islamic State, red lines in Syria, the Iran deal—all proved foreign policy disasters.

Yet Obama has been quiet about one of the greatest economic revolutions in American history, one that has kept the U.S. economy afloat: a radical transformation from crippling energy dependency to veritable fossil-fuel independence. The United States has become the world's greatest combined producer of coal, natural gas and oil. It is poised to be an energy exporter to much of the world.

The revolution in fracking and horizontal drilling has brought in much-needed federal revenue, increased jobs, weakened Russia and our OPEC rivals, and has given trillions of dollars in fuel savings to American consumers.

Yet Obama opposed the energy revolution at every step. He radically curtailed the leasing of federal lands for new drilling, stopped the Keystone XL pipeline, and subsidized inefficient and often crony-capitalist wind and solar projects. Nonetheless, Obama's eventual failure to stop new drilling ended up his one success.

Hillary Clinton, in her presidential bid, did everything by the playbook—and therefore her campaign went catastrophically wrong. Her campaign raised more than \$1 billion. She ran far more ads than did Trump. She won over the sycophantic press. She got all the celebrity endorsements. She united the Democratic Party.

Logically, Clinton should have won. The media worked hand in glove with her campaign. Her ground game and voter registration drives made Trump's look pathetic.

Yet all that money, press and orthodoxy only confirmed suspicions that Clinton was a slick but wooden candidate. She became so scripted that even her Twitter feed was composed by a committee.

The more she followed her boring narrative, the more she made the amateur Trump seem authentic and energized in comparison. Doing everything right ended up for Hillary as doing everything wrong—and ensured the greatest upset in American political history.

The ancient Greeks taught us that arrogance brings payback, that nothing is sure in a fickle universe, that none of us can be judged successful and happy until we die, and that moderation and humility alone protect us from our darker sides.

In 2016, what could never have happened usually did.



An editorial by Fareed Zakaria titled "Here's Hoping Trump Flip-Flops Even More" was posted at washingtonpost.com on Nov. 24, 2016. Following is the article.

So Donald Trump now says, in an interview with the *New York Times*, that he believes there is some connection between human activity and climate change, that Hillary Clinton should not be prosecuted and that, after one conversation with retired Marine Gen. James Mattis, he might be having second thoughts about waterboarding.

One might wonder why he didn't have that conversation during the campaign or why he pounded home the opposite views on all these topics for a year and a half. But at this point, it doesn't matter. Trump is president-elect. We should all hope that he flip-flops some more.

In this spirit, let me outline a few news stories that I hope we will see over the next few weeks.

■ Donald Trump wants to keep Iran deal: The president-elect has come to realize that the agreement with Iran has blocked that country's pathways to a nuclear weapon. Furthermore, were the United States to pull out, no other country would reimpose sanctions, so it would simply hurt American businesses. "I hadn't focused so much on the benefits of the deal," Trump said.

■ "We have been bombing the s--- out of ISIS," says Trump: The president-elect described a phone conversation with President Obama in which he learned that the United States and its coalition partners have conducted more than 16,000 airstrikes on the Islamic State. "That's a lot," said Trump, noting that in Syria, the Obama administration had been focused on defeating the Islamic State and not on deposing President Bashar al-Assad. "They have been doing what I suggested all along," he noted proudly.

■ "Trumpcare will be a "terrific" improvement on Obamacare: The Trump administration plans to propose a health-care bill that will require insurance companies to enroll people with preexisting conditions. In return, the companies will gain millions of new customers, since people will now face a mandate to buy health insurance or else face a \$10,000 fine—much higher than under Obamacare. "I figured out, like with houses or cars, insurance can't work unless we're all in," explained the president-elect.

■ New administration to scale back tax breaks for the rich: Donald Trump said that once his friends Carl Icahn and Wilbur Ross crunched the numbers on his tax plan, they realized that it would explode the federal deficit. So he has put forward a new plan that simplifies the code but cuts taxes only for the middle class. "These are policies aimed to help the forgotten Americans," he explained. "I don't need a tax cut."

■ Trump plans to limit deportations: The Trump administration is going to proceed slowly and carefully with the deportation of undocumented workers. "If we deport millions of these people, industries such as construction and agriculture would collapse and we would have a big recession. How does that help the American worker?" asked Trump.

■ Donald Trump announces sale of the Trump Organization: The president-elect said that he decided that people deserved a president without even the hint of conflicts of interest and so has decided to sell all his companies, put the proceeds in a multibillion-dollar charitable trust and ask his children to run it. "If they want to get back into business, I will give them each a few million to get started, just like my father gave me."

Okay, that last one is total fantasy.

On the others, I don't know whether they will happen, but if they do, that would be great for America. I know that many people who opposed Trump's election want him to fail. I don't. It's much better for the country and the world if Trump does well in the White House.

That is not "normalizing" him, as some worry, but recognizing that the situation is what it is and trying to hope for the best.

When Trump does things I disagree with, I will loudly protest. (For example, his refusal to properly separate himself from his businesses is truly unconscionable and makes the country look like a banana republic.)

But if he ends up doing things that are sensible, I will cheer.

Trump has a unique opportunity. A vast number of Americans are deeply distrustful of elites in Washington and New York. They believe that there are simple solutions to the problems that the United States faces, and they resent the country's engagement with the world, which they see as harming ordinary Americans.

These people have put their faith in Trump. If Trump can help make them understand some of the realities of the world and the constraints on government, that would be a huge step forward. If Trump tells his followers that the Paris agreement on climate change is worth preserving or that NATO is crucial for global stability, they might actually listen.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled "How Trump Could Ruin His Presidency" was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 1, 2016. Following is the article.

Soon after Trump's announcement speech, I said he would win the nomination and likely the election. It wasn't that hard to predict. For anyone familiar with the Republican Party's repeated betrayals of the American people, it was a 2-foot putt.

I issue this warning with the same certitude—in fact, for the exact same reason I knew anyone running on Trump’s platform would have unbreakable support from millions of voters.

What coalesced Trump’s base, what made his support tempered steel, was the fact that voters had been lied to, over and over again—on many things, but most smugly and repeatedly on immigration.

How many times did we have to see the GOP choke? There’s 30 seconds left in the game, Republicans are down by two, they move the ball up the court, have a man in position—and, every time, the GOP would do anything to avoid taking the 3-point shot.

That is the beating heart of the anger that voters felt toward the party. No one trusted Republicans to ever score when they had the ball.

It’s why Trump’s supporters stuck with him through thick and thin—his attack on war hero John McCain (he deserved it), his mocking a disabled reporter (a lie), his lazy first debate performance (totally true), and the “Access Hollywood” tape (oh well).

After he gave that Mexican rapists speech, and never backed down, Trump’s base would have brushed off six more “Access Hollywood” tapes. All because they think Trump will take the shot.

He’d better! As the popular vote proves, we don’t have 30 seconds on the clock. It’s only three.

But if he breaks a major campaign promise, his supporters will turn on him with a blind ferocity, dwarfing their rage toward Jeb! because Trump’s is the more exquisite con. He will have duped them. And he will never, ever, ever get them back.

Most of his promises can be kept with little trouble: He will appoint good judges, cut regulations, replace Obamacare and renegotiate trade deals. In other words, he’ll do all the things any Republican president would do—plus the trade deals.

But the moment Trump attempts to make good on his central promise—to remove troublesome immigrants and give us our country back—every major institution in America will declare war on him.

Trump knows that. In his Phoenix immigration speech, he said: “To all the politicians, donors and special interests, hear these words from me and all of you today. There is only one core issue in the immigration debate, and that issue is the well-being of the American people.”

If powerful interests were not furiously opposed to Trump’s idea that immigration should benefit Americans, rather than foreigners, our immigration policies would already do so.

It will surprise consumers of American media to learn this, but every promise Trump made on immigration is already the law. Why? Because politicians

know that's what the public wants. So they pass the laws—and then refuse to enforce them.

But if Trump doesn't appoint the sort of people capable of fulfilling his campaign promises on immigration, he will fail. He'll be just another lying politician, and his supporters will watch in horror as rapists, terrorists and drug dealers continue living in our country.

There will be no one person to blame. No one is ever to blame in Washington. They just won't get it done.

Then, well into the Trump presidency, some Muslim will commit a machete attack, shoot up a community center, stage a mass slaughter at a gay nightclub or bomb a marathon. There's no question but that the terrorist attacks won't stop—unless Trump nominates people who know what needs to be done and aren't intimidated by testy New York Times editorials.

There will be more Americans like Kate Steinle, Grant Ronnebeck and Joshua Wilkerson killed by illegal aliens. There will be more children addicted to heroin brought in by Mexican drug cartels. There will be more parents joining the Remembrance Project.

But this time, they'll blame Trump.

And then it will be Trump's opponents saying, "What is wrong with our politicians, our leaders—if we can call them that. What the hell are we doing?"

If Trump betrays voters on immigration, he can have as many rallies as he wants, but Americans will say, Been there, done that—you screwed us. He will never escape the stink of broken campaign promises.

So unless Trump has another 60 million voters hiding someplace, the appointments he makes today—to State, Defense, Homeland Security, Labor, even the IRS—will determine whether he is remembered as America's greatest president, or if the Trump name becomes a cautionary tale in American politics.

At this precise moment—not after his inauguration, not in year two of his administration, but today, as he fills his Cabinet—Trump has to decide if he's going to be like every other Republican and throw a brick or grab the ball and score.

Whether he's listening or not, his supporters are screaming: TRUMP! NOW! TAKE THE SHOT!!!



Looking back to 2009, here is an article by Toby Harnden titled "Barack Obama Faces 30 Death Threats a Day, Stretching US Secret Service" that was posted at telegraph.co.uk on Aug. 3, 2009.

Since Mr Obama took office, the rate of threats against the president has increased 400 per cent from the 3,000 a year or so under President George W. Bush, according to Ronald Kessler, author of *In the President's Secret Service*.

Some threats to Mr Obama, whose Secret Service codename is Renegade, have been publicised, including an alleged plot by white supremacists in Tennessee late last year to rob a gun store, shoot 88 black people, decapitate another 14 and then assassinate the first black president in American history.

Most however, are kept under wraps because the Secret Service fears that revealing details of them would only increase the number of copycat attempts. Although most threats are not credible, each one has to be investigated meticulously.

According to the book, intelligence officials received information that people associated with the Somalia-based Islamist group al-Shabaab might try to disrupt Mr Obama's inauguration in January, when the Secret Service co-ordinated at least 40,000 agents and officers from some 94 police, military and security agencies.

More than a dozen counter-sniper teams were stationed along the inauguration parade route and the criminal records of employees and hotel guests in nearby buildings were scrutinised.

Despite all this, there were glaring loopholes in the security. Kessler describes how more than 100 VIPs and major campaign donors were screened by metal detectors but then walked along a public pavement before boarding "secure" buses and were not checked again.

It could have been relatively simple for an assassin to have mingled with them in order to get close enough to shoot the new president.

After Mr Obama was elected president, his two children Malia, 11, codenamed Radiance, and Sasha, eight, codenamed Rosebud, began receiving Secret Service protection. Mr Obama's wife Michelle is codenamed Renaissance. The Secret Service also started to protect Vice-President Joe Biden's children, grandchildren, and mother.

Instead of bringing in more agents—instantly identifiable because of their bulky suits, worn over bullet-proof jackets, and earpieces—the Secret Service directed agents to work longer hours to cover the extra load and to miss firearms training, physical fitness sessions and tests.

"We have half the number of agents we need, but requests for more agents have fallen on deaf ears at headquarters," a Secret Service agent told Kessler. "Headquarters' mentality has always been, 'You can complete the mission with what you have. You're a U.S.S.S. agent.' "

Mr Biden's constant travel, including back to his home state of Delaware—the burden has meant that all agents on his team have ceased training. According to Kessler, however, they fill in forms stating they have "taken and passed all tests, when they have not, creating a dishonest culture."

The Secret Service has increasingly cut corners after it was absorbed by the new Homeland Security Department under Mr Bush. Kessler said that when Mr Biden threw the first pitch at the first Baltimore Orioles game of the 2009 season, the Secret Service did not screen any of the more than 40,000 fans, stunning his agents and the local Secret Service field office.



An article by Katie McHugh titled "Twitter Allows 'Rape Melania' to Trend After Site Explodes With Trump Assassination Threats" was posted at breitbart.com on Nov. 13, 2016. Following is the article.

Social media giant Twitter allowed the violent threat "Rape Melania" against incoming First Lady Melania Trump to trend after the site exploded with assassination threats against President-elect Donald Trump.

Outside the Trump International Hotel in Washington, D.C., a protester held up a sign saying "RAPE MELANIA," which went viral.

November 13, 2016—"RapeMelania"—free speech! "Assassinate Trump"—free speech! "Run them over."

After Trump won the presidential election on Tuesday, threats against his life spread on social media, as the Daily Mail reported:

- "So who's going to assassinate Trump at his inauguration?" one Twitter user demanded to know.
- "I just pray that the first n***a who tries to assassinate Donald Trump don't miss," another added.
- One joked: "My mom is talking about assassinate donald trump. watch out guy my white suburban mother is coming for you."

A source close to the Secret Service, told the DailyMail.com that the agency were well aware of the threats and that they had seen a spike since Trump was elected on Tuesday.

They said there were 'mechanisms in place' to monitor social media for such posts, and to determine which threats were more concerning than others but said that "every threat was taken seriously."

Twitter routinely removed pro-Trump trending topics and manipulated hash-tags that hurt failed Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton during the election.



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."