

Eye on the World

April 15, 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 15, 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 number of videos and an article by Robert Mackey titled "Trump Surrenders Element of Surprise by Warning Russia of Planned Strike on It's Ally Syria" were posted at theintercept.com on April 7, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

No doubt fearing the grave risk of killing Russian military personnel on the ground in Syria, the United States military gave Russia advance notice before launching cruise missile strikes overnight on a Syrian air base that is used to store chemical weapons, according to a U.S. intelligence assessment.

A Pentagon spokesman, Capt. Jeff Davis, said in a statement that a pre-existing "deconfliction" channel, set up to keep American and Russian jets from crossing paths in the skies over Syria, was used to disclose the planned attack to Russia. "U.S. military planners took precautions to minimize risk to Russian or Syrian personnel located at the airfield," Davis said.

(After the strikes hit, the Russians announced that they were withdrawing from the agreement to share information about their movements over Syria.)

According to Davis, the strikes were aimed not at Syrian soldiers but the "aircraft and support infrastructure and equipment at Shayrat Airfield," with the intention of "reducing the Syrian Government's ability to deliver chemical weapons."

In his statement announcing the strikes on the airfield, President Donald Trump said that the base in central Syria had been used on Tuesday [April 4] to launch a chemical attack that killed dozens of men, women and children in the rebel-held town of Khan Sheikhoun in Idlib Province.

Evidence of the damage caused by the strikes is incomplete, but images of the base broadcast on Russian state television on Friday suggested that significant parts of it remain intact.

Evgeny Poddubnyy, a Russian war correspondent, posted more images of the damaged airfield on Instagram, showing a bunker reduced to rubble and what might have been a jet, but another plane that looked unscathed.

Video posted on YouTube by a news site in St. Petersburg, Federal News Agency, also appeared to show an air defense battery at the perimeter of the base had escaped the bombing.

It is not yet clear how far ahead of time the Russians were warned, but a witness told Riam Dalati of the BBC that a convoy of Russian military vehicles left the base at some stage yesterday.

Although at least six Syrian airmen died in the attack, according to a Syrian military spokesman, it seems inconceivable that the Russian military personnel fleeing the base would not have alerted their allies to what was coming.

Video recorded by a Russian military drone over the base suggested to some observers that the Syrians might have moved some of their jets out of their bunkers in anticipation of the strikes.

While it was no doubt prudent to take steps to minimize the number of people killed in the attack, letting Syria know that the strike was coming represents a significant departure from Trump's own campaign rhetoric.

At rally after rally before he was president, and in debates against Hillary Clinton, Trump repeatedly called for surprise attacks and mocked the U.S. military and its Iraqi allies for giving advance notice of a planned offensive against Islamic State fighters to retake the city of Mosul in Iraq.

"Whatever happened to the element of surprise?" Trump asked in a September debate. "Douglas MacArthur, George Patton, spinning in their graves when they see the stupidity of our country."

"Why don't we just go in quietly, right?" Mr. Trump told supporters in Wisconsin at one campaign rally in late October. "They used to call it a sneak attack."

Pressed on the idea that he did not understand military strategy in an interview just before the election, Trump vowed to teach military experts a thing or two.

In a video statement on the impact of Trump's non-surprise attack in the Syrian air base, a Russian military spokesman mocked it as ineffective, saying that just six MIG-23 jets were destroyed, while the runways and bulk of the Syrian jets were unharmed.

The Russian spokesman also scoffed at the notion that Syria's government was responsible for the chemical attack this week—reiterating his government's claim that Islamist rebels were producing their own nerve agents—and suggested that Trump had staged the incident purely for reasons of domestic politics.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled "Lassie, Come Home" was posted at townhall.com on April 12, 2017. Following is the article.

War is like crack for presidents. It confers instant gravitas, catapulting them to respectability, bypassing all station stops. They get to make macho pronouncements on a topic where every utterance is seen as august.

On the other hand, Trump's Syrian misadventure is immoral, violates every promise he ran on and could sink his presidency.

Left to his own devices, uncontaminated by Washington group-think, Trump gets it right.

Back in 2013, when President Obama was being egged on to attack Syrian President Bashar al-Assad in response to an alleged chemical weapons attack far more sweeping than this latest one, Trump tweeted:

- Aug. 29, 2013: "What will we get for bombing Syria besides more debt and a possible long term conflict? Obama needs Congressional approval."
- Aug. 31, 2013: "Be prepared, there is a small chance that our horrendous leadership could unknowingly lead us into World War III."
- Sept. 1, 2013: "If the U.S. attacks Syria and hits the wrong targets, killing civilians, there will be worldwide hell to pay. Stay away and fix broken U.S."
- On the campaign trail, Trump repeatedly stated that he had no interest in starting "World War III over Syria," saying, "We have bigger problems than Assad." His policy position was: "Let Syria and ISIS fight. I look at Assad—and Assad looks better than the other side."

Trump was right on every point.

Assad is one of the least bad leaders in the entire Middle East. He's not a murderous thug like Saddam, has no rape rooms, isn't into jihad, protects Christians and is fighting ISIS. He provided us with intelligence on al-Qaida after 9/11. He does not have crazy Islamic police slapping women around or throwing gays off buildings. (That would be our beloved ally, Saudi Arabia.)

Trump was also correct about Assad's opponents being far worse, containing large helpings of both ISIS and al-Qaida.

As awful as it was to see those dead children, Trump knew that America's first duty is to our own children.

We have never succeeded at turning a Third World dictatorship into a paradise. The history of these things is that removing a Middle Eastern strongman always makes things worse—for example, in Iran, Iraq, Libya and Egypt.

We leap in, thinking we're helping the poor devils under the thumb of a dictator—and then the new tribe takes over and oppresses everyone else, usually much more brutally, while hating us even more than the old tribe did.

If voters wanted more Middle Eastern wars, there were plenty of other candidates offering that: Marco Rubio, Lindsey Graham, Carly Fiorina and Hillary Clinton, for example. And we must never forget Jeb! though it proved surprisingly easy to do so in 2016.

But we picked Trump.

While most of the left wailed about the return of Nazi Germany under Trump, savvy liberals saw his vulnerability: flattery. All we have to do is praise him! You'll be shocked at how easy it is.

And, boy, did they lay it on thick with the Syrian misadventure. No sucker's bait was left on the floor.

- Cable news hosts gushed, "Trump became president of the United States tonight!"

- On MSNBC, Brian Williams called the bombing "beautiful" three times in less than a minute.

- Sen. Lindsey Graham (one of the "women of the Senate," according to Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg) compared Trump to Reagan.

- The *New York Times* headlined an article, "On Syria Attack, Trump's Heart Came First."

My nightmare scenario: Trump and Jared watching TV together and high-fiving: DID YOU SEE THE NEWS! THEY LOVE YOU! All Trump had to do was pointlessly bomb another country, and it was as if a genie had granted his every wish.

Looking for some upside to this fiasco, desperate Trump supporters bleated that bombing Assad had sent a message to North Korea.

Yes, the message is: The Washington establishment is determined to manipulate the president into launching counterproductive military strikes. Our enemies—both foreign and domestic—would be delighted to see our broken country further weaken itself with pointless wars.

Was America strengthened by the Iraq War? The apparently never-ending Afghanistan War? Vietnam? This is how great powers die, which is exactly what the left wants.

Administration policy was heading in the wrong direction at 90 mph, but thank God Trump seems to have grabbed the steering wheel and hit the brakes. Notwithstanding the hopes and dreams of Clausewitzian military strategist Nikki Haley, we will not be engaging in regime change in Syria or starting World War III with Russia today.

We want the “president of America” back—not “the president of the world.”



An article by Larry Elder titled “Obama Claimed ‘All’ of Syria’s Chemical Weapons Had Been Eliminated” was posted at townhall.com on April 13, 2017. Following is the article.

The Obama administration claimed that it negotiated with Syria and Russia to eliminate “100 percent” of Syria’s chemical weapons. After President Barack Obama’s 2012 “red line” warning to Syria about using chemical weapons, Syria launched a chemical attack in August 2013.

But U.S. military action was avoided by the alleged Russian/American/Syrian diplomatic accomplishment, achieved without “firing a shot.”

Here’s what we were told:

- President Obama, on April 28, 2014: “We’re getting chemical weapons out of Syria without having initiated a strike.”
- Sen. Claire McCaskill, D-Mo., crowed on June 1, 2014: “We’re getting the chemical weapons out of Syria.” And Sen. Bob Casey, D-Pa., chimed in July 6: “We should commend the administration for the result that they got.”
- Then-Secretary of State John Kerry, on July 20, 2014: “We got 100 percent of the chemical weapons out (of Syria).”
- President Obama, on Aug. 18, 2014: “Today we mark an important achievement in our ongoing effort to counter the spread of weapons of mass destruction by eliminating Syria’s declared chemical weapons stockpile.”
- Kerry on Oct. 31, 2014: “We . . . cut the deal that got 100 percent of the declared chemical weapons out of Syria, and people nevertheless have been critical—of one day of bombing versus the virtue of getting 100 percent of the chemical weapons out of Syria.”
- Kerry reiterated the accomplishment on Feb. 24, 2015, telling the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: “We got, as you know, last year, all the chemical weapons out of Syria.”
- True, Bloomberg reported on May 13, 2015: “The U.S. government was informed months ago that an international monitoring body found traces of chemical weapons that President Bashar al-Assad had promised to turn over, including sarin gas—a clear violation of the deal he struck with President

Obama after crossing the administration's 'red line' two years ago. Officials from the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons told the Obama administration early this year that its inspectors had found traces of two banned chemical weapons during an inspection of the Syrian government's Scientific Studies and Research Center in the district of Barzeh near Damascus, two administration officials told us. A report by Reuters May 8 said that OPCW inspectors had found traces of sarin and VX nerve agent at the site in separate inspections in December and January."

■ After the Bloomberg story, then-White House press secretary John Earnest initially admitted: "We're aware that the OPCW continues to receive credible allegations that the use of chemical weapons in Syria is still taking place." But a month later, on June 17, 2015, Earnest responded: "(Syria's) declared chemical weapons stockpile that Assad previously denied existed has now been acknowledged, rounded up, removed from the country and destroyed precisely because of the work of this administration and our successful efforts to work with the Russians to accomplish that goal."

■ But Susan Rice, then Obama's national security adviser, on Jan. 16, 2017, said, "We were able to find a solution that didn't necessitate the use of force that actually removed the chemical weapons that were known from Syria, in a way that the use of force would never have accomplished . . . We were able to get the Syrian government to voluntarily and verifiably give up its chemical weapons stockpile."

After last week's chemical weapons attack that left nearly 100 Syrians dead, former Obama advisers now say they always knew that not all of chemical weapons were eliminated—and that turning over all their weapons is not exactly what tyrants tend to do.

■ Antony J. Blinken, a former deputy secretary of state, recently said, "We always knew we had not gotten everything, that the Syrians had not been fully forthcoming in their declaration."

■ Michael McFaul, Obama's former ambassador to Russia, said, "For me, this tragedy underscores the dangers of trying to do deals with dictators without a comprehensive, invasive and permanent inspection regime."

■ Tom Malinowski, an assistant secretary of state for human rights under Obama, laments: "The difficult and debatable choice the Obama administration . . . made not to use military force when Assad last used nerve gas against his people (in 2013) will shape our thinking about this and similar crises for a long time to come. The lesson I would draw from that experience is that when dealing with mass killing by unconventional or conventional means, deterrence is more effective than disarmament."

This brings us the Obama's Iran deal that allegedly prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Why should we believe that Obama was any less duped here than when he claimed the elimination of "all" of Syria's chemical weapons? We shouldn't.



A Reuters article by Michelle Nichols titled "Russia Blocks U.N. Security Council Condemnation of Syria Attack" were posted at reuters.com on April 12, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Russia blocked a Western-led effort at the U.N. Security Council on Wednesday to condemn last week's deadly gas attack in Syria and push Moscow's ally President Bashar al-Assad to cooperate with international inquiries into the incident.

It was the eighth time during Syria's six-year-old civil war that Moscow has used its veto power on the Security Council to shield Assad's government.

In the latest veto, Russia blocked a draft resolution backed by the United States, France and Britain to denounce the attack in the town of Khan Sheikhoun and tell Assad's government to provide access for investigators and information such as flight plans.

The toxic gas attack on April 4 prompted the United States to launch missile strikes on a Syrian air base and widened a rift between the United States and Russia.

Russian President Vladimir Putin said on Wednesday that trust had eroded between the two countries under U.S. President Donald Trump.

U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson echoed that comment after meetings with Russian leaders in Moscow, saying that relations are at a low point with a low level of trust. Tillerson called for Assad to eventually relinquish power.

U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki Haley, called on Moscow to stop protecting Assad and said the United States wants to work with Russia toward a political solution for Syria.



A Reuters article by Steve Holland and Jeff Mason titled "In Abrupt Shift, Trump Warms to China And NATO, Sours on Russia" was posted at reuters.com on April 13, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

After less than three months in office, President Donald Trump has abruptly shifted his stance on an array of foreign policy issues from the U.S. relationship with Russia and China to the value of the NATO alliance.

Trump, who ran for the White House on a pledge to shake up the status quo in Washington, repeatedly lashed out at China during the campaign, accusing Beijing of being a "grand champion" of currency manipulation.

Candidate Trump also dismissed the NATO military alliance as obsolete and said he hoped to build warmer ties with Russia.

But at a White House news conference and in a newspaper interview on Wednesday, he offered starkly different views on those issues, saying his relationship with Moscow was souring while ties with Beijing were improving. He also lavished praise on NATO, saying it was adapting to changing global threats.

"I said it was obsolete. It's no longer obsolete," Trump said as he stood at a news conference alongside NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg in the White House East Room on Wednesday.

The reversals on Russia and NATO could reassure U.S. allies in Europe who were rattled by Trump's overtures toward Moscow during the campaign. But the president's talk of "bonding" with Chinese President Xi Jinping could sow confusion in Asia, where U.S. allies are fearful of a rising China.

Trump's apparent shifts toward a more conventional foreign policy came amid infighting within his administration that has lately seen a decline in the influence of political operatives, mainly his chief strategist, Steve Bannon.

Six months ago, candidate Trump suggested he was eager for an alliance with Russian President Vladimir Putin.

"If he says great things about me, I'm going to say great things about him," Trump said last September.

On Wednesday, however, Trump said he had growing concerns about Russia's support of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

"We may be at an all-time low in terms of a relationship with Russia," said Trump, who ordered the firing of U.S. cruise missiles at a Syrian airfield last week to punish Assad for suspected use of poison gas in Syria's civil war.

While criticizing Russia on Wednesday, Trump said he and Xi had bonded during the Chinese president's visit to the Mar-a-Lago resort in Florida, where they dined together with their wives and held talks.

Ahead of that visit, Trump had predicted "difficult" discussions on trade.

The improving ties with Beijing were underscored when Trump told the Wall Street Journal in an interview on Wednesday that he would not declare China a currency manipulator as he had pledged to do on his first day in office.

The evolving Trump foreign policy appears to reflect less of the influence of his campaign team and more the views of Defense Secretary James Mattis, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and national security adviser H.R. McMaster, all of whom are deeply skeptical of Russia.

Trump's former national security adviser, retired General Michael Flynn, was forced to resign on Feb. 13 for contacts with Russia's ambassador to the United States before Trump took office.

The new tone on foreign policy comes as Trump has been trying to settle the palace intrigue inside the White House, where Bannon, former chief of the conservative Breitbart News organization, has been at odds with the more mainstream Jared Kushner, the senior White House adviser who is Trump's son-in-law.

In an interview with the New York Post on Tuesday, Trump offered only lukewarm support for Bannon.

"I like Steve, but you have to remember he was not involved in my campaign until very late," Trump said.



An article by Leah Barkoukis titled "Krauthammer: Chinese Are 'Acting Rather Well' on North Korea Because They're Worried About Trump" was posted at townhall.com on April 13, 2017. Following is the article.

The U.S.'s missile strike against a Syrian airfield was not only retaliation against Syrian President Bashar al Assad's use of chemical weapons against his own people, it also served as a notice to the world that there's a new sheriff in town, and the U.S. is ready and willing to follow through on threats.

Enter: China and North Korea. Trump essentially threatened China that if they don't help solve the North Korea problem, a good trade deal with the U.S. is at risk.

Syndicate columnist Charles Krauthammer believes China is worried about Trump now and it may be the reason why they're acting better about reining in the rogue nation.

"Let's not forget about the stick," he said on *Special Report with Bret Baier*.

"This is an administration that unlike Obama, did something in Syria. Actually attacked an air base where the Russians were, that didn't hit any Russians, but not afraid to do it. There a carrier group Winston, off the shores of North Korea. That sends a message, when you combine the two, the Chinese have to calculate that it is possible not likely, but possible this is a president who would actually do a preemptive attack, or at the least, in a year or so we'll see it, shoot down a rocket that the North Koreans have launched. That will be another signal that Chinese are worried about how it is a Nixon effect. What is this man capable of doing, and that I think is having an effect on their being acting rather well so far on North Korea."

China has since turned back North Korean coal ships; an influential Chinese paper urged the country to halt its nuclear program; and the government sent tens of thousands of troops to the North Korean border ahead of this weekend's anniversary celebrations of the founding of the Kim regime.



Several videos and an article by David Martosko titled "ISIS Hammered As US Drops Biggest Non-Nuclear Weapons Ever: 21,000 lb Bomb is Used in Anger for the First Time to Obliterate Jihadists' Caves in Afghanistan" were posted at dailymail.co.uk on April 13, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

The United States dropped its largest non-nuclear weapon on Thursday after it targeted an ISIS network of caves and tunnels in eastern Afghanistan.

U.S. forces used a 30-foot long, GPS-guided GBU-43 bomb, at around 7.30pm local time in the Nangarhar Province.

The weapon weighs a staggering 21,600 pounds.

It is known as the 'Mother Of All Bombs'—a play on 'MOAB,' an acronym that stands for 'Massive Ordnance Air Burst.'

A crater left by the blast is believed to be more than 300 meters wide after it exploded six feet above the ground. Anyone at the blast site was vaporized.

President Donald Trump told reporters at the White House that he was 'very, very proud' and called the operation 'really another successful job. We're very, very proud of our military.'

The Pentagon is denying that the attack was a revenge strike despite the fact that it came in the same area of Afghanistan where a Green Beret soldier was killed on Saturday [April 8].

Staff Sgt. Mark De Alencar of the 7th Special Forces Group was cut down by enemy small arms fire while his unit was conducting counter-ISIS operations.

That MOAB's first practical test was carried out on March 11, 2003, at Eglin Air Force Base in Florida.

The GBU-43, otherwise known as the Mother of All Bombs, or MOAB unleashes a devastating fireball that incinerates anything within 300 feet when it first detonates.

In the milliseconds following the initial blast, all the oxygen would have been sucked out of the tunnels and for hundreds of feet around, literally sucking the life out of terrorists, suffocating them as their lungs imploded.

Then, in a flash the fiery shockwave would have blasted outwards at the speed of sound for up to a mile, causing huge concussive injuries to anyone caught in its path, essentially smashing them to death, while at the same time leveling buildings and trees.

Ears would have been left bleeding and internal organs battered by the staggering force of the blast.

Anyone caught inside the tunnels would have been crushed as the force of 19,000 pounds of highly complex explosives caused them to collapse on the ISIS terrorists.

Anyone left alive would have been shocked and left in awe by the ferocity of the blast—the psychological scars staying with them forever.

Its frightening power was unleashed by the United States for the first time on Thursday when it was dropped on an ISIS camp in Afghanistan's Nangarhar Province, in order to obliterate underground tunnels used by the terrorists.

A crater left by the blast is believed to be more than 300 feet wide after it exploded just six feet above the ground. Anyone at the blast site was vaporized.

The energy released by the nearly 19,000 pounds of highly complex explosive, would have caused a barometric shock wave known as 'overpressure' that moves at the speed of sound away from ground zero.

Classed as a thermobaric bomb—'thermo' for heat and 'baric' for pressure, the MOAB features a two stage detonation powered by H6 explosive which contains powdered aluminum.

The first blast detonates and spreads highly flammable aluminum dust and the second is the baric blast—which literally sucks oxygen out from cave tunnels before rapidly becoming an expanding shock wave.

Both the implosion and the blast wave cause massive internal damage to anyone who has not been already been incinerated by the detonation, with most injuries to hollow organs such as the ears, lungs and stomach.

Anyone in the tunnels who did not have the life sucked out them would have then been crushed to death by the sheer force of the explosion.

Effects of bomb

However, an explosion in the Afghan desert is one thing. To bring things closer to home, what would be the effect of a MOAB detonation on Times Square?

MOAB: The Mother of All Bombs—otherwise known as the GBU-43 would obliterate most of Times Square.

The effects of a MOAB detonation are explained as the following.

■ 1: Fire Ball

Laser guided and parachuted down onto the Crossroads of The World, the MOAB would technically explode as an airburst weapon, albeit from six-feet and not thousands, like a nuclear bomb.

The fireball radius would be 300-feet, incinerating every person and obliterating Times Square's famous jumbotrons and billboards.

■ 2: Air Blast

As the bomb ignites the aluminum dust and nearly 19,000 pounds of explosives a shock wave sucks the air from another 160-feet of prime Manhattan real estate and destroying Broadway. Concrete buildings are severely damaged and fatalities are also close to 100 percent here.

■ 3: Continuing Air Blast

The dissipated air blast continues on for another 300-feet, damaging more residential buildings and causing injury to anyone caught up in the blast and more fatalities.

■ 4: Burn injuries

People up to 330-feet away from Ground Zero would suffer 3rd degree burns and some would suffer the loss of their limbs.

Smaller than “little boy”

The NukeMap estimates casualties for the blast to be 2,600 and injuries to be 2,380—but at anyone time there are up to 10,000 to 15,000 people in the center of Times Square, so these figures are conservative.

However, with a yield blast of 0.011 KT the MOAB pales in comparison to even the nuclear bomb dropped on Hiroshima—Little Boy—which had a yield of 15 KT. Above is a simulation if that nuclear device was dropped on Times Square

Authorized commanders

President Donald Trump told reporters at the White House that he had authorized his military commanders to take actions like the one put into play on Thursday. He suggested that he had not personally ordered the bomb strike, but delegated authority to commanders in the field.

‘Everybody knows exactly what happened. So, what I do is I authorize my military . . . We have given them total authorization,’ he said.

The move marks the fulfilment of a 17-month-old campaign promise Trump delivered in Iowa, when he scoffed at ISIS terror forces and said he ‘would bomb the s**t out of them’ if he became president.

Then-candidate Donald Trump told an Iowa audience in November 2015 that he would fight ISIS from the air as president: ‘I would bomb the s**t out of them’

Message to North Korea

The explosion will also send a saber-rattling message to North Korea and Iran that rogue states’ nuclear-weapons ambitions could be met with brute force.

Trump said of North Korean dictator Kim Jong-Un: ‘I don’t know if this sends a message. It doesn’t make any difference if it does or not.’

The Department of Defense is denying that Thursday’s attack was revenge for Saturday’s death of Green Beret sergeant Mark De Alencar in the same region of Afghanistan

‘North Korea’s a problem. The problem will be taken care of.’



An article by Melanie Arter titled "Trump Signs Resolution Overturning Obama Regulation That Forces States to Fund Planned Parenthood Under Title X" was posted at cnsnews.com on April 13, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

President Donald Trump on Thursday signed H.J. Res. 43, a resolution that overturns President Barack Obama's regulation forcing states to fund Planned Parenthood, the nation's largest abortion provider, under Title X.

"This resolution that he signed today overturns a regulation that was put in place by the previous administration on their way out the door that would have taken away the right of states to set their own policies and priorities for Title 10 family-planning programs," White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer announced Thursday.

H.J. Res. 43 brings the total number of Congressional Review Act legislation pieces that the president has signed to 13, Spicer said.

Pro-life groups praised the president's decision.

■ "This week the pro-life movement had two huge victories: first, the swearing-in of Justice Gorsuch and now, President Trump will undo former President Obama's parting gift to the abortion industry," Susan B. Anthony List President Marjorie Dannenfelser said in a statement ahead of the signing Thursday.

"The resolution signed today simply ensures that states are not forced to fund an abortion business with taxpayer dollars. Rather, states have the option to spend Title X money on comprehensive health care clinics that better serve women and girls," said Dannenfelser who was present at the signing.

"We thank President Trump, Vice President Pence, who cast the tie breaking vote last month, as well as the women who led this effort in Congress, Rep. Diane Black and Sen. Joni Ernst," Dannenfelser said.

"Prioritizing funding away from Planned Parenthood to comprehensive health care alternatives is a winning issue. We expect to see Congress continue its efforts to redirect additional taxpayer funding away from Planned Parenthood through pro-life health care reform after the spring recess," she added.

■ "President Trump is expressing the sentiment many of us feel about Planned Parenthood receiving our tax dollars to assault the souls and sensibilities of our children. We are grateful that the Title X bill the president signed today finally allows states to withhold Title X funds from abortion providers," American Life League President Judie Brown said in a statement.

■ "Our supporters contacted their members of Congress asking them to vote yes as this bill made its way through the House and the Senate. This law will undo an Obama era regulation and return to states the ability to withhold Title X money from Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers. The passage of this law and its signing by the president demonstrate a real changing of the guard in DC. We look forward to many more victories for the

babies,” Jim Sedlak, executive director of American Life League and founder of STOPP (Stop Planned Parenthood International), said in a statement.

Planned Parenthood condemned Trump for signing the resolution but clarified that H.J. Res. 43 “does not ‘defund’ Planned Parenthood.”

“That is a separate issue. However, this latest move could embolden states to try to block access to health care through Title X, both at Planned Parenthood health centers and independent clinics. These types of actions are already illegal, as a court in Florida found just this past summer,” Planned Parenthood Federation of America said in a statement Thursday.

“People are sick and tired of politicians making it even harder for them to access health care, and this bill is just the latest example. Planned Parenthood strongly opposes President Trump’s willingness to undermine millions of women’s access to birth control through the Title X family planning program. Four million people depend on the Title X family planning program, and by signing this bill, President Trump disregards their health and well-being,” Dawn Laguens, Executive Vice President of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, said in a statement.

“We should build on the tremendous progress made in this country with expanded access to birth control, instead of enacting policies that take us backward. Too many women still face barriers to health care, especially young women, women of color, those who live in rural areas, and women with low incomes,” Laguens said.

She said women’s “worst fears” are coming true.



An article by Rebecca Hagelin titled “Baby in a Jar” was posted at townhall.com on April 13, 2017. Following is the article.

“There’s a jar on the shelf with a little baby in it!” the girl nervously whispered.

Several of us were gathered around one of the lab stations in our seventh-grade science class when my wide-eyed classmate revealed her gruesome discovery.

Of course we couldn’t believe it. We all knew those crowded bookshelves in the far corner of the room. They were filled with jars of frogs and snakes and other former living things that now stood preserved in some brownish yellow liquid, made cloudy and dense by their very slowly decomposing bodies. Every specimen had that same sickening hue, long void of life and whatever color it once had.

A friend and I made our way to the back of the room amidst the clinking of test tubes and mayhem while the class of 12-year-olds tried to organize in little groups for the day’s lab activity. The year was 1974. It was a time when bunson burners, formaldehyde, scalpels and preteens regularly interacted in public school science classrooms.

It was also the year after it became legal in America to kill preborn human babies—and put them in jars on dusty shelves along with mice and frogs.

Was it really legal? You know, to kill a baby? To put it in a jar on a shelf? These questions swamped my mind as I spotted the jar in disbelief. Crammed inside the pint-sized tomb and immersed in that same sickening liquid was a perfectly formed little baby. A human baby.

Abortion was not discussed in middle school in those days. But our gentle, kind science teacher thought the truth about the product of abortion should be known. I remember him softly saying, “God rest his soul,” as he joined us at the bookshelves in our silent contemplation. He didn’t need to expound. He didn’t have to.

But to this day I wish I knew more about the helpless little baby whose life had been snuffed out. While others were preoccupied with where our teacher got the baby, I was struck by his dead stillness. I marveled at his tiny toes, and the perfectly formed delicate rib cage barely visible through taut, translucent skin. And I had the unshakeable feeling that his death was very, very wrong.

Something is very, very wrong in a country where little human babies continue to be legally slaughtered. If more people saw their little bodies and witnessed that they are not formless blobs of tissue as Planned Parenthood tells young, unsuspecting mothers in the midst of emotional turmoil, then perhaps our American holocaust would finally end.

But the truth is largely hidden.

Thank God, the Center for Medical Progress (CMP) has bravely infiltrated Planned Parenthood clinics and meetings over the last several years and carefully documented the grisly truth through under-cover video.

Although California’s attorney general, to whom Planned Parenthood made numerous campaign contributions, recently charged the CMP citizen journalists with 15 criminal counts for allegedly illegally recording conversations with employees of the baby abortuaries, many of the videos can be viewed at www.CenterForMedicalProgress.org.

The videos and hundreds of pages of documents reveal for all the world to see how Planned Parenthood not only kills babies but often has them chopped into pieces and sold like chicken parts to those who traffic human remains.

Oh, and if you are a taxpayer, you are helping to fund the atrocities.

Find out what you can do to help persuade Congress to stop paying Planned Parenthood and to work toward protecting the preborn and their unsuspecting moms.

Visit CenterForMedicalProgress.org and click on “Take Action.”

Consider this column your baby in a jar moment.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled “Metastasizing Academic Cancer” was posted at jewishworldreview.com on April 13, 2017. Following is the article.

The average American has little knowledge of the extent to which our institutions of higher learning have been infected with a spreading cancer. One aspect of that cancer is akin to the loyalty oaths of the 1940s and '50s.

Professors were often required to sign statements that affirmed their loyalty to the United States government plus swear they were not members of any organizations, including the Communist Party USA, that sought the overthrow of the United States government.

Fortunately, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down loyalty oaths as a condition of employment in 1964.

Today we're seeing the re-emergence of the mentality that gave us loyalty oaths, in the form of mandating that faculty members write “diversity statements,” especially as part of hiring and promotion procedures. They are forced to pledge allegiance to the college's diversity agenda.

For example, the University of California, San Diego requires that one's “Contributions to Diversity Statement” describe one's “past experience, activities and future plans to advance diversity, equity and inclusion, in alignment with UC San Diego's mission to reflect the diversity of California and to meet the educational needs and interests of its diverse population (<http://tinyurl.com/mm6vzzq>).”

George Leef, director of research at The James G. Martin Center for Academic Renewal, has written an article titled “Loyalty Oaths Return with Faculty ‘Diversity Statements’ ” (<http://tinyurl.com/mxy363c>).

His article documents the growing trend of mandated faculty diversity statements—such as that at Virginia Tech, in which “candidates should include a list of activities that promote or contribute to inclusive teaching, research, outreach, and service.”

College diversity agendas are little more than a call for ideological conformity.

Diversity only means racial, sex and sexual orientation quotas.

In pursuit of this agenda, colleges spend billions of dollars on offices of diversity and inclusion, diversity classes, and diversity indoctrination.

The last thing that diversity hustlers want is diversity in ideas.

By the way, the next time you hear a college president boasting about how diverse his college is, ask him how many Republican faculty members there are in his journalism, psychology, English and sociology departments.

In many cases, there is none, and in others, the ratio of Democrats to Republicans might be 20-to-1.

Nearly 100 percent of political campaign contributions from liberal arts faculty go to Democrats.

At Cornell University, for example, 97 percent of contributions from faculty went to Democrats.

At Georgetown University, it was 96 percent.

A study by my George Mason University colleague Daniel B. Klein, along with Charlotta Stern, titled "Professors and Their Politics: The Policy Views of Social Scientists" (<http://tinyurl.com/qxne3db>), concluded: "The academic social sciences are pretty much a one-party system. Were the Democratic tent broad, the one-party system might have intellectual diversity. But the data show almost no diversity of opinion among the Democratic professors when it comes to the regulatory, redistributive state: they like it. Especially when it comes to the minimum wage, workplace-safety regulation, pharmaceutical regulation, environmental regulation, discrimination regulation, gun control, income redistribution, and public schooling."

The fascist college trend that we are witnessing today is by no means new. As early as 1991, Yale University President Benno Schmidt warned: "The most serious problems of freedom of expression in our society today exist on our campuses. The assumption seems to be that the purpose of education is to induce correct opinion rather than to search for wisdom and to liberate the mind."

What diversity oaths seek is to maintain political conformity among the faculty indoctrinating our impressionable, intellectually immature young people.

Vladimir Lenin said, "Give me four years to teach the children and the seed I have sown will never be uprooted." That's the goal of the leftist teaching agenda.

You might ask, "Williams, what can be done?"

Parents, donors and legislatures need to stop being lazy. Check to see whether a college has diversity mandates for faculty. Check to see whether campus speakers have been disinvited. College administrators have closed minds about their diversity agenda, but there's nothing more effective in opening up closed minds than the sound of pocketbooks snapping shut.



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled "The Northwestern University Rape Outbreak That Wasn't" was posted at townhall.com on April 5, 2017. Following is the article.

Campus feminists whipped up a Category-5 frenzy over sexual assault allegations at a Northwestern University fraternity in February. But last week, the

school's Vice President for Student Affairs Patricia Telles-Irvin was forced to muster up her best impression of "Saturday Night Live's" classic foot-in-mouth, Emily Litella.

Neeeeever miiiiind.

Picture Telles-Irvin squinting and grimacing sheepishly as she wrote an update on her breathless bulletin "that four female students attending an event at the Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity house were possibly given a date-rape drug, and two of these students believed they were sexually assaulted."

Before I reveal the substance of her update, let me note that shrieking protests ensued after that initial alert. Tears flowed. Demands escalated.

- Northwestern's student government association called for SAE's suspension.
- The *Chicago Tribune's* headline on the brouhaha screamed "crisis."
- The Chicago Sun-Times' headline blared that "nerves are raw."
- Local TV stations spread panic over "date rape drugs."
- On behalf of the university, Telles-Irvin condemned "any such conduct in the strongest possible terms."
- The school offered support for "survivors."

But the hysteria was all based on anonymous phone calls.

There were no actual victims, no witnesses and no physical evidence or electronic evidence or any other kind of evidence that any such an event involving any such women ingesting any such drugs or suffering any such sexual assaults ever occurred.

It was left to Northwestern professor Laura Kipnis, author of the new book, "Unwanted Advances: Sexual Paranoia Comes to Campus," to publicly caution against premature witch hunts. (Kipnis was the target herself of a social justice mob inquisition after penning an irreverent essay assailing oppressive campus sexual behavior codes, Title IX litigation run amok and "infantilized" student snowflakes.)

"If we've learned anything from the unraveling of Rolling Stone's now-retracted story about an alleged rape and cover-up at a University of Virginia frat a couple of years ago, it's that we need to slow down the rush to judgment until we're in possession of sufficient verifiable information to form solid conclusions," Kipnis warned eight weeks ago.

"If we fail to do that, we're guilty of what the commission that later investigated the *Rolling Stone* story excoriated as 'confirmation bias'—that is, forming conclusions in advance of the facts to justify our biases," she added.

"I certainly hope we get updates as the investigation continues," she concluded, "but leaping to action—especially in the absence of verified (or per-

haps even verifiable) complaints—is at best a failure of due process, and at worst vigilantism.”

Indeed, as K.C. Johnson and Stuart Taylor Jr. document in “The Campus Rape Frenzy,” the federal government and virtually all colleges and universities have “mounted a systematic attack on bedrock American principles including the presumption of innocence, access to exculpatory evidence, the right to cross-examine one’s accuser, and due process” in the name of eradicating “rape culture.”

Unfortunately, Kipnis is in the minuscule minority of the sane and responsible at Northwestern. When one brave student senator, who is an SAE fraternity member, stood up for the “rights of the accused” during debate over a resolution to condemn the “pervasive culture of sexual misconduct” on campus, he was chastised for his “privilege” and castigated for “victim-blaming.”

And now for the denouement.

After a “prompt and thorough” investigation, Patricia Telles-Irvin revealed last week, “no disciplinary action or further investigative action related to the reports of sexual misconduct will be taken at this time.”

Did investigators ever track down the anonymous callers who leveled the allegations that smeared the fraternity’s rep and convicted its members in the court of public opinion?

Will false accusers ever be held accountable?

We’ll never know. The case of the Northwestern rape outbreak that never happened is closed. Poof!

Now, instead of admitting the whole thing was a hoax, Northwestern is scouring the targeted fraternity for “other potential violations” of campus codes to justify putting them through hell in the first place. Victimized again.

Why any mom would pay to send their son into this anti-male maelstrom is beyond me. I’d ask famous Hollywood lefty Julia Louis-Dreyfus, whose son plays basketball at Northwestern (and is an SAE member, I’m told), what she thinks of toxic “rape culture” zealots targeting innocent men on campus. But she’s apparently too busy modeling her militant feminist pussyhat on Instagram to take notice.



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled “Who’s Unsafe on Campus?” was posted at townhall.com on April 12, 2017. Following is the article.

Springtime may be in bloom, but snowflakes never go out of season at America’s most prestigious colleges and universities.

Quivering students at the University of Notre Dame launched a protest last week against the school’s decision to invite Vice President Mike Pence as commencement speaker. Activist Imanne Mondane told the campus newspaper that she

and her peers felt “unsafe” and threatened by “someone who openly is offensive but also demeaning of their humanity and of their life and of their identity.”

In other words: The mere presence of a public official whose policy positions veer from acceptable left-wing norms is a public safety hazard.

At Wichita State University, the student government voted to refuse official recognition of the libertarian Young Americans for Liberty group because it supports—gasp!—the First Amendment. Since other chapters of the group across the country have invited controversial conservative speakers to their campuses, the Kansas safe-spacers argued, it would be “dangerous” to allow them to operate in Kansas.

And at Duquesne University, students have now declared that welcoming a Chick-fil-A on campus would put their “safe place” at “risk” because the founders of the fast-food company defended traditional marriage.

What the cluck? These millennial chicken littles have grown softer than the insides of waffle fries.

While they hype the existential dangers of exposure to discomfiting ideological dissent, the bubble-wrapped brigade ignores the real menaces in the academy.

Take vengeful Fresno State professor Lars Maischak. He’s been on the loose on social media, tweeting earlier this year that “Trump must hang.” Just to be clear, he added: “The sooner and the higher, the better.” In retaliation the administration’s crackdown on illegal immigration, Maischak proclaimed, “two Republicans” should be “executed” for “each deported immigrant.”

Using the hashtag “#TheResistance,” Maischak tweeted: “Has anyone started soliciting money and design drafts for a monument honoring the Trump assassin, yet?”

The unhinged academic also tweeted a photo of a bullet with the caption: “Finally discovered! A cure for racism. Take one, administered straight to the cranium.”

I can’t say “lock and load” or do the “Charlie’s Angels” finger gun pose without being accused of inciting violence. But this assassination-obsessed loon can tweet his twisted heart out on Twitter with impunity. (Where’s that Twitter Safety Council when you need it?) Of course, Maischak denies harboring any hatred and claims he’s the innocent target of a “digital lynch-mob.”

Meanwhile, real mobs set fire to U.C. Berkeley to protest speaker Milo Yiannopoulos, injured a professor at Middlebury College while hounding conservative speaker Charles Murray off campus, and assaulted conservative speaker and Vice Media co-founder Gavin McInnes at New York University.

As Manhattan Institute scholar and “The War on Cops” author Heather MacDonald recounted in *City Journal*, she became “the target of such silencing tactics two days in a row last week” at Claremont McKenna College and UCLA. Baying protesters chanted, “We are here to shut down the f—ing fascist” and “From Oakland to Greece, f— the police.” She was forced to livestream her talk

from an empty room while agitators pounded on the windows outside. Then she was whisked away in an unmarked Claremont Police Department van.

Who's unsafe on campus? The social justice mobsters play victim but wield bloodied brass knuckles in the ivory tower against any and all who threaten their orthodoxy and power.



An article by Christopher Wilson titled "Additional Officers Placed on Leave Over United Passenger Removal" was posted at yahoo.com on April 12, 2017. Following is the article.

Two more officers involved in dragging a United Airlines passenger off a plane have been placed on administrative leave, according to a statement provided to Yahoo News.

"The Chicago Department of Aviation (CDA) continues reviewing the details surrounding the incident," the CDA said in a statement released late Wednesday afternoon. "As part of our review, two additional officers have been placed on administrative leave until further notice. The employees' collective bargaining agreement prohibits the CDA from releasing their names at this time."

Initially, one officer was placed on leave Monday following the removal of 69-year-old Dr. David Dao from United Airlines Flight 3411, which was scheduled to fly from Chicago to Louisville, Ky., on Sunday. Dao was forcibly removed from the plane when he refused to give up his seat after being notified that United needed four volunteers to give up their seats to allow crew members to make the overbooked flight.

Dao was selected by the airline to give up his seat but refused, leading to the actions by the three officers. Videos of Dao being dragged through the aisle of the plane and then returning to the cabin with blood on his face went viral, causing a drop in United's stock price, sparking calls for a boycott of the airline in China, and eventually forcing an apology from CEO Oscar Munoz and an offer of a full refund to all passengers on the flight.

Lawyers for Dao filed an emergency request Wednesday in an Illinois court seeking to preserve surveillance videos, cockpit voice recordings, passenger and crew lists, and other materials related to United Flight 3411, Reuters reported.

The CDA, meanwhile, explained the reasoning behind the original officer's being put on leave in a statement released Tuesday evening.

"Aviation Security Officers (ASOs) are part of the public safety teams at both O'Hare and Midway, and complement and assist the Chicago Police Department (CPD), Chicago Fire Department (CFD) and federal law enforcement. While they do have limited authority to make an arrest, Sunday's incident was not within standard operating procedures nor will we tolerate that kind

of action. That is why we quickly placed the aviation security officer on leave pending a thorough review of the situation.”



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.”