

Eye on the World

April 8, 2017

This compilation of material for "Eye on the World" is presented as a service to the Churches of God. The views stated in the material are those of the writers or sources quoted by the writers, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Church of God Big Sandy. The following articles were posted at churchofgodbigandy.com for the weekend of April 8, 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).



A Reuters article by Ellen Frances titled "Scores Reported Killed in Gas Attack on Syrian Rebel Area" was posted at reuters.com on April 5, 2017. Following is the article.

A suspected Syrian government chemical attack killed scores of people, including children, in the northwestern province of Idlib on Tuesday, a monitoring group, medics and rescue workers in the rebel-held area said.

The U.S. government believes the chemical agent sarin was used in the attack, a U.S. government source said, adding it was "almost certainly" carried out by forces loyal to Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

The Syrian military denied responsibility and said it would never use chemical weapons, echoing denials it has made over the course of the more than six-year Syrian civil war that has killed hundreds of thousands, created the world's worst refugee crisis and drawn in nations such as Russia, Iran and the United States.

The United States, Britain and France on Tuesday proposed a United Nations Security Council resolution condemning the attack, which they have blamed on Assad's forces. Diplomats said the resolution would likely be put to a vote on Wednesday.

The attack also sparked political recriminations. U.S. President Donald Trump condemned the “heinous actions by the Bashar al-Assad regime,” but also blamed his predecessor Barack Obama’s “weakness” on Syria. A Syrian opposition figure said it was a consequence of recent U.S. statements suggesting a focus on stopping Islamic State militants rather than ousting Assad.

If confirmed, the incident reported in the town of Khan Sheikhoun would be the deadliest chemical attack in Syria since sarin gas killed hundreds of civilians in Ghouta near Damascus in August 2013. Western states said the Syrian government was responsible for that attack. Damascus blamed rebels.

The head of the health authority in rebel-held Idlib province said more than 50 people had been killed and 300 wounded in the latest incident. The Union of Medical Care Organizations, a coalition of international aid agencies that funds hospitals in Syria, said the death toll was at least 100.

The British-based Syrian Observatory for Human Rights said the attack killed at least 58 people and was believed to have been carried out by Syrian government jets. It caused many people to choke and some to foam at the mouth.

Director Rami Abdulrahman told Reuters the assessment that Syrian government warplanes were to blame was based on several factors such as the type of aircraft, including Sukhoi 22 jets, that carried out the raid.

“We deny completely the use of any chemical or toxic material in Khan Sheikhoun town today and the army has not used nor will use in any place or time neither in past or in future,” the Syrian army command said in a statement.

The Russian Defence Ministry, whose forces are backing Assad, said its aircraft had not carried out the attack. The U.N. Security Council was expected to meet on Wednesday to discuss the incident.

Reuters photographs showed people breathing through oxygen masks and wearing protection suits, while others carried the bodies of dead children. Corpses wrapped in blankets were lined up on the ground.

Activists in northern Syria circulated pictures on social media showing a man with foam around his mouth, and rescue workers hosing down almost-naked children squirming on the floor.

Blame game

Mounzer Khalil, head of Idlib’s health authority, said hospitals in the province were overflowing with victims.

“This morning, at 6:30 a.m., warplanes targeted Khan Sheikhoun with gases, believed to be sarin and chlorine,” he told a news conference.

The attack sparked a blame game within the United States.

Trump faulted Obama for not enforcing a 2012 “red line” against the use of chemical weapons and suggested the attack was “a consequence of the past administration’s weakness and irresolution.”

An Obama spokesman declined comment.

U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson issued an appeal for Russia and Iran “to exercise their influence over the Syrian regime and to guarantee that this sort of horrific attack never happens again.”

In contrast, Syrian opposition member Basma Kodmani blamed recent statements by Tillerson and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley that suggested the new U.S. administration could live with Assad remaining in power for the time being.

“This is a direct consequence of American statements about Assad not being a priority and giving him time and allowing him to stay in power,” Kodmani told Reuters via text, saying the U.S. officials’ comments amounted to “a blank check for Assad.”

French Foreign Minister Jean-Marc Ayrault said the attack was a way of testing the Trump administration and urged Washington to clarify its position on Assad.

The incident was condemned by a host of leaders, including the president of France, who directly blamed Syrian government forces, and Britain, which said Assad would be guilty of a war crime if his government was proved responsible.

U.N. Syria mediator Staffan de Mistura said the “horrific” chemical attack had come from the air.

The draft text of the U.N. resolution, seen by Reuters, says Syria’s government must provide an international investigation with flight plans and logs for Tuesday, the names of all helicopter squadron commanders and provide access to air bases where investigators believe attacks using chemicals may have been launched.

In February, Russia, backed by China, cast its seventh veto to protect Assad’s government from U.N. Security Council action, blocking a bid by Western powers to impose sanctions over accusations of chemical weapons attacks during the conflict.

A series of investigations by the United Nations and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) found that various parties in the Syrian war had used chlorine, sulfur mustard gas and sarin.

Toxic arsenal

Idlib province contains the largest populated area controlled by anti-Assad rebels—both nationalist Free Syrian Army groups and powerful Islamist factions including the former al Qaeda-linked Nusra Front.

Idlib’s population has ballooned, with thousands of fighters and civilians shuttled out of Aleppo city and areas around Damascus that the government has retaken in recent months as Assad has gained the upper hand in the war.

The United States has also launched a spate of air strikes in Idlib this year, targeting jihadist insurgents.

Following the 2013 attack, Syria joined the international Chemical Weapons Convention under a U.S.-Russian deal, averting the threat of U.S.-led military intervention.

Under the deal, Syria agreed to give up its toxic arsenal and surrendered 1,300 tonnes of toxic weapons and industrial chemicals to the international community for destruction.

U.N.-OPCW investigators found, however, that it continued to use chlorine, which is widely available and hard to trace, in so-called barrel bombs dropped from helicopters. Chlorine is not a banned substance, but the use of any chemical is banned under 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention, to which Syria is a member.



An article by Marian Tupy titled “Venezuela Reminds Us That Socialism Frequently Leads to Dictatorship” was posted at reason.com on April 4, 2017. Following is the article.

On March 29, the Supreme Court of Venezuela dissolved the country’s elected legislature, allowing Venezuela’s top court to write future laws. The court is filled with allies of Venezuela’s socialist president, Nicolas Maduro, while the legislature is dominated by Maduro’s opponents, and the court’s ruling was seen as the latest step on Venezuela’s descent into a full-fledged dictatorship.

But following international outcry—as well as the appearance of cracks within Maduro’s own party—the court reversed itself just a few days later, on April 1.

Thus, the uneasy standoff between Venezuela’s legislature and executive is set to continue. Last week’s episode is only the latest reminder of the tendency of socialism to lead to dictatorship, as identified by the Nobel Prize-winning economist Friedrich Hayek in *The Road to Serfdom*.

In 1944, when he wrote his book, Hayek noted that the crimes of the German National Socialists and Soviet Communists were, in great part, the result of growing state control over the economy. As he explained, growing state interference in the economy leads to massive inefficiencies and long queues outside empty shops. A state of perpetual economic crisis then leads to calls for more planning.

But economic planning is inimical to freedom. As there can be no agreement on a single plan in a free society, the centralization of economic decision-making has to be accompanied by centralization of political power in the hands of a small elite. When, in the end, the failure of central planning becomes undeniable, totalitarian regimes tend to silence the dissenters—sometimes through mass murder.

Hayek was fortunate enough to live to see the defeat of both the Nazi and Soviet totalitarian regimes. Unfortunately, there are still places where Hayek’s most dire warnings remain relevant. Nicolas Maduro’s Venezuela is one such place.

Beginning in 1999, when Maduro's predecessor, the late Hugo Chavez, became President, the government has played an ever-increasing role in the Venezuelan economy. Price and wage controls were put in place, trade was restricted, and private property was expropriated—often without compensation.

Partly as a result of those economically illiterate actions (the fall in the price of oil, which Venezuela depends on, did not have such dire consequences in any other oil-rich country), Venezuela's economy tanked and public opposition to the ruling regime increased. Thus, the 2015 parliamentary election saw the opposition to Maduro's leftist policies capture a super-majority in the country's National Assembly.

Unfortunately, socialism, in spite of its manifest failings and Hayek's warnings, refuses to go away. Wannabe socialists are thus destined to learn not from history, but from their own mistakes. In the meantime, ordinary people suffer.

To give just one example, between 1999, when Hugo Chavez took over as President, and 2016, average per capita income in Venezuela rose by 2 percent. In the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean, it rose by 41 percent. A similar story can be observed in Zimbabwe.

Robert Mugabe, Chavez's erstwhile friend, has been in charge of his unfortunate country since 1980. Since then, Africa's income per person rose by 48 percent. In Zimbabwe, a socialist dictatorship, it has declined by 25 percent. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.*



An article by Shane Croucher titled "Why Britain, Not Spain, Has Sovereignty Over Gibraltar" was posted at ibtimes.com on April 3, 2017. Following is the article.

Gibraltar is a sore point for Spain. It sits on a small peninsula in the southwestern reaches of Spain, jutting out into the Mediterranean Sea at the only entrance from the Atlantic, just a few miles from North Africa.

But Gibraltar isn't part of Spain, even though it's connected to the mainland. It's a British Overseas Territory, of which there are 14, legacies of the Empire over which the British government maintains its sovereignty.

Gibraltar, like the others, is self-governing, though it relies on the British government for defence, foreign policy and trade. Spain disputes British sovereignty over Gibraltar and wants it to be brought under the control of Madrid, making it a flashpoint in Brexit negotiations.

The former Tory leader Lord Howard caused a stir by suggesting there could arise a situation similar to the Falklands War in the early 1980s, when Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher defended the islands—a British Overseas Territory—from Argentinian attack.

But how did Gibraltar, which is over a thousand miles from London, end up under British sovereignty in the first place?

Tarik Ibn Zeyad, the military commander who led the Muslim conquest of Spain, captured Gibraltar in 711. It did not come back into Spanish hands until 1501, under Queen Isabella I of Spain, a few years after Muslim rule had ended.

Spanish rule lasted only a couple of centuries. During the War of the Spanish Succession, a conflict between European powers over which monarchy should inherit Spain and its territories after heirless Charles II's death in 1700, Britain captured Gibraltar with a fleet led by Admiral George Rooke in 1704, and held onto it.

Its geographic location on the Strait of Gibraltar, a gateway to the Mediterranean, made it a peninsula of great strategic importance.

The war ended with the Treaties of Utrecht between 1713 and 1714, a series of agreements between the countries to bring about peace and an end to the Spanish succession question. On 13 July, 1713, Spain signed a treaty with the British handing them Gibraltar.

"The Spanish nevertheless made several attempts to retake Gibraltar from Britain, most notably in a protracted but unsuccessful military siege that lasted from 1779 to 1783," says *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

"In 1830 Gibraltar became a British crown colony. The opening of the Suez Canal (1869) heightened British determination to keep possession of Gibraltar, since the Mediterranean was the main route to Britain's colonies in East Africa and southern Asia."

The Gibraltarians claim the right to self-determination and reject demands from Spain that the territory, which has a population of 30,000, should fall back under the sovereignty of Madrid. In 2002, on an 88% turnout in a referendum, Gibraltar voted by 99% against Spain sharing sovereignty with Britain.

But they also voted in the EU referendum by 96% to remain, with an 84% turnout, creating friction with the British government as it pursues Brexit and uncertainty around the future of its sovereignty.

"Gibraltar is not a bargaining chip in these negotiations," said Gibraltar's chief minister Fabian Picardo. "Gibraltar belongs to the Gibraltarians and we want to stay British."



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Reversing Another Obama Policy, Trump Pulls Funding for UN Population Fund" was posted at cnsnews.com on April 4, 2017. Following is the article.

The Trump administration said Monday it was ending funding to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), long a target of conservatives over concerns that its work in China abets the communist authorities' controversial population limitation programs.

The administration's first confirmed cut to a U.N. agency will cost the UNFPA \$32.5 million.

Its budget proposal for fiscal year 2018 calls for unspecified reductions to contributions to the U.N. budget, and further "seeks to reduce or end direct funding for international organizations whose missions do not substantially advance U.S. foreign policy interests, are duplicative, or are not well-managed."

The move comes as a follow up to President Trump's decision, three days after his inauguration, to restore Reagan-era policy that denies federal funding to abortion-supporting or promoting groups.

The State Department said the determination to cut UNFPA funding "was made based on the fact that China's family planning policies still involve the use of coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization, and UNFPA partners on family planning activities with the Chinese government agency responsible for these coercive policies."

The 1985 "Kemp-Kasten amendment" prohibits federal funding for any agency that "supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization."

The Reagan administration first withheld UNFPA funding under the amendment in 1986, and the first Bush administration followed suit in 1989. President Clinton restored the funding in 1993, before President George W. Bush defunded the UNFPA from 2002 to 2008, in a move costing the U.N. organization a total of some \$244 million.

President Obama restored funding soon after taking office. In FY 2016 it gave \$67.88 million to the agency in assessed and voluntary contributions.

The UNFPA has long denied that its work in China supports Beijing's efforts to curb population growth through the "one-child" and subsequent "two-child" policies, which critics say are characterized by coercive measures such as forced abortion and sterilization.

It did so again on Monday in a statement regretting the administration's decision.

"This decision is based on the erroneous claim that UNFPA 'supports, or participates in the management of, a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization' in China," it said. "UNFPA refutes this claim, as all of its work promotes the human rights of individuals and couples to make their own decisions, free of coercion or discrimination."

The agency said it was being denied U.S. funding for "its life-saving work the world over."

"The support we received over the years from the government and people of the United States has saved tens of thousands of mothers from preventable deaths and disabilities, and especially now in the rapidly developing global humanitarian crises," it said.

China introduced its “one-child” policy in 1979, restricting couples to one child only, with some exceptions—for example some rurally-based or ethnic minority couples were allowed a second child if their firstborn was a girl.

Over the decades since it has been enforced through forced abortions and sterilizations, punitive fines and other penalties for violators. Critics have described it as one of the most far-reaching government-enforced human rights violations in history.

In a society with a cultural preference for baby boys, sex-selective abortions—although illegal—have contributed to a lopsided male-female ratio which experts warn will have troubling implications for future generations.

In 2015 Beijing loosened the policy to allow two children.

Women’s Rights Without Frontiers president Reggie Littlejohn told a panel discussion alongside the U.N. Commission on the Status of Women session in New York last month that forced abortions and the conditions that give rise to sex-selective abortions of baby girls continue under the “two-child” policy.

“I believe that any independent, unbiased investigation into UNFPA’s activities in China will lead to the inescapable conclusion that they are complicit with China’s population control practices, which include forced abortion and involuntary sterilization,” Littlejohn said.

“To the extent that the global community is funding the UNFPA, the blood of Chinese women and babies is on our hands.”



An article by Nick Enoch titled “Muslim Births to Overtake Christian Births Globally Within Two Decades As Islamic Population is Expected to Grow by 70% in the Next 40 Years” was posted at dailymail.co.uk on April 5, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

The number of babies born to Muslim women worldwide will exceed the number of Christian births within the next 20 years, according to a new study.

Although Christians accounted for 33 per cent of global births in recent years—slightly more than Muslim births—they also accounted for 37 per cent of worldwide deaths, nearly twice the share of deaths from other religions.

Between 2015 and 2060, the global Muslim population is expected to grow by 70 per cent, while Christianity is projected to grow by 34 per cent—at which point, the two religions will have similar numbers.

The Muslim population increased by more than 150million people between 2010 and 2015, to 1.8 billion. As of 2015, there were 2.3billion Christians.

Researchers say migration is among factors helping to increase the Muslim population in some regions, including North America and Europe.

While Christianity remained the largest religious group globally in 2015—comprising almost a third (31 per cent) of the world's 7.3 billion people—its number is in decline in Europe.

"Christianity is literally dying in Europe," Conrad Hackett, the lead researcher on the study, told the Wall Street Journal.

"The heart of Christianity is moving from Europe to Africa," he added.

Furthermore, Christians had the highest number of births and deaths of any religious group in recent years, according to the Pew Research Center, a non-partisan US "fact" tank.

Between 2010 and 2015, around 223million babies were born to Christian mothers and roughly 107million Christians died—a natural increase of 116million.

In Europe, however, Christian deaths outnumbered births by nearly 6 million during this time.

- Number of people in 2015 (in billions)
- Christians—2.3 billion
- Muslims—1.8
- Unaffiliated—1.2
- Hindus—1.1
- Buddhists—0.5
- Folk religions—0.4
- Other religions—0.1
- Jews—0.01

Meanwhile, between 2010 and 2015, there were 213million Muslim births, compared to 61 million deaths.

Some 62 per cent of Muslims live in the Asia-Pacific region with large populations in Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Iran and Turkey, Pew researchers said.

In 2050, India is set to take over from Indonesia as the country with the world's largest Muslim population.

Last year there were 3.3 million Muslims of all ages in the US—about 1 per cent of the population.

Muslims have gained slightly in recent years due to people converting to Islam.

However, Christians have lost more followers than any other religion recently due to religious switching.



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "2,070 Refugees Arrived in U.S. in March; 54% Drop From February" was posted at cnsnews.com on April 3, 2017. Following is the article.

The number of refugees admitted to the United States dropped in March to its lowest monthly tally of the current fiscal year, even as the implementation of President Trump's latest immigration executive order continues to be held up by federal courts.

In a continuing declining trend, 2,070 refugees arrived during March, an approximately 54.79 percent drop from the 4,579 recorded in February, according to State Department Refugee Processing Center data.

The number has steadily declined in FY 2017, from 9,945 refugees admitted to the U.S. last October, to 8,355 in November, 7,371 in December and 6,777 in January.

Of the 2,070 refugees resettled in March, the largest contingents came from Somalia (335), Syria (282), Burma (278), Iraq (192), Democratic Republic of Congo (184), Ukraine (167) and Iran (101).

After an initial executive order ran into legal roadblocks, Trump issued a revised one on March 6 that once again sought to block all refugees from entering the country for 120 days. It dropped the original's provision placing an indefinite ban on the admission of refugees from Syria, however.

The new order again included a ceiling on 50,000 refugees overall to be admitted during FY 2017. Trump declared that allowing more than that "would be detrimental to the interests of the United States."

The U.S. District Court in Hawaii issued a temporary restraining order preventing the administration from implementing the 120-day bar on refugee entry, (as well as a 90-day bar on entry of most citizens of six terror-prone countries—Iran, Libya, Syria, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen.)

Other parts of the order, including the 50,000 refugee admission ceiling for FY 2017, were not impacted by the court action and went into effect on March 16.

The 50,000 ceiling stands in sharp contrast to the Obama administration's announcement last fall that the U.S. would resettle 110,000 this fiscal year.

With the fiscal year now halfway through, 39,098 refugees had arrived as of March 31, of whom 30,122 arrived before the end of the Obama administration and 8,967 since Trump's inauguration.

The countries of origin of the biggest groups of resettled refugees in FY 2017 are the Democratic Republic of Congo (6,698), Syria (5,839), Iraq (5,676), Somalia (4,917), Burma (3,270), Ukraine (2,600), Bhutan (2,132), Iran (1,969) and Afghanistan (1,027).

Of the six terror-susceptible countries whose citizens (as opposed to those seeking refugee status) were banned for entry under the now suspended executive order, four are well-represented in the FY 2017 refugee admission statistics: Syria (5,839), Somalia (4,917), Sudan (627), and Iran (1,696). The last two, Yemen and Libya, accounted for just 18 and three refugees respectively.

Syrian refugees have been in the spotlight especially because of fears that the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS/ISIL) would try to exploit refugee admission programs to infiltrate operatives into the West.

After the deadly ISIS terror attacks in Paris in November 2015, French authorities confirmed that two of the terrorists involved had been carrying fake Syrian passports.

"Some terrorists are trying to get into our countries and commit criminal acts by mixing in with the flow of migrants and refugees," Interior Minister Bernard Cazeneuve warned fellow European Union countries at the time.

The Obama administration maintained that the vetting process for refugees was the most robust of any for those wanting to travel to the U.S.

But concerns have also been raised about limits on U.S. security agencies' ability to vet refugee applicants from Syria, given the ongoing civil war.

Weeks before the Paris attack, FBI Director James Comey addressed the difficulties at a House Homeland Security Committee hearing.

"If someone has never made a ripple in the pond in Syria in a way that would get their identity or their interests reflected in our database, we can query our database until the cows come home but we're not going to—there'll be nothing to show up, because we have no record of that person," Comey said. "You can only query what you've collected."

The U.S. has admitted 18,135 Syrian refugees since the Paris attacks, including 5,839 during FY 2017, and 1,221 since the start of the Trump administration.

Of the 18,135 admitted since the Nov. 2015 attacks, 98.8 percent were Muslims, 0.9 percent Christians, and 0.3 percent Yazidis and others.

Of the 1,221 Syrian refugees admitted since the start of the Trump administration, 98.5 percent were Muslims, 1.2 percent Christians and 0.2 percent Yazidis.

The Syrian conflict has impacted citizens of all religious and ethnic groups, although the Obama administration determine a year ago that Christians and Yazidis were being targeted for genocide in areas under the control of the Sunni jihadists of ISIS.

Trump's revised executive order dropped a provision in the original one that called for the prioritizing of refugees from religious minorities.



An article by Stephen Dinan titled "Illegal Immigration Plummets After Trump Inauguration" was posted at washingtontimes.com on April 4, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Illegal immigration across the southwest border is down more than 60 percent so far under President Trump, officials revealed Tuesday, even before the first new agent is hired or the first mile of his promised border wall is constructed.

Mr. Trump took a victory lap over the "record reductions" in illegal crossers, saying he is already saving Americans' jobs by preventing them from having to compete with unauthorized workers.

"Down 61 percent since inauguration. Gen. Kelly is doing a fantastic job," Mr. Trump told a labor union gathering in Washington, praising Homeland Security Secretary John F. Kelly, a retired Marine Corps general.

Mr. Kelly is scheduled to detail the numbers Wednesday to the Senate Homeland Security Committee, which is investigating the situation on the border.

Testifying to the committee in a first hearing Tuesday, former Border Patrol Chief David V. Aguilar said the percentage may be even higher than Mr. Trump teases. Compared with 2016, he said, apprehensions on the southwest border were down 67 percent through March.

Mr. Aguilar credits Mr. Trump, who has freed U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents to pursue illegal immigrants in the interior of the U.S. and vowed to tighten border controls.

"This administration has said we're going to address illegal immigration. ICE has started working in the interior, unlike other times. So that message resonates," Mr. Aguilar said.



"Eye on the World" comment: Two other articles that discuss similar information as portrayed in the previous article are listed here.

■ An article by Anna Giaritelli titled "Border Apprehensions Hit 17-Year Low in March" was posted at washingtonexaminer.com on April 4, 2017.

■ An article by Craig Bannister titled "Southwest Border Arrests Plummet 61% Since January" was posted at cnsnews.com on April 5, 2017.



An article by Clay Travis titled "MSESPN Doubles Down on Left Wing Politics, Bounces Sage Steele" was posted at outkickthecoverage.com on April 5, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

On Monday night, just minutes after the tip of the NCAA basketball title game, the People's Republic of MSESPN tried to sneak in a new policy on politics. It was textbook MSESPN, claim objectivity while actually allowing its talent in the opinion business to double down on left wing politics.

And, of course, the new policy was released under the cover of night while the vast majority of sports fans were just settling down to watch North Carolina and Gonzaga.

The next day MSESPN did what MSESPN does—it replaced a prominent conservative voice, Sage Steele, with a prominent liberal voice, Michelle Beadle.

You'll recall that Beadle has spent much of the past several months on Twitter denigrating Donald Trump and those who voted for him. If Beadle had Tweeted the same things about Barack Obama and his voters, she'd be fired. But say it about Trump and his voters—millions of whom watch ESPN every day—and at MSESPN this is cause for promotion.

After the news went public of her removal from NBA coverage Steele trended on Twitter, being ripped by a mostly black audience for the audacity she has to not be a left wing liberal in sports.

Steele had previously addressed these negative responses she received on Twitter stating, "There are times that I believe that we, as African-Americans, can be hypocritical, and that is to not look ourselves in the mirror when we are saying certain things and blaming other groups for one thing when we are doing the exact same thing. The worst racism that I have received, and I mean thousands and thousands over the years, is from black people, who in my mind I thought would be the most accepting because there has been that experience. But even as recent as the last couple of weeks, the words that I have had thrown at me I can't repeat here and it's 99 percent from people with my skin color. But if a white person said those words to me, what would happen?"

Steele's right, if white people were saying what black people were saying about her online yesterday, it would be a major story covered everywhere online as an indictment of racist social media culture.

But when black people say it, there's no racism involved. It's an insane double standard. The things being Tweeted about Steele were racist, sexist, and demeaning. Yet Twitter didn't step in to protect her. Too bad. Guess Steele should have been a black liberal Ghostbuster instead of a black conservative sportscaster.

No one came to her aid in the sports media as these attacks ripped through social media all day long. There was total Twitter silence from MSESPN. You know, MSESPN, the same network that tried to make it appear that only women in sports

media ever get bad things said about them online when they staged a viral video about mean Tweets to try and bolster their liberal talent's name recognition.

Why is it when people with conservative opinions are attacked on social media the entire sports media goes silent?

Why does MSEPN only protect liberal and left wing political beliefs? Especially when, let's be honest, it takes much more bravery for Steele to not trot out the same bland liberal political cliches.

Ask yourself this, how much easier would Steele's life be if she were a liberal sportscaster at ESPN instead of a conservative one?

Isn't it a measure of the steadfastness of Steele's beliefs that she's willing to think independently and not follow the left wing sports media crowd?

Shouldn't MSEPN—and the rest of the liberal sports media who follow ESPN's lead—be celebrating diversity of thought instead of wanting people who look different and all think the same?

And more importantly, why does everyone in the media, including Twitter, stand by and watch a conservative black woman get crushed on social media yet immediately rally to the defense of a liberal black woman?

Shouldn't we be opposed to all demeaning treatment online regardless of the political beliefs of the individual involved?

What's more, as part of their coverage of Steele's removal from the NBA coverage, many media outlets cited Steele's "controversial" opinions as one of the reasons for her removal. Including, today, Fox News. But that got me wondering, what has Steele said that is actually controversial?

Here are the only "controversial" things Steele has done in the past couple of years that I could find:

1. She pulled the mic away from an artist who was about to go on a political tirade at the NBA All Star game.
2. She posted an Instagram complaint about immigration protests at LAX disrupting travel plans for many families.
3. Steele, the daughter of the first black man to play football at Army, criticized Colin Kaepernick for kneeling during the national anthem.

How in the world are any of these comments remotely controversial?

The vast majority of ESPN's audience would agree with all three of these perspectives. That's because they aren't overtly political and many of them are rooted in common sense.

Who among us is happy when protesters for any cause disrupt air travel? I don't care what the cause is, I'm much less likely to support it if you make me miss my flight. Chances are you agree with that.

The vast majority of Americans disagreed with Kaepernick kneeling before the national anthem. It stands to reason that the daughter of the first black man to play football at West Point might have reason to disagree with Kaepernick's protest. If he has the right to protest at sports, why does Steele not have the right to disagree with that protest too?

Finally, who among us wants a political tirade from a musical artist at an all star game?

The fact that these opinions are labeled "controversial" is an insult to controversy everywhere. Moreover, and this is an important point, why does the media only label conservative sports media opinions controversial? I've been pro choice and anti the death penalty for my entire public career and frequently shared those opinions both online and on air. No one has ever called those opinions controversial. That's because they're "liberal" opinions.

But the moment I write that Colin Kaepernick's protest is absurd and idiotic—a point the vast majority of sports fans agree with—I'm labeled controversial. I even had a prominent sports executive recently tell me that I could have my own television show, but I had to give up talking about politics because I was too conservative to go on sports TV.

Too conservative! I WORKED FOR AL GORE'S PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN AND HAVE NEVER VOTED FOR A REPUBLICAN IN MY LIFE.

Evidently that's too conservative for sports media today. That makes me a right winger in this industry.

The truth of the matter is this: the sports media doesn't need more people who look differently and think the same. When only 4% of the sports media voted for Donald Trump according to a recent poll in The Big Lead, it desperately needs more diversity of thought, not less.

Sage Steele should be celebrated for having the courage of her convictions and praised for the fortitude she's shown to stand behind her political beliefs even when they don't advance her professional career.



An article by Madison Gesiotto titled "Congress is Working Only 8 Days in April and It is Unacceptable" was posted at washingtonexaminer.com on March 29, 2017. Following is the article.

April is only a few days away, which means it's time for Congress to take almost 75% of the month off. This is no April Fools joke. In fact, the House will only be in session for 8 days out of the 30 days during the month of April.

Are these elected representatives in D.C. to represent and work for us, "we the people?" It is hard to tell anymore.

It seems as if many of them have lost focus and have allowed their personal interests as well as special interests to be placed ahead of the interests of the American people.

With over \$19 trillion of national debt, a failing health care system and disastrous immigration policies, there is absolutely no acceptable reason for our Congressmen and Congresswomen to be working only 8 days in April.

One of their apparent excuses for only working 8 days in April is that they need to visit their districts to communicate with their constituents. I'm sorry, but last time I checked it was not 1776.

In 2017, we are lucky enough to have Twitter, Facebook, FaceTime, Skype, email and so many other incredible technologies that allow us to communicate anytime with people from anywhere across the world. Congress could easily use these outlets to reach out to constituents without having to leave Washington.

To be honest, I'm sick of the excuses and the lack of results. With as much as there is to get done right now, 8 days is simply not enough and clearly not an efficient use of their \$174,000 taxpayer funded base salaries.

And don't forget Speaker of the House Paul Ryan and House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy, who make base salaries of \$223,500 and \$193,400 respectively. In total, taxpayers dish out over \$75.7 million each year to fund the base salaries of the House members alone.

It's time for Congress to get to work for us. There's no better time than the present to make the changes we want to see in our nation.



An article by Bob Barr titled "GOP Kicks Another Can Down the Road" was posted at townhall.com on April 5, 2017. Following is the article.

While President Donald Trump wasted little time after taking his oath of office to outline his vision to "make America great again," Republicans in Congress have behaved more like a sleepy bear waking from nearly a decade of hibernation.

The latest example of this legislative yawn was the move by the House last week to "reform" internet privacy laws. In a typical "pass-the-buck" fashion, the House majority simply concurred in a vote by the Senate to overturn a 2016 decision by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) that limited in a small way how Internet Service Providers (ISPs) could access and use browsing data for commercial purposes, such as selling it to third parties.

Last year's ruling by the FCC, however, only applied to ISPs and not industry giants such as Google and Amazon; and, this was the public excuse on which the House GOP hung its hat to justify the precipitous vote to ratify the Senate action and nullify the rule.

Supporters of the measure, which included all but 15 House Republicans, claimed the Obama-era ruling was “unfair” because it only applied to ISPs, and not everyone else. They also argued in another inside-the-Beltway manner that it should have been a different federal regulatory agency—the Federal Trade Commission (FTC)—that made the change.

So, in what now seems to be the way Rep. Paul Ryan and Sen. Mitch McConnell are running things at the Capitol, when confronted with a substantive but important question of reforming and modernizing a complex issue—in this case, internet privacy—Republicans simply hit the “Easy Button,” call it a day, and return to the status quo.

If the excuse for this failure to address a timely and relevant issue sounds familiar, it should. Simply look at the failure by the GOP last month to take the time and devote the effort to develop, draft, present and explain to the American people a true repeal and replacement for Obamacare—rather than the Rube-Goldberg plan that neither repealed the underlying law nor replaced it with comprehensive, market-base provisions.

Doing little is always easier than doing it right.

Many of today’s laws regarding data and personal privacy reflect technology from the 1970s and 1980s, long before the age of the internet cloud, search engines, and metadata. As such, they are woefully inadequate at addressing pressing practical and constitutional questions of personal privacy; this in an era when even a small sampling of an individual’s search history can reveal deeply intimate details of one’s life.

Supreme Court Justice Sonya Sotomayor perfectly captured this sentiment and the need for modernizing privacy laws in her concurring opinion in *United States v. Jones*, a 2011 case dealing with GPS tracking. Sotomayor argued a comprehensive re-write of our nation’s privacy laws; arguing quite correctly that the current approach “is ill suited to the digital age, in which people reveal a great deal of information about themselves to third parties in the course of carrying out mundane tasks.”

Rather than scrap the FCC ruling, and in turn one of the few positive steps for personal privacy in the modern era, Republicans should have seized the opportunity for the first true attempt to bring privacy laws into the 21st Century.

It would have been a major victory for the GOP, demonstrating a vision for constitutional leadership that heretofore has been noticeably absent. Instead, congressional Republicans took yet another shortcut, putting off the hard work behind meaningful, comprehensive reform for another day that is likely never to come.

The missed opportunity is a reminder of Winston Churchill’s observation that, “men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing had happened.”

Congress acts in much the same way—stumbling on opportunities for real change, but hurrying along before any real work is required of them. This is why advocates of privacy reform such as the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF), Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC), and other like-minded groups must start applying serious pressure on the Congress—and continue applying pressure—in a concerted effort to force Congress to challenge the powerful lobbying arm of Silicon Valley and other vested interests.

Privacy advocates must be prepared also to challenge federal law enforcement agencies on this matter; agencies that prefer to keep the laws and regulations under which they operate as vague and outdated as possible, in order to offer them maximum room to maneuver.

Left to its own devices, the Congress will do what it excels at—kicking the can down the road.



An article by Ed Feulner titled “Americans Are Losing Their Independence, Must Get Government Under Control” was posted at cnsnews.com on April 5, 2017. Following is the article.

Most Americans don’t expect the federal government to stay out of their lives altogether. What they expect is minimal involvement: Let Washington be the last resort, the one Americans turn to only when they truly can’t devise any alternative.

Given our resourcefulness, that should be rare. As Alexis de Tocqueville, the 19th century French political writer, observed, “The citizen of the United States is taught from infancy to rely upon his own exertions to resist evil and difficulties of life; he looks up on the social authority with an eye of mistrust and anxiety, and he claims assistance only when he is unable to do without it.”

Self-reliance characterized the first settlers in this country, and the U.S. Constitution exemplified that spirit by creating a federal government of separate and limited powers—one strong enough to represent a new nation to the world, but weak enough to allow states and individuals to thrive.

Article 1, Section 8 lays out the specific powers vested in Congress. They range from collecting federal taxes and regulating interstate commerce to raising armies for national defense and declaring war. They include the power to make all laws “necessary and proper” for carrying out any constitutional power—a way to adapt those powers to changing times. As it turns out, the result has been ever more federal laws, stacked as high as the Washington Monument.

On the whole, the Constitution is a marvel of principles and restraint, a unique compass designed to keep the nation both pointed in the right direction and stable in the face of unknowable change in the future. But if we revisit the Constitution’s original impetus—the need to preserve American

independence and self-reliance—we realize that what the document does not say is no less important than when it does say.

For example, it does not mention such activities as education, medical care, and retirement security. These issues and others affect self-reliance in profound ways. The framers excluded them from the Constitution almost certainly because, at the time, most Americans thought they were none of the federal government's business and were best carried out by individual citizens.

When this important separation of federal and local functions is breached, problems begin. The poor state of our school system is a classic example.

Since 1965, the federal government has spent more than \$2 trillion (inflation-adjusted) on K-12 education, according to testimony delivered by Andrew Coulson before the House Education and the Workforce Committee. Shouldn't the logical result be all sorts of wonderful academic improvement in U.S. schools?

It hasn't worked out that way. Since 2012, test scores for American schoolchildren have fallen steadily behind those in Britain, Japan, the Netherlands, Singapore, and most other industrial nations. In 2015, for example, the United States ranked 35th in math, down from 28th just a few years earlier, coming in behind the Slovak Republic, Hungary and Lithuania. In other words, it looks as though education ranks among the black holes of federal spending.

The existence of the Education Department is proof that subpar educational performance is a national problem that millions of Americans yearn to solve. But that does not make it a federal issue. Because there is also proof that federal bureaucrats have almost zero chance of truly solving those problems.

It is clearly impractical to demand that the federal government immediately withdraw from education, health care, and all the other areas in which its current vast presence is, to the minds of many conservatives, clearly unconstitutional. It is too late, as well as politically impossible, to try to lock that barn door. The intruders are already acting like owners.

But we can, and must, try to keep the remaining horses under local control. With patience, persistence, and citizen involvement, it should even be possible to recapture some of the stolen ponies—and help restore the federal government's proper role.



An article by John Stossel titled "Enough Protection Already" was posted at townhall.com on April 5, 2017. Following is the article.

"Trump may have just signed a death warrant for our planet!" warns CNN host Van Jones.

"Disaster for Clean Water, Air," says the Environmental Working Group.

Give me a break.

Regulation zealots and much of the media are furious because President Donald Trump canceled Barack Obama's attempt to limit carbon dioxide emissions. But Trump did the right thing.

CO₂ is what we exhale. It's not a pollutant. It is, however, a greenhouse gas, and such gases increase global warming. It's possible that this will lead to a spiral of climate change that will destroy much of Earth!

But probably not. The science is definitely not settled.

Either way, Obama's expensive regulation wouldn't make a discernible difference. By 2030—if it met its goal—it might cut global carbon emissions by 1 percent.

The Earth will not notice.

However, people who pay for heat and electricity would notice. The Obama rule demanded power plants emit less CO₂. Everyone would pay more—for no useful reason.

I say "would" because the Supreme Court put a "stay" on the regulation, saying there may be no authority for it.

So Trump proposes a sensible cut: He'll dump an Obama proposal that was already dumped by courts. He'd also reduce Environmental Protection Agency spending by 31 percent.

Good!

Some of what regulators do now resembles the work of sadists who like crushing people. In Idaho, Jack and Jill Barron tried to build a house on their own property. Jack got permission from his county. So they started building.

They got as far as the foundation when the EPA suddenly declared that the Barrons' property was a "wetland."

Some of their land was wet. But that was only because state government had not maintained its own land, adjacent to the Barrons' property, and water backed up from the state's land to the Barrons'.

The EPA suddenly said, "You are building on a wetland!" and filed criminal charges against them. Felonies. When government does that, most of us cringe and give up. It costs too much to fight the state. Government regulators seem to have unlimited time and nearly unlimited money.

But Jack was mad enough to fight. He spent \$200,000 on his own lawyers.

Three years later, a jury cleared Jack of all charges.

But even that didn't stop the EPA.

Jill Barron told me, "We won, but after we were home for a month maybe, the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA sent us another letter saying, 'how nice for you that you won in the criminal court, but we still feel it's a wet-

lands.' And the decision made by the jury did not matter to them. 'And if you don't get off the property, we're going to fine you (in) civil (court).'"

The EPA threatened a fine of \$37,500 a day.

The Barrons sold their home and moved into a trailer.

"We'll be bankrupt, obviously." Jill told me, "You have no idea what you're up against. You don't know the power that is the EPA."

So I'm glad that Trump wants to limit the EPA. Scott Pruitt, the agency's new director, understands that bureaucrats often abuse their power. When he was Oklahoma attorney general, he sued the EPA 13 times for regulatory overreach.

I hope he cuts the bureaucrats back to proper size.

The agency was necessary in 1970, when it was created. At the time, cities dumped whatever we flushed into nearby waterways—with no treatment.

Smokestacks filled the air with actual pollutants: soot, sulfur dioxide, etc. In New York City, we didn't dare leave windows open because filth would blow in.

The EPA required sewage treatment, scrubbers in smokestacks and catalytic converters in car exhaust systems. The regulations worked. America's air and water is cleaner than it's been for decades. I can even swim in the Hudson River, right next to millions of people—who are still flushing.

Now, in a rational world, the EPA would say, "Stick a fork in it, it's done! EPA now stands for 'Enough Protection Already.'" But bureaucracies never say they're done. "Done" means bureaucrats are out of work. Can't have that.

So politicians keep adding unnecessary new rules and keep harassing people like the Barrons.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Is Profiling Okay?" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on April 5, 2017. Following is the article.

Profiling is needlessly a misunderstood concept.

What's called profiling is part of the optimal stock of human behavior and something we all do. Let's begin by describing behavior that might come under the heading of profiling.

Prior to making decisions, people seek to gain information. To obtain information is costly, requiring the expenditure of time and/or money. Therefore, people seek to find ways to economize on information costs. Let's try simple examples.

You are a manager of a furniture moving company and seek to hire 10 people to load and unload furniture onto and off trucks. Twenty people show up for the job, and they all appear to be equal except by sex.

Ten are men, and 10 are women. Whom would you hire? You might give them all tests to determine how much weight they could carry under various conditions, such as inclines and declines, and the speed at which they could carry.

To conduct such tests might be costly.

Such costs could be avoided through profiling—that is, using an easily observable physical attribute, such as a person’s sex, as a proxy for unobserved attributes, such as endurance and strength. Though sex is not a perfect predictor of strength and endurance, it’s pretty reliable.

Imagine that you’re a chief of police. There has been a rash of auto break-ins by which electronic equipment has been stolen. You’re trying to capture the culprits.

Would you have your officers stake out and investigate residents of senior citizen homes?

What about spending resources investigating men and women 50 years of age or older?

I’m guessing there would be greater success capturing the culprits by focusing police resources on younger people—and particularly young men.

The reason is that breaking in to autos is mostly a young man’s game. Should charges be brought against you because, as police chief, you used the physical attributes of age and sex as a crime tool? Would it be fair for people to accuse you of playing favorites by not using investigative resources on seniors and middle-aged adults of either sex even though there is a non-zero chance that they are among the culprits?

Physicians routinely screen women for breast cancer and do not routinely screen men. The American Cancer Society says that the lifetime risk of men getting breast cancer is about 0.1 percent. Should doctors and medical insurance companies be prosecuted for the discriminatory practice of prescribing routine breast cancer screening for women but not for men?

- Some racial and ethnic groups have higher incidence and mortality from various diseases than the national average.
- The rates of death from cardiovascular diseases are about 30 percent higher among black adults than among white adults.
- Cervical cancer rates are five times greater among Vietnamese women in the U.S. than among white women.
- Pima Indians of Arizona have the world’s highest known diabetes rates.

■ Prostate cancer is nearly twice as common among black men as it is among white men.

Using a cheap-to-observe attribute, such as race, as a proxy for a costly-to-observe attribute, such as the probability of some disease, can assist medical providers in the delivery of more effective medical services. For example, just knowing that a patient is a black man causes a physician to be alert to the prospect of prostate cancer. The unintelligent might call this racial profiling, but it's really prostate cancer profiling.

In the real world, there are many attributes correlated with race and sex.

■ Jews are 3 percent of the U.S. population but 35 percent of our Nobel Prize winners.

■ Blacks are 13 percent of our population but about 74 percent of professional basketball players and about 69 percent of professional football players.

■ Male geniuses outnumber female geniuses 7-to-1.

■ Women have wider peripheral vision than men.

■ Men have better distance vision than women.

The bottom line is that people differ significantly by race and sex. Just knowing the race or sex of an individual may on occasion allow us to guess about something not readily observed.



An article by Robyn Dolgin titled "Liberal Mom Runs Into Pervert in 'Transgender' Bathroom" was posted at americanthinker.com on April 6, 2017. Following is the article.

Kristen Quintrall, a self-identified liberal, admits that her run-in with a pervert in a public restroom made her rethink her position on the whole transgender bathroom crusade.

The "horrifying" (her word) incident took place in what should have been a safe place: Disneyland—"The Happiest Place on Earth," according to the sign outside the amusement park in Orange County.

Ms. Quintrall recalls that she and numerous other mothers were shocked at the site of a "big burly" man entering the crowded restroom, acting nonchalant about the intrusion. He then proceeded to act like a peeping Tom, shamelessly lingering around the stalls—trying to gape at the sights between the cracks in the doors.

Not one mother in the long line uttered a peep (no pun intended). They simply clutched their children closer to their sides, while another mother at the

diaper-changing station repositioned her body to shield her infant from the prying eyes of the male intruder.

"If this had been five years ago," Ms. Quintrall wrote on her social media page, "you bet . . . every woman in there would've been like 'Umm what are you doing here?'"

Of course, Ms. Quintrall puts forth her trustworthy credentials as a "very progressive mother." She wants to "be clear . . . This was totally a man. This wasn't a man . . . transitioning via surgery and hormones." Wasn't that obvious to everyone?

Therefore, she was left wondering why "every single one of us [in the restroom] was silent." One might consider a more pressing question. Why would responsible mothers put their P.C. credentials before the safety and welfare of their children? And let's not leave out giving Mr. Peeping Tom free rein to openly violate the privacy of women and children with their pants around their ankles engaging in what they thought were private acts behind locked doors.

Ms. Quintrall did not wish to be thought of as an "intolerant [a—]," especially at the "Happiest Place on Earth," she wrote on her blog. She knows that conservatives are raked over the coals for denying the Caitlyn Jenners of the world access to women's bathrooms, and called the "b" word for it: "bigot."

But we are living in a new age. Now we know everyone is a racist because of unconscious bias and that everything is racist because of systemic racism, according to the Thought Police turning our culture into a left-wing seminary.

Some may argue that this "unconscious bias" is like chasing ghosts: how can we identify behavior that's inaccessible to the conscious mind? Got that? If this bias ever spills over into the real world, we can all fight it together.

None of this stops Ms. Quintrall from arriving at a perfectly liberal solution. "We can't leave this situation ambiguous any more," she writes on her blog. "The gender debate needs to be addressed . . . There have to be guidelines."

Tragically, Ms. Quintrall is torn by her conscience. She unwittingly had assumed the role of "bystander," allowing the sexually aberrant behavior of a peeping Tom to take place while she and other politically correct mothers stood by—allowing the perversion to take place before their very eyes.

Ironically, I teach an anti-bullying course to 5th- and 6th-graders that is designed for them to step outside the role most people play when terrible things happen: "bystander." Perhaps Ms. Quintrall would find it illuminating to hear the same question I put forth to the children who are invited to shout out their "yes" or "no" answer: "If I'm just standing there—not doing anything—am I helping the bully?"

All things considered, Ms. Quintrall boils the argument down to "gender just can't be a feeling." I feel for Ms. Quintrall: she is living in an alternate universe where it is increasingly more difficult to make sense of life looking through a P.C. lens, which tends to fog up all sense of right and wrong.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled “The Russian Emperor’s New Clothes” was posted at townhall.com on April 5, 2017. Following is the article.

The Susan Rice bombshell at least explains why the Democrats won’t stop babbling about Russia. They need a false flag to justify using national intelligence agencies to snoop on the Trump team.

Every serious person who has tried to locate any evidence that Russia attempted to influence the 2016 election—even Trump-haters at the *New York Review of Books* and *Rolling Stone* magazine—has come away empty-handed and angry. We keep getting bald assertions, unadorned with anything resembling a fact.

But for now, let’s just consider the raw plausibility of the story.

The fact-less claim is that (1) the Russians wanted Donald Trump to win; and (2) They thought they could help him win by releasing purloined emails from the Democratic National Committee showing that the Democrats were conspiring against Hillary Clinton’s primary opponent, Bernie Sanders.

First, why on earth would Russia prefer a loose cannon, untested president like Trump to an utterly corrupt politician, who’d already shown she could be bought? The more corrupt you think Russia is, the more Putin ought to love Hillary as president.

The Russians knew Hillary was a joke from her ridiculous “reset” button as secretary of state. They proceeded to acquire 20 percent of America’s uranium production, under Hillary’s careful management—in exchange for a half-million-dollar speaking engagement for her husband and millions of dollars in donations to the Clinton Foundation.

(Politifact rates this claim FALSE!—LIAR, LIAR PANTS ON FIRE!—because Trump referred to 20 percent of America’s “uranium,” not to 20 percent of America’s “uranium capacity.” This is the sort of serious reporting we get from our watchdog media.)

The last thing our enemies want is unpredictability in an American president, and Trump is nothing if not unpredictable. Actually, that’s only the second-to-last thing Putin wants. Russia’s only export is energy: The last thing Putin wants is a president who vows to drill and frack, driving down the world oil price.

But let’s say the Russians were morally offended by a woman who could be bought (by them) for a \$500,000 speaking fee, and what they really longed for was a bellicose American president promising to put our interests first.

Why would anyone, least of all trained spies, think that it would help Trump to release emails showing the DNC had its thumb on the scale against Bernie Sanders?

How was that supposed to work again? I forget.

Accepting everything else the most deranged Trump-hater believes, normal people lose the thread of the conspiracy at the moment when the Russians are supposed to have said to themselves, "HEY, I KNOW—LET'S TRY THIS!"

Even experts in American politics haven't the first idea how to affect an election. The best minds of the GOP bet \$140 million of their own money that Jeb! would be the nominee. (Maybe they should have hired Putin.)

Throughout the primaries, Democrats were openly praying that the GOP would nominate Trump. Democrats had the same hope in 1980 for Ronald Reagan. In 2008, Republicans hooted at the idea of Al Franken running for the U.S. Senate.

Days before the election, America's premier journal of liberal opinion, *The New York Times*, gave Hillary a 91 percent chance of winning. The Princeton Election Consortium calculated her chances at 99 percent. The Huffington Post's polling aggregator put Hillary's odds at 98 percent.

But we're supposed to believe that a country practiced in spycraft was confident that it not only knew what was likely to happen in a U.S. presidential election, but also knew how to swing it? And no one in Moscow thought to ask: "What will be the predictable, certain outcome of releasing the DNC's 'Get Bernie' emails?"

The DNC leaks might have ended up being the best thing that ever happened to the Democrats. What if they had pulled a Torricelli, and forced Hillary to drop out, so they could run Joe Biden instead? Biden is a lot more popular than Hillary!

Isn't the more logical leaker someone within the DNC who'd had enough with David Brock and Debbie Wasserman Schultz steering the party into a ditch? The actual leaker probably thought: I've got to save the party! She's going to destroy us!

Wikileaks founder Julian Assange, as well as his associate, former British ambassador Craig Murray, both say that the DNC emails came from a whistleblower within the DNC. Murray has even identified the precise location where a DNC insider passed him the emails—a park near American University.

Assange may be a misguided zealot, but neither his friends nor his enemies call him a liar. His image is very nearly the opposite: a self-righteousness fanatic—not a slippery con man.

Hey, did anyone else notice that last week, very quietly, every single staffer at the DNC was fired?

The claim that Russia hacked the DNC's emails to help Trump is the sort of crackpot theory that can only be concocted after the fact.

They would prefer to say that North Korea or ISIS "hacked" our election and somehow installed Trump. But unfortunately, Trump has no business dealings with ISIS or the Pyongyang regime. He—or people he knows—have had some vague business dealings with Russia. So the left is stuck with its insane Russia conspiracy.

And now, just as the whole story is collapsing, their need is even more urgent, to distract from the Obama administration's use of national security intelligence-gathering agencies to spy on domestic enemies like Donald Trump.



An article by J. Marsolo titled "Obama And Rice Focused on the Enemy: Trump" was posted at americanthinker.com on April 6, 2017. Following is the article.

Susan Rice finally remembered that she unmasked intercepted messages to show that Trump and his campaign and transition team had their conversations intercepted by our intelligence agencies. Rice has not yet explained why she did this. Her role as national security adviser was to advise on policy, not to act as an investigator.

Presumably, the intelligence agencies that intercepted the messages did not believe that it warranted unmasking the identity of Trump and his associates. But Susan Rice did. She is now trying to remember why she did it and what she did with the intercepts.

Why? The answer is obvious to anyone using simple logic. She did it because her boss, Obama, told her to do it. Not even Rice is dumb enough to say she unmasked Trump to advise Obama on foreign policy. But if she read the intercepts and unmasked Trump, then it is logical that she gave this information to Obama. Otherwise, why do it?

Obama was campaigning furiously daily to help Hillary and defeat Trump. He told audiences he would view it as a personal insult if they did not elect Hillary. Obama did all he could to defeat Trump but failed.

Obama and Rice were looking at the intercepted messages, hoping to find some dirt to use against Trump. There was none, but they still did it, and when Trump won, they leaked the General Flynn story to weaken Trump. Not even Rice is dumb enough to say she unmasked Trump to advise Obama on foreign policy.

Obama's obsession with defeating Trump highlights the irresponsible conduct by Obama, as president, to focus on Trump and do nothing about the North Korea nuclear program, do nothing to combat ISIS, and appease Iran. He gave Iran, the principal sponsor and supporter of radical Islamist terrorism, over 150 billion dollars, plus millions more in ransom.

Obama viewed Trump as the enemy, not Iran, North Korea, ISIS, and Islamist terrorism. He spent more time trying to defeat Trump than doing his job. He had the perfect tool and fool: Susan Rice. She proved her loyalty and her willingness to do anything for Obama when she lied on five Sunday TV shows to the effect that a video caused the Benghazi attack, and when she said the traitor Bergdahl served our country with distinction.

The question now is, will Susan Rice tell the truth and implicate Obama, or will she stonewall and hope the Opposition Party (Democrats and mainstream media) scares the Republicans into backing off from a real investigation?



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.”