

Eye on the World

May 27, 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 May 27, 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 Parisa Hafezi titled "Iran Says It Has Built Third Underground Ballistic Missile Factory" was posted at reuters.com on May 25, 2017. Following is the article.

Iran has built a third underground ballistic missile production factory and will keep developing its missile program, the semi-official Fars news agency quoted a senior commander of the elite Revolutionary Guard as saying.

The development is likely to fuel tensions with the United States in a week when President Donald Trump, on his first foreign trip, has called Iran a sponsor of militant groups and a threat to countries across the Middle East.

"Iran's third underground factory has been built by the Guards in recent years . . . We will continue to further develop our missile capabilities forcefully," Fars quoted Amirali Hajizadeh, head of the Guard's airspace division, as saying.

Since taking office in January, Trump has imposed new sanctions on Iran in response to its recent missile launches, putting Tehran "on notice."

Iran has reacted defiantly. Newly re-elected pragmatist President Hassan Rouhani said on Monday: "Iran does not need the permission of the United States to conduct missile tests."

Iran's Sunni Muslim Gulf neighbors and its arch-enemy Israel have expressed concerns over Tehran's ballistic missile program, seeing it as a threat to regional security.

In 2015, Iranian state TV aired footage of underground tunnels with ready-to-fire missiles on the back of trucks, saying the facility was one of hundreds of underground missile bases around the country.

"It is natural that our enemies America and the Zionist regime (Israel) are angry with our missile program because they want Iran to be in a weak position," Hajizadeh said.

Most nuclear-related sanctions on Iran were lifted last year after Tehran fulfilled commitments under a 2015 deal with major powers to scale back its nuclear program—an agreement that Trump has frequently criticized as being too soft on Tehran. But Iran remains subject to a U.N. arms embargo and other restrictions.

Two months after implementation of the deal, the Guards test-fired two ballistic missiles that it said were designed to be able to hit Israel.

Iran says its missile program is not in defiance with a U.N. resolution that calls on it to refrain from work on ballistic missiles designed to deliver nuclear weapons for up to eight years.

"Along with improving our defense capabilities, we will continue our missile tests and missile production. The next missile to be produced is a surface-to-surface missile," said Hajizadeh, without elaborating.

In retaliation for the new U.S. sanctions over its ballistic missile program, Iran this month added nine American individuals and companies to its own list of 15 U.S. companies for alleged human rights violations and cooperation with Israel.



An article by Leah Barkoukis titled "Trump in Israel: 'Iran Must Never Be Allowed to Possess a Nuclear Weapon' " was posted at townhall.com on May 22, 2017. Following is the article.

During a news conference with Israeli President Reuven Rivlin Monday, President Trump said he was there to "reaffirm the enduring friendship between the United States and the state of Israel."

This relationship, the president said, was No. 1 to him.

Trump also called out Iran as one of the global security challenges both countries face.

"This moment in history calls for us to strengthen our cooperation as both Israel and America face common threats from ISIS and other terrorist groups to countries like Iran that sponsor terrorism and fund and foment terrible violence, not only here but all over the world," Trump said.

“Most importantly the United States and Israel can declare with one voice that Iran must never be allowed to possess a nuclear weapon—never ever.”

And Israel is not alone in the Middle East in recognizing the threat from Iran, Trump said.

“There is a growing realization among your Arab neighbors that they have common cause with you and the threat posed by Iran and it is indeed a threat,” he said.



An article by Lauren Thomas titled “Defense Stocks Soar to All-Time Highs on \$110 Billion US—Saudi Arabia Weapons Deal” was posted at cnbc.com on May 22, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Defense stocks took off on Monday after President Donald Trump signed a nearly \$110 billion weapons deal with Saudi Arabia. The deal will be worth \$350 billion over 10 years.

On Monday, Lockheed Martin closed up more than 1 percent and General Dynamics closed up about 1 percent. These stocks, along with Raytheon and Northrop Grumman, hit all-time highs earlier in the day.

Additionally, the iShares U.S. Aerospace & Defense ETF (ITA) closed nearly 1 percent higher.

Jet maker Boeing also signed a handful of deals with Saudi Arabia during Trump’s weekend visit, involving the sale of military and passenger aircraft. Its stock closed up more than 1 percent.

These types of arms deals have caused defense stocks to rally in the past, according to CNBC analysis using Kensho.

One month after about 40 U.S.-Saudi Arabia arms deals—going back to 2009—the iShares U.S. Aerospace & Defense ETF was up 3.3 percent, on average, almost double the return of the S&P 500, according to data compiled by Kensho.

Trump’s deal with the Saudis solidifies a decades-long alliance with the world’s largest oil exporter and will be worth \$350 billion over 10 years.



An article by the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) titled “ZOA Concerned U.S. Arms Sale to Saudi Arabia Harms Israel’s Security” was posted at jewishpress.com on May 23, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

The huge 10-year \$380 billion U.S.-Saudi agreement announced this past weekend raises serious concerns as to the how Israel’s Qualitative Military

Edge ("QME") will be impacted by the deal's massive weapons sales to the Saudi Kingdom.

U.S. law provides that assuring Israel's QME is vital to U.S. security, and requires certification that a sale or export of major defense equipment to a country in the Middle East will not adversely affect Israel's QME. Israel should be furnished with any needed upgrades to assure that her QME is not impaired by the Saudi sale.

The U.S.-Saudi agreement includes \$110 billion of U.S. sales to Saudi Arabia of advanced, sophisticated military equipment, includes the following.

- Tanks
- Artillery
- Counter-mortar radars
- Aerostats
- Armored personnel carriers
- Helicopters
- Multi-Mission Surface Combatant ships
- Patrol boats
- Air transport systems
- Intelligence-gathering aircraft
- Patriot and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) air and anti-ballistic missile defense systems
- Cybersecurity and communications equipment
- Associated weapons systems, sustainment and training.

("U.S. State Dept.: Supporting Saudi Arabia's Defense Needs Fact Sheet," May 20, 2017.)

In addition, Saudi Arabia's Foreign Minister explained that the deal will also involve "building up [Saudi Arabia's] defense manufacturing capability." ("Rex Tillerson Remarks With Saudi Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir at a Press Availability," Riyadh, Saudi Arabia," U.S. State Dept. website, May 20, 2017.)

ZOA appreciates and echoes the good U.S. intentions related to the weapons sale to the Saudi Kingdom. As Secretary Tillerson put it, the deal is intended to enhance the Saudis' ability to counteract and combat "malign Iranian influence and Iranian-related threats which exist on Saudi Arabia's borders" and to bolster the Saudi Kingdom's ability to "contribut[e] to counterterrorism operations across the region." (Id.)

In the wake of the prior U.S. administration's catastrophic Iran deal, Iran's malign influence is expanding, and ZOA, of course, favors efforts to curb Iran.

"This is a matter that really should trouble us . . . because Saudi Arabia is still a hostile country without any diplomatic relations and nobody knows what the future will be."

On the other hand, U.S. arms provided to Middle Eastern nations with the best of intentions have too often end up being turned against U.S. forces and our allies. This possibility must also be considered here.

This is particularly so because the deal ultimately relies on the rather thin reed of "trust." During his joint press conference regarding the deal, Secretary Tillerson acknowledged that the "growing partnership [with Saudi Arabia] is really grounded in trust, trust between our two nations that we are pursuing the same objectives." (Id.) Objectives can change in a flash in the volatile Middle East.

In recent years, Saudi-Israeli cooperation stemming from mutual concerns about Iran has been quietly developing. Nonetheless, hostile Saudi actions towards Israel persist.

For instance, Saudi Arabia still boycotts Israeli goods and services; backs a so-called "Arab Peace Initiative" that is a blueprint for Israel's destruction; and denies entry to visitors who have Israeli stamps in their passports. The potential for Saudi weapons being turned on Israel clearly exists, and our stable ally Israel must be prepared for this.

Israel is understandably concerned.

Israeli Energy Minister Yuval Steinitz stated regarding the Saudi arms deal: "This is a matter that really should trouble us . . . We have also to make sure that those hundreds of billions of dollars of weapons to Saudi Arabia will not, by any means, erode Israel's qualitative edge, because Saudi Arabia is still a hostile country without any diplomatic relations and nobody knows what the future will be." ("Trump's Saudi Weapons Deal May Worry Israel," by Reuters, May 21, 2017.)

Top U.S. officials have confirmed that maintaining Israel's QME is "critical to regional stability and as a result is fundamentally a core interest of the United States." (See "ZOA: Pres. Obama Questions Providing Qualitative Military Edge for Israel; [But] Assuring Israel's QME is Also the Law, and Vital to U.S. Security," Mar. 16, 2016.)

Federal law on military exports, 22 U.S. Code § 2776(h), thus requires, inter alia, detailed evaluation and certification of "Israel's capacity to respond to the improved regional capabilities provided by such sale or export" and "identification of any specific new capacity, capabilities, or training that Israel may require to address the regional or country-specific capabilities provided by such sale or export."

"Qualitative military edge" analysis looks at the combined capabilities of all other Middle Eastern states and non-state actors.

(QME means the ability to counter and defeat any credible conventional military threat from any individual state or possible coalition of states or from non-state

actors, while sustaining minimal damages and casualties, through the use of superior military means, possessed in sufficient quantity, including weapons, command, control, communication, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities that in their technical characteristics are superior in capability to those of such other individual or possible coalition of states or non-state actors.)

The U.S.-Saudi arms deal may very well alter the combined balance of power in the Middle East.

ZOA thus urges careful analysis of the impact of the U.S.-Saudi arms deal on Israel's QME. The U.S. should provide Israel with any military enhancements needed to assure Israel's QME in the wake of the U.S.-Saudi deal.



An article by Fiamma Nirenstein titled "Trump's Shift in Saudi Arabia: 'Confronting Iran And Terror, Islam is Our Ally' " was posted at timesofisrael.com on May 23, 2017. Following is the article.

It's been a while, perhaps an eternity, since Trump, during the election campaign said that Islam was in itself a religion of hate and therefore, of terrorism, so much so as to warrant a travel ban on those coming from several Islamic country.

Yesterday, in Riyadh, in front of about fifty Muslim leaders hailing from all Arab countries (facing crowned heads like King Abdullah of Jordan, strong presidents such as Egypt's Al-Sisi, as well as weak leaders like Lebanon's Saad Hariri, and above all with the benevolent frown of the elderly King Salman) Trump passionately declared that Muslims are vital allies in a ruthless and definitive war against terrorism.

He used drastic and definitive rhetoric: drive them out of your communities, places of worship, and from this earth . . . Muslims themselves are the main victims, he said, of these "barbaric criminals," just like Christians, Muslims, and listen well because never has a president dared to denounce it before a crowd of Islamic leaders, Jews.

Perhaps Trump, who was greeted with the splendor of "Arabian Nights," in a dream-like hall, with gifts and reverences (moreover reciprocated) simply couldn't resist as other hopeful politicians before him the usual temptation to establish a new Middle East.

But there is some hope this time: his speech outlines a shift from Obama's preference for Iran to a pragmatic pro-Sunni option. Moreover, it puts the Islamic Republic "on notice" repeatedly, along with the general exasperation towards terrorism.

The latter is entirely new: namely it comes down to Trump's basic idea of forming a moderate coalition headed by Saudi Arabia (that in one fell swoop

has casually removed some of its terrible human rights violations and funding for extremist madrasas) and outlines two ways in which to guarantee it.

■ The first revolves around economic convenience, and Trump is specialized in this field: the chances of success are closely linked to the multi-billion-dollar deals signed during this visit for the sale of American weapons that, as the president has repeatedly said, will bring “jobs, jobs, jobs,” and the Saudis will obtain deadly weapons capable of keeping its most dangerous enemy at bay: in other words, Iran. Trump spoke of the need for the Middle East’s youth to live in a modern, rich, and advanced world, in prosperity and peace.

■ Connected to this, the second main aspect of Trump’s policy is the need to contain Iran, the Shiite enemy that already has the entire Sunni world, Saudi Arabia and Egypt first and foremost, shaking in worry.

Trump didn’t ease up on his criticisms toward the ayatollahs and even issued threats towards the end of his speech, he spoke about renewing sanctions and cutting financial backing to anyone who doesn’t use funds for peace, and supports terrorism, i.e. Iran.

Or may be also the use of international help to fund terrorist Palestinian activities, like the Palestinian authority does. Moreover, he reminded everyone of Iran’s support for terrorism and even, in front of that assembly! About its repeated intention of destroying Israel. Then, he outlined the moral horror of those who support a figure like Assad who has killed his own citizens with nerve gas.

In short, Iran was slammed in his speech as an enemy that causes instability and violence. Trump also very clearly defined the first enemies to beat quoting not only Daesh (or rather ISIS), but also Hezbollah (currently used in Syria as Assad’s partners along with their master, Iran), and, on par with the terrorism that Israel is affected by to that of the rest of the world, Hamas.

By doing so Trump didn’t care about justly pointing at a not minor problem for Abu Mazen, who is still trying to unite with these brothers who openly declare themselves terrorists, rulers of an Islamo-fascist regime in Gaza.

Trump, despite his great storm at home, was brave, and showed that he was in great shape even while dancing the traditional dance of the Saudi warriors. Ivanka and Melania free heads waved their hair under the ancient noses of the Saudi dignitaries and the cunning eyes of all those young, muscular princes who in the sparkling gold and silver room of the speeches, fiddled with their cell phones and giggled among themselves under immaculately pressed keffiyeh.

In general, this meeting had in common with those of Obama’s solely the repetition of the mantra that no one dreams of dictating to the Islamic world how it should live and in what it should believe. But it truly paves the way for a new moment, if not a new era.

Of course Trump, on his way to Israel, also announced his intention of bringing about a peace between Israelis and Palestinians. Well, American presidents

always say this. Yesterday, however, that chapter begun with Trump's visit to the Western Wall in an extremely renovated friendly attitude toward Israel.



An editorial by Cal Thomas titled "Saudi Arabia's Duplicity" was posted at townhall.com on May 25, 2017. Following is the article.

Trusting Saudi Arabia to combat terrorists and extremists and "drive them out," as President Trump called on the kingdom and other Arab and Muslim nations to do in his Riyadh speech, is akin to forging an alliance with the Ku Klux Klan to combat racism and anti-Semitism. Saudi Arabia has for years promoted the very evil they now "commit" to fighting through a newly established Global Center for Combating Extremist Ideology. Never forget that 15 of the 9-11 hijackers were citizens of Saudi Arabia.

President Trump's speech was written by Westerners, delivered by a westerner and based on a faulty western premise, namely, that radical Muslims can be persuaded to abandon their goal of establishing a worldwide caliphate. It is a central theological principle of Wahhabism, an austere form of Islam based on a literal interpretation of the Koran, which Saudi Arabia has for years promoted in children's textbooks, in mosques and through its media.

No reporter asked the central question that should have been put to Saudi Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir during his press availability with Secretary of State Rex Tillerson: Since Saudi Arabia's domestic and foreign policy is based on a theological worldview, have those views changed and if so, how did that "revelation" come to you?

One indication the Saudis might be engaging in duplicity that is common practice throughout the Middle East comes in a Washington Post story. The Saudis, the newspaper says, helped block a Trump administration proposal to impose sanctions against a Saudi branch of ISIS: "The plan to add the Islamic State's Saudi affiliate to a U.N. list of terrorist groups was quietly killed two weeks ago in a bureaucratic maneuver at the U.N. Security Council, records show. U.S. officials familiar with the move said the Saudis objected to the public acknowledgement of the existence of a separate Saudi offshoot of the terrorist group inside the kingdom."

Here, a definition of duplicity may be helpful: "Deceitfulness in speech or conduct, as by speaking or acting in two different ways to different people concerning the same matter." Arab and Muslim leaders have long said one thing to the West and the opposite to their own people. This is not "breaking news." The surprise is that Westerners continue to fall for it.

President Trump's speech was well delivered and he got some economic benefits from Saudi Arabia by signing a nearly \$110 billion arms deal, effective immediately, plus another \$350 billion over the next 10 years, which the

president said would create thousands of new American jobs. All of that is good, but Saudi Arabia will stop promoting an ideology that encourages terrorism only if their god cancels the order for establishing a worldwide caliphate, the elimination of Israel and the vilification of Jews. This is what the secular West under several administrations has failed to grasp.

A policy forged in theology is not about to be changed by the urging of “infidels.”

Saudi Foreign Minister Jubeir also said, “If we can change the conversation in the Islamic world from enmity towards the U.S. to partnership with the U.S., and if we can change the conversation in the U.S. and in the West from enmity towards the Islamic world to one of partnership, we will have changed our world and we will have truly drowned the voices of extremism and we will have drained the swamps . . . from which extremism and terrorism emanates.”

It is an interesting metaphor in a desert land.

Speaking of Iran and its recent election, Jubeir said, “From our perspective, we judge Iran by its actions, not by its words.”

That’s a suitable standard by which to judge the words of Saudi leaders. Without a change in their theological worldview, however, I’m not buying it.



An article by the cnsnews.com staff titled “Christian Population of England Dropped From 71.7% to 59.4% in 10 Years” was posted at cnsnews.com on May 23, 2017. Following is the article.

The percentage of people in England who said they were Christian dropped from 71.7 percent to 59.4 percent between the United Kingdom’s 2001 and 2011 censuses, according to the U.K.’s Office for National Statistics.

At the same time, the percentage of people who said they were Muslim increased from 3.1 percent to 5.0 percent.

In Greater Manchester, the Christian population held relatively steady, going from 74.1 percent in 2001 to 73.1 percent in 2011. At the same time, however, the Muslim population of Manchester grew from 5.0 percent in 2001 to 8.7 percent in 2011.

In 2001, there 49,138,831 people in England (which does not include Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland). Of those 49,138,831 people, 35,251,244 (or 71.7 percent) were Christian; 1,524,887 (or 3.1 percent) were Muslim. 7,709,267 (or 14.6 percent) said they had no religion; and 3,776,515 (or 7.7 percent) did not volunteer to state their religion.

By 2011, according to the Office of National Statistics, there were 53,012,456 people in England. Of these 31,479,876 (or 59.4 percent) were Christian;

2,660,116 (or 5.0 percent) were Muslim. 13,114,232 (or 24.7 percent) said they had no religion; and 3,804,104 (or 7.2 percent) did not state their religion.

Between 2001 and 2011, the number of Christians in England declined by 3,771,368 (from 35,251,244 to 31,479,876). The number of Muslims increased by 1,135,229 (from 1,524,887 to 2,660,116).

Between 2001 and 2011, in Greater Manchester, the Muslim population increased by 107,508 (from 125,219 to 232,787).



An article titled "600,000 Immigrants Overstayed Their Visas in 2016" was posted at aol.com on May 22, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

A whole lot of the people, living in this country illegally, got here with perfectly legal visas. They just, for whatever reason, didn't leave when that visa was up.

That includes about 600,000 foreign travelers who entered this country last year. That number comes from a new report Homeland Security just put out.

The 600,000 figure represents a tiny fraction of the travelers who visited the U.S. It's just 1.25% of foreign travelers. But, those so-called "visa overstays" make up 40% of the undocumented immigrants.

You can expect the Trump administration to use this data to make the argument we need better systems to track people who are here on short-term visas. It also means, for all the talk of people crossing the Mexican border, fixing the immigration system is more complicated than that.



An article by Betsy McCaughey titled "Why the Superbugs Are Winning" was posted at townhall.com on May 24, 2017. Following is the article.

The deadliest superbug yet—*Candida auris*—is invading hospitals and nursing homes, killing a staggering 60 percent of patients it infects. Some exposed patients don't succumb to infection but silently carry the germ and infect others. So far, the lethal germ has sickened patients in New York, New Jersey, Michigan, Illinois and Massachusetts, with 122 cases reported so far this year, up from only six last year.

The germ—a fungus—lingers on bedrails and on the uniforms and hands of doctors and nurses, ready to attack the next patient. Once it gets inside a catheter or breathing device and invades a patient's body, it kills.

Candida auris is already in 15 hospitals in New York, including prestigious medical centers. Acting Center for Disease Control and Prevention Director

Anne Schuchat calls it a “catastrophic threat.” Strong words, but don’t expect health authorities to do much. They’re saying what they always say—patients dying from these infections were already seriously ill. Well, duh. Who else goes to a hospital?

Health care infections—from *Candida auris* and many other germs—kill at least 75,000 hospital patients a year and five times that number in nursing homes. That’s nearly half a million deaths a year. Politicians talk nonstop about insurance guaranteeing seriously ill people access to care. But the biggest risk to these patients isn’t lack of insurance. It’s infection.

Infections jeopardize vulnerable patients’ access to organ transplants, cancer therapy and HIV/AIDS treatments, even if they have insurance.

New York City is ground zero, with three-quarters of the cases. But the state’s health commissioner Howard Zucker claims *Candida auris* “poses no risk to the general public” because it “impacts patients who are already ill for other reasons.” Why write them off?

Watching officials downplay *Candida auris* is *deja vu* all over again. In 1999, researchers revealed the existence of a killer germ CRE (short for carbapenem-resistant bacteria) at Downstate Medical Center in Brooklyn. But state health officials and the CDC failed to act. By 2008, the germ had reached 22 states, often carried by patients from New York.

In 2011, a woman with CRE transferred from a New York hospital to the National Institutes of Health in Maryland, which set off an outbreak that killed 11 patients there, including a 16-year-old boy.

Not until 2013 did health officials label carbapenem-resistant germs “nightmare bacteria” and call for “urgent and aggressive action.” Tough words but no follow-up. Now CRE is in hospitals and nursing homes nationwide. Yet the CDC is dithering instead of insisting all hospitals screen patients likely to have the germ so precautions can be taken to stop its spread. And Medicare doesn’t reimburse for screening, though it’s a necessary tool.

CRE lodges in sink drains of infected patients’ rooms, and nothing short of ripping out the plumbing gets rid of it. It adheres to medical devices, turning them deadly. In Seattle, Pittsburgh, Chicago and Los Angeles, patients with digestive problems died after being treated with scopes previously used on patients with CRE.

Compare this needless dying to Israel’s resolve when CRE reached its borders in 2007. Health authorities launched a screen and clean campaign, reducing CRE by 70 percent in one year, and followed up with a four-year campaign to slash CRE’s presence in nursing homes. In Israel patients—even newborns—are routinely screened to prevent the germ from spreading.

Meanwhile health officials in the U.S. cater to the hospital and nursing home industries and excuse shoddy infection control. Despite protests from members

of Congress, the CDC sticks with outdated guidelines for how to clean patients' rooms, ignoring the potential of automatic room disinfection to save lives.

Similarly, Medicare officials turn a blind eye to hospitals filing false infection rate reports, a new Inspector General report says.

Until public health officials start fighting for patients, the superbugs will keep winning.



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled "A Thinking Mom's Message for Jimmy Kimmel" was posted at michellemalkin.com on May 3, 2017. Following is the article.

I feel your pain. But please use your brain.

On Monday, late-night TV comedian Jimmy Kimmel delivered an emotional monologue about his newborn son. His baby was born with a congenital heart defect that required emergency open-heart surgery.

Millions of American parents, myself included, have walked in Kimmel's shoes. We've experienced the terrifying roller coaster of emotions—panic, helplessness, anger, anxiety, relief, grief and unconditional love—that comes with raising chronically ill kids.

But Kimmel didn't use his high-profile platform to educate the public about coping with rare diseases. Or to champion the nation's best and brightest pediatric specialists and medical innovators. The Tinseltown celebrity turned his personal plight into a political weapon, which his liberal friends were all too happy to wield.

Top Democrats tweeted their praise for Kimmel's advocacy of expanded government health care regulations.

■ "Well said, Jimmy," Barack Obama gushed.

■ "Thanks @jimmykimmel for sharing your story & reminding us what's at stake w/health care," Hillary Clinton effused.

■ *The Huffington Post* piled on: "Jimmy Kimmel's Humanity Underscores Heartlessness Of GOP's Approach To The Poor."

I don't need lectures from *Huffington Post* and Hollywood elites about having a heart. Neither do the rest of America's parents, whatever their political affiliations, who know what it's like to stay up night after endless night with suffering children, wondering whether they would ever be able to breathe normally again or see the light of the next day.

Kimmel doesn't need more maudlin Twitter suck-uppery. He needs a healthy fact-check.

"Before 2014," he claimed, "if you were born with congenital heart disease like my son was, there was a good chance you'd never be able to get health insurance because you had a pre-existing condition, you were born with a pre-existing condition."

This is false. If parents had health insurance, the child would have been covered under the parents' policy whether or not the child had a health problem.

Kimmel continued: "And if your parents didn't have medical insurance, you might not live long enough to even get denied because of a pre-existing condition."

The term "pre-existing condition" is used to describe uninsured chronically ill people who apply for insurance coverage, not for a child in need of immediate care. Moreover, in the U.S., virtually all hospitals are legally obligated to provide emergency treatment to every patient who urgently requires emergency medical care regardless of the patient's insurance status.

This would include a newborn with an urgent heart condition. This requirement does not apply only to patients who enter an emergency room. It applies to all patients who set foot on a hospital's property.

Kimmel then dramatically asserted: "If your baby is going to die, and it doesn't have to, it shouldn't matter how much money you make."

I repeat: It does not matter if you are rich or poor or if you are uninsured. If your baby is in the hospital, he or she will receive emergency care no matter what.

"This isn't football," Kimmel implored. "There are no teams. We are the team, it's the United States. Don't let their partisan squabbles divide us on something every decent person wants."

Kimmel implies that opposition to Obamacare-style insurance mandates is both un-American and indecent. Had he been less hysterical, he would have acknowledged that different health care systems have pros and cons—and decent Americans can have legitimate differences of opinion on such matters.

In the land of make-believe, it would be wonderful if everyone had free access to the same high-quality care Kimmel and his family did at Cedars-Sinai and Children's Hospital Los Angeles.

In the real world, Obamacare plans have severely curtailed the number of doctors and hospitals that customers can use. Command-and-control regulations on guaranteed issue, community rating and pre-existing conditions favored by Kimmel and company are driving up costs for everyone.

Limited access to specialists and long waits have become the increasing norm—just like that other model of government-run health care, the Veterans Affairs system, where the despicable practice of "death by queuing" spiked under Obama.

Moving toward a nationalized health system might play well with an emotion-driven late-night comedy audience. But sober observers know it would mean

undermining America's superior access to cutting-edge diagnosis, innovative treatment, top specialists and surgeons, technology, and drugs.

Compassion without clear thinking is just a waste of Kleenex.



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled "Who Has Absolute Health Care Moral Authority?" was posted at michellemalkin.com on May 17, 2017. Following is the article.

Here is what happens if you try to tell health care stories that defy big government orthodoxy.

When GOP Congressman Rodney Davis of Illinois tried to recount how his wife, a nurse and colon cancer survivor, struggled in the nationalized Canadian health care system, liberal protesters responded by uttering "Ugh!" and catcalling him.

When GOP Rep. Tom MacArthur of New Jersey attempted to tell a rowdy town hall audience about health policy insights he gained caring for his special needs daughter, Gracie, who passed away at age 11, he was booed. And jeered. Rude pigs yelled "Shame!" at the insurance executive turned public servant as he talked about his daughter's legacy.

When GOP Rep. David Kustoff of Tennessee wrapped up a meeting with agricultural educators in his district this week, a woman stalked him and an aide—reportedly, nearly driving them off a road. According to the sheriff's department, the stalker approached Rep. Kustoff's car, "screaming, "striking the windows," "cursing" and blocking the vehicle, according to police.

After GOP Rep. Martha McSally of Arizona voted for the House Obamacare repeal plan, an unhinged Tucson public school employee left voice messages on her congressional office phone line threatening to "wring" her neck and "pull the trigger" to shoot her between the eyes.

When I countered late-night joker Jimmy Kimmel's Obamacare-cheerleading monologue tied to his newborn child's chronic illness with my own experience as a mother of a chronically ill child, left-wing readers called me an "insensitive b—" "mean-spirited" and "twisted."

One reading comprehension-challenged letter writer, Diane Goldwater, wrote: "Perhaps one day one of your children will suffer from a life-threatening disease . . . what goes around comes around we will see how you feel when it happens to someone you love."

Along similar bloodthirsty lines, in response to all Republicans who supported the House health insurance package, Newsweek writer Kurt Eichenwald seethed on Twitter that he wanted his political enemies and their loved ones to be "tortured:"

"I hope every GOPer who voted 4 Trumpcare sees a family member get long term condition, lose insurance & die."

As ever, absolute moral authority only belongs to those who preach civility and compassion for others—while ramming their own policy preferences and values down our throats.

Millions of us who wanted our individual market health insurance plans left alone were branded selfish or liars for the past eight years. Our stories were stifled; our cancellation notices derided; our accounts of skyrocketing health insurance costs and diminished access to doctors mocked.

The partisan Beltway press shot down true stories of government-engineered pain and suffering, while hyping countless tall tales spun by the Obamacare Fable Factory.

Remember when Organizing for Action (previously Obama for America) peddled the "success story" of Chad Henderson, a supposedly random millennial who miraculously enrolled in Obamacare while everyone else in America experienced major tech meltdowns and sticker shock?

Chad was an OFA volunteer who had actually never enrolled in Obamaare—and then claimed he was just "joking" when he got caught lying.

Or how about Otto Raddatz, the Illinois cancer patient promoted by President Obama who supposedly died after he was dropped from his plan when his insurer discovered an unreported gallstone the patient hadn't known about. The truth? He got the treatment he needed in 2005 and lived for nearly four more years.

The Mother of All Pre-Existing Condition Cons, of course, involved President Obama's own mom, Stanley Ann Dunham. He invoked Dunham's alleged deathbed fight with her insurer repeatedly in his quest for top-down health insurance mandates:

"For my mother to die of cancer at the age of 53 and have to spend the last months of her life in the hospital room arguing with insurance companies because they're saying that this may be a pre-existing condition and they don't have to pay her treatment, there's something fundamentally wrong about that."

But Dunham's health insurer had in fact reimbursed her medical expenses with no objections. The actual coverage dispute centered on a separate disability insurance policy.

To left-wing liars and control freaks go the government spoils and political immunity shields.

To the rest of us who dare to tell our counternarratives? Ad hominem attacks, road rage, death threats—and complete apathy from the selective news suppressers of the Fourth Estate.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Sheer Lunacy on Campus" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on May 17, 2017. Following is the article.

Parents, taxpayers and donors have little idea of the levels of lunacy, evil and lawlessness that have become features of many of today's institutions of higher learning. Parents, taxpayers and donors who ignore or are too lazy to find out what goes on in the name of higher education are nearly as complicit as the professors and administrators who promote or sanction the lunacy, evil and lawlessness.

As for the term "institutions of higher learning," we might start asking: Higher than what? Let's look at a tiny sample of academic lunacy.

During a campus debate, Purdue University professor David Sanders argued that a logical extension of pro-lifers' belief that fetuses are human beings is that pictures of "a butt-naked body of a child" are child pornography.

Clemson University's chief diversity officer, Lee Gill, who's paid \$185,000 a year to promote inclusion, provided a lesson claiming that to expect certain people to be on time is racist.

To reduce angst among snowflakes in its student body, the University of California, Hastings College of the Law has added a "Chill Zone."

The Chill Zone, located in its library, has, just as most nursery schools have, mats for naps and beanbag chairs. Before or after a snooze, students can also use the space to do a bit of yoga or meditate.

The University of Michigan Law School helped its students weather their Trump derangement syndrome—a condition resulting from Donald Trump's election—by enlisting the services of an "embedded psychologist" in a room full of bubbles and play dough.

To reduce pressure on law students, Joshua M. Silverstein, a law professor at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, thinks that "every American law school ought to substantially eliminate C grades and set its good academic standing grade point average at the B- level."

Today's academic climate might be described as a mixture of infantilism, kindergarten and totalitarianism. The radicals, draft dodgers and hippies of the 1960s who are now college administrators and professors are responsible for today's academic climate. The infantilism should not be tolerated, but more important for the future of our nation are the totalitarianism and the hate-America lessons being taught at many of the nation's colleges.

For example, led by its student government leader, the University of California, Irvine's student body voted for a motion, which the faculty approved, directing that the American flag not be on display because it makes some students uncomfortable and creates an unsafe, hostile environment.

The flag is a symbol of hate speech, according to the student government leader. He said that the U.S. flag is just as offensive as Nazi and Islamic State flags and that the U.S. is the world's most evil nation.

In a recent *New York Times* op-ed, New York University provost Ulrich Baer argued: "The idea of freedom of speech does not mean a blanket permission to say anything anybody thinks. It means balancing the inherent value of a given view with the obligation to ensure that other members of a given community can participate in discourse as fully recognized members of that community."

That's a vision that is increasingly being adopted on college campuses, and it's leaking down to our primary and secondary levels of education.

Baer apparently believes that the test for one's commitment to free speech comes when he balances his views with those of others. His vision justifies the violent disruptions of speeches by Heather Mac Donald at Claremont McKenna College, Milo Yiannopoulos at UC Berkeley and Charles Murray at Middlebury College.

Baer's vision is totalitarian nonsense. The true test of one's commitment to free speech comes when he permits people to be free to say and write those things he finds deeply offensive.

Americans who see themselves as either liberal or conservative should rise up against this totalitarian trend on America's college campuses. I believe the most effective way to do so is to hit these campus tyrants where it hurts the most—in the pocketbook. Lawmakers should slash budgets, and donors should keep their money in their pockets.



An article by Cortney O'Brien titled "Texas Governor Signs Bill Preventing State From Demanding Pastors' Sermons" was posted at townhall.com on May 23, 2017. Following is the article.

Pastors in Texas will no longer have to fear government officials showing up at their church doors. Gov. Greg Abbott signed Senate Bill 24 Monday, protecting pastors from subpoenas demanding they turn over their messages.

"Texas law now will be your strength and your sword and your shield," Abbott said, invoking Bible verse as he addressed the 11 a.m. service at Grace Church. "You will be shielded by any effort by any other government official in any other part of the state of Texas from having subpoenas to try to pry into what you're doing here in your churches."

The law, which Abbott signed Friday, will go into effect immediately and mandate that a government cannot "compel the production or disclosure of a written copy or audio or video recording of a sermon delivered by a religious leader during religious worship, or compel the religious leader to testify regarding the sermon."

The legislation became necessary after five Houston pastors were ordered to surrender their sermons in 2014, at the demands of liberal Houston Mayor Annise Parker. I spoke with one of her targets, Pastor Khanh Huynh, earlier this year at a press conference for the introduction of the Free Speech Fairness Act. Parker, Huynh said, demanded his sermons because he and his fellow pastors were opposed to her transgender bathroom ordinance.

"We're not going to back down, because we did nothing wrong," Huynh said at the time. "We just speak the word of God on moral issues and we fight for the safety of women and girls."

President Trump has also sought to defend religious leaders' right to speak their mind on politics and policies in his quest to overturn the Johnson Amendment. The law, introduced by Lyndon B. Johnson in 1954 when he was still a senator, forbids religious leaders from wading into politics in front of their congregations.

Trump did sign an executive order on religious freedom earlier this month, but it left most of the Johnson Amendment in place.



An article by Laretta Brown titled "Harvard Study: Media Coverage of Trump's First 100 Days Sets 'New Standard' in Negativity" was posted at townhall.com on May 19, 2017. Following is the article.

It's no secret that the media are not President Trump's loudest cheering section, but a new study released Thursday by Harvard Kennedy School's Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics and Public Policy lends a certain amount of credence to President Trump's recent claim that "No politician in history" has been "treated worse or more unfairly" by the media.

The report, based on an analysis of "news reports in the print editions of *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and *The Washington Post*, the main newscasts of CBS, CNN, Fox News, and NBC, and three European news outlets (The UK's *Financial Times* and BBC, and Germany's ARD)," found that media coverage of Trump's first 100 days "set a new standard for negativity" at 80 percent negative coverage.

Clinton received 60 percent negative coverage during his first 100 days, George W. Bush had 57 percent negative coverage, and Obama had just 41 percent negative coverage.

"Trump's coverage was unsparing," the report found. "In no week did the coverage drop below 70 percent negative and it reached 90 percent negative at its peak."

The period when Trump received his most positive coverage was week 12 of his presidency, when he ordered a missile strike on a Syrian airbase in

response to the Assad regime's use of chemical weapons on civilians. He had 70 percent negative coverage in that week and 30 percent positive.

The high level of negativity comes in unison from six outlets that Trump has called out in the past for frequent attacks.

"CNN and NBC's coverage was the most unrelenting—negative stories about Trump outpaced positive ones by 13-to-1 on the two networks," the study found. "Trump's coverage on CBS also exceeded the 90 percent mark. Trump's coverage exceeded the 80 percent level in The New York Times (87 percent negative) and The Washington Post (83 percent negative). The Wall Street Journal came in below that level (70 percent negative)."

"Fox was the only outlet where Trump's overall coverage nearly crept into positive territory—52 percent of Fox's reports with a clear tone were negative, while 48 percent were positive. Fox's coverage was 34 percentage points less negative than the average for the other six outlets."

"Studies of earlier presidents found nothing comparable to the level of unfavorable coverage afforded Trump," the study's authors noted, "Should it continue, it would exceed even that received by Bill Clinton. There was not a single quarter during any year of Clinton's presidency where his positive coverage exceeded his negative coverage, a dubious record no president before or since has matched."

"Trump can't top that string of bad news but he could take it to a new level," they add. "During his first 100 days, Clinton's coverage was 3-to-2 negative over positive. Trump's first 100 days were 4-to-1 negative over positive."

The study's authors concede that "the sheer level of negative coverage gives weight to Trump's contention, one shared by his core constituency, that the media are hell bent on destroying his presidency."

"The public's low level of confidence in the press is the result of several factors, one of which is a belief that journalists are biased," they conclude. "That perception weakens the press's watchdog role. One of the more remarkable features of news coverage of Trump's first 100 days is that it has changed few minds about the president, for better or worse. The nation's watchdog has lost much of its bite and won't regain it until the public perceives it as an impartial broker, applying the same reporting standards to both parties."



An article by Matt Vespa titled "Feminist: Journalists Are Colluding With Democrats to Cripple Trump White House and Create Chaos" was posted at townhall.com on May 22, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

While conservatives mock feminists, Camille Paglia is one who you should really take some time to read. For starters, she believes that gender is a concrete structure concerning biology because science says so, she's no fan of Hillary Clinton, and she believes that feminism is moribund in its current state.

She made the first point clear in a 2015 interview during the Munk Debate in Toronto, Canada, about whether men are obsolete. She, of course, was arguing against that absurd view. She's not a favorite within feminist circles. Second, she's not a conservative.

She voted for Jill Stein in 2016, but noted that (a) Hillary Clinton is a disaster; and (b) feels that the Democratic Party is egregiously overplaying their hand that Donald Trump is already on his way to a second term.

On the latter point, she felt the political Left of the America, along with the news media—who were giving Clinton in some cases 80+ percent chances of winning, never did any soul searching. They never had an introspective autopsy on why America chose Trump over Clinton.

Why did white working class whites favor Trump over Clinton?

While Democrats have bashed the GOP for being the party of the rich, a gross inaccuracy, Priorities USA actually found that a lot of Obama voters who flipped for Trump did so because they couldn't stand Clinton, and that they felt the Democratic agenda favored the wealthy.

This is like the Left's slam-dunk talking point and Clinton couldn't ingrain that into former Obama voters. Yes, she was a disaster. Yet, now that Mr. Trump is president of the United States, Paglia has another view that is surely shared by Trump voters: the Democratic Party is colluding with the news media to create chaos.

Emily Jashinsky of the *Washington Examiner*, who interviewed Ms. Paglia last week, had the details:

- In a Tuesday interview [May 16] with the *Washington Examiner*, Paglia excoriated the press for its coverage of Trump's decision to fire FBI Director James Comey and his alleged sharing of classified information with Russian officials.
- Fresh off a spirited panel with Christina Hoff Sommers hosted by the Independent Women's Forum, the iconic feminist dissident, who serves as a professor of media studies at the University of the Arts, accused journalists of colluding with the Democratic Party in an effort to damage the Trump administration.
- "Democrats are doing this in collusion with the media obviously, because they just want to create chaos," she said when asked to comment on the aforementioned stories. "They want to completely obliterate any sense that the Trump administration is making any progress on anything."
- Paglia's assessment of media bias in the Trump era leaves little room for optimism. "I am appalled at the behavior of the media," she declared. "It's the collapse of journalism."

Jashinsky added that Paglia's new book notes how Barack Obama and Bill Clinton's first six months in office were marked by "chaos," though it was

never in this fashion regarding Trump who can barely breath before the media is trashing him.

One semi-comical (or tragicomic) example was when CNN reported that Mr. Trump receives more ice cream on his desserts than anyone else. There's the endless string of developments regarding whether Russian intelligence colluded with members of the Trump campaign to sink Hillary Clinton and elect Donald Trump.

So far, there has been zero evidence to corroborate such an explosive and politically un-survivable claim. The House and Senate Intelligence Committees have found nothing, the infamous Russian dossier that was published in BuzzFeed is unverified and part of an anti-Trump opposition research effort, and Reuters' report that the Trump campaign had 18 undisclosed contacts with the Russians in the last seven months of the 2016 election is undercut by the fact that there is no direct evidence of collusion or wrongdoing in these meetings.

Rep. Adam Schiff (D-CA) the ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee said there was no definitive proof of collusion.

Senate Democrats on their respective intelligence committee have admitted that there may be no evidence of collusion.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) has said twice this month that there is no such evidence, and that newspapers articles about it doesn't constitute evidence of collusion. And yet, you read some of these stories as if a real Manchurian Candidate plot had been carried out.

The Russia-Trump probe is the one area that some Democrats feel is their best shot to remove Trump.

When it comes to Paglia's theory, no one is a better person to lead that charge of bringing chaos than Rep. Maxine Waters (D-CA), who literally said that the Trump campaign's talking points and slogans came from Russian President Vladimir Putin's playbook, and that other campaign strategies were developed in tandem with the Kremlin.

That's insane. Even *The Huffington Post's* Sam Stein, who pressed Waters on what her definition of collusion means, seemed a bit unnerved by this scree, also noting that there is no evidence of collusion, which Waters agreed.

Just to be clear, we haven't—there's been no actual evidence yet of collusion," said Stein.

"No, it has not been," replied Waters.

And yet, Waters said that she would be pressing for Trump's impeachment, that she thought this was the right course of action long ago, and has also said that Mr. Trump had no business being president.

Waters has been getting more airtime to expound on this nonsense, even accusing outgoing House Oversight Chair Jason Chaffetz (R-UT) of having Russian ties.

Then, there's the whole drama with the Comey memo, which while verified to exist by Fox News, has yet to be analyzed. Mr. Chaffetz sent a letter to the FBI demanding that they turn over all documents relating to communications with Mr. Comey and the president. The Senate Intelligence Committee made a similar request, and Mr. Comey is set to appear before the committee in an open session after Memorial Day.

Mr. Comey, who was fired by President Trump earlier this month, wrote a memo detailing ways in which the president tried to improperly influence an ongoing investigation into former national security adviser Michael Flynn.

In the memo, it says that the president asked Attorney General Sessions and Vice President Pence to leave the Oval Office. Once alone, Mr. Comey alleges that the president told him that Flynn is a good guy, and that he hopes to let the matter go.

After that, there's the *New York Times* report that said the president called Mr. Comey a "nut job," and that his dismissal eased the pressure on him regarding the Russian collusion probe. This was said the day after Mr. Comey was fired. The White House did not refute this story.

Now, there is clamoring from the Left that the president obstructed justice, which is an impeachable offense. Again, we still don't know the full details on this story, though both do seem to play into Paglia's notion concerning creating the chaos needed to cripple the Trump administration.

- At the same time, some of the Left are making such outrageous comments that it's hard to take them seriously. That so far, has been the Trump White House's saving grace. That the Left is so filled with rage that coordinating a cogent and effective assault is near impossible.

- At the same time, the Trump White House would do well to make sure the president isn't so loose with his words, and to cut down on other unforced errors.

The Left will eventually get their act together. There was some glimmer of sanity last week, with top House Democrats shying away from the impeachment talk that has trickled in over the past couple of days. In all, the Democrats don't like Trump and the media don't like Trump. There couldn't be two better allies.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled "Every Time I Try to Be Mad at Trump, the Media Pull Me Back" was posted at anncoulter.com on May 17, 2017. Following is the article.

Every time I try to be mad at Trump, the media reel me back in by launching some ridiculous, unprovoked attack. This time, it's the fake news story about Trump "leaking" classified information to the Russkies.

The president can't "leak" classified information: It's his to declassify.

The big secret Trump allegedly revealed is that Muslims might try to blow up a plane with laptops. I already knew that. I read it in *The New York Times*.

The New York Times, March 22, 2017: Devices Banned on Some Planes Over ISIS Fears.

"Intelligence showing that the Islamic State is developing a bomb hidden in portable electronics spurred the United States and Britain on Tuesday to bar passengers from airports in a total of 10 Muslim-majority countries from carrying laptop computers . . . two senior American counterterrorism officials said . . ."

This totally secret, Deep Throat-level information has been widely published in thousands of news outlets throughout the civilized world. There was yet another round of stories last week with the update that the U.S. is considering a laptop ban on flights from Europe as well.

Hey, you know what might make more sense than banning laptops? How about banning Muslims?

Bear with me here, I'm still working out the details, but I'm almost certain a federal judge in Hawaii can't block a president's temporary ban on Muslim immigration just because he's testy with Trump over some campaign statements.

As Northwestern law professor Eugene Kontorovich explained in *The Washington Post*, courts have never examined a politician's campaign statements for improper motive, because 1) campaigns are not part of the deliberative process; and 2) to start doing so would open the door to "examinations of the entire lives of political officials whose motives may be relevant to legal questions."

Nonetheless, Kontorovich says, that is the legal argument being advanced against Trump's travel ban: "Trump is a bigot, and thus his winning presidential campaign in fact impeaches him from exercising key constitutional and statutory powers, such as administering the immigration laws."

To preserve their judicial coup, this Monday, the 9th Circuit sent out the geriatric ward to hear an appeal of the Hawaii judge's absurd ruling. At their ages, there's a good chance the judges will be dead by the time the Supreme Court overturns them.

Arguing against Trump's exercise of his constitutional and statutory powers was first-generation American, Neal Katyal. (There are plenty of 10th-generation America-haters. You couldn't get one of them to argue that we should end our country through mass immigration?)

At oral argument before the three wheezing gargoyles, Katyal announced that, before enforcing federal immigration laws passed by generations of Democrats and Republicans working together in Congress, the president of the United States is required to profess: "Islam is peace."

There's a new legal principle!

Asked by one of the crypt-keepers if Trump is the only president who would be prohibited from issuing this precise travel ban because of his statements about Muslims, the smarmy, preening, pretentious Katyal answered: "I think the most important point is, if you don't say all these things, you never wind up with an executive order like this."

As lawyers say: Nonresponsive!

But as long as we're operating under these new rules for determining a U.S. president's rights and responsibilities, how about looking at everything Trump has said about Muslims?

For example, may the courts consider this quote from September 2015?

Trump: "I love the Muslims. I think they are great people . . . Would I consider putting a Muslim-American in my Cabinet? Oh, absolutely. No problem with that."

Lawyers like Katyal aren't telling the courts what Trump said; they're telling courts their own crazy interpretations of what Trump said. No liberal is capable of accurately reporting Trump's position because the left never understood his position in the first place. As Peter Thiel said, the media take Trump literally, but not seriously, while the people take him seriously, but not literally.

After the San Bernardino terrorist attacks in December 2015, Trump made the perfectly reasonable suggestion that we curtail our breakneck importation of Muslims, some of whom periodically erupt in murderous violence. The media concluded: TRUMP HATES MUSLIMS! Nothing Trump or anyone else said could persuade them otherwise.

Here's what Trump actually said:

"What's happened is, we're out of control. We have no idea who's coming into our country. We have no idea if they love us or if they hate us . . . I have friends that are Muslims. They are great people. But they know we have a problem. They know we have a real problem. 'Cause something is going on. And we can't put up with it, folks . . .

“Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country’s representatives can figure out what the hell is going on . . . Where the hatred comes from and why—we’ll have to determine, we’re going to have to figure it out. We have to figure it out. We can’t live like this. It’s going to get worse and worse. You’re going to have more World Trade Centers . . .”

Throughout the campaign, Trump supporters tried in vain to explain the so-called “Muslim ban” to a hostile media dead set on interpreting everything out of Trump’s mouth in the ugliest possible way. For example, our general policy on Muslim immigration would be “No, thanks!” but there would be exceptions. So Charles Krauthammer can stop worrying about King Abdullah of Jordan.

In March, Trump supporter Andy Dean told a dense CNN anchor:

“He’s talking about the culture of Islam in the Middle East . . . We love Muslims in America and they love us. Why? We have a great culture that respects women’s rights . . . The thing about Muslims in the Middle East is they don’t respect women’s rights. If a woman wants to get a divorce in the Middle East, that woman could be killed. If you want to leave the religion of Islam in the Middle East, you can be killed. It’s very real.”

To the same blockhead anchor, Trump supporter Kayleigh McEnany had to fill in an edited quote the network had just shown of Trump:

“It’s important to know what happened 15 seconds later. Anderson Cooper said to him, ‘Are you speaking of radical Islam or are you speaking of Islam?’ He said radical; sometimes it’s hard to tell the difference, though. So he did say radical Islam. He said it repeatedly during his campaign. He said, ‘I have Muslim friends. I love the Muslim people’ “. . .

One of Trump’s vast number of African-American supporters told HLN’s Drew Pinsky:

“I love what (Trump) is doing with the Muslims getting out of the country, because if they really knew what that was about—if they knew that that was about freedom. It was about freedom versus enslavement.”

He’s right. It’s not about religion. It’s not about nationality. It’s about hitting the pause button on bringing in radical Islam’s dysfunctional, misogynist, violent, exploding-airplane culture.

The voters understood Trump. (At least some of us did—barely enough of us to elect him president!) Liberals didn’t. But now the courts are blocking Trump’s exercise of presidential powers based on the left’s own idiotic misinterpretations of what he said.



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.”