

Eye on the World

June 23, 2018

This compilation of material for "Eye on the World" is presented as a service to the Churches of God. The views stated in the material are those of the writers or sources quoted by the writers, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Church of God Big Sandy. The following articles were posted at churchofgodbigandy.com for the weekend of June 23, 2018.

Compiled by Dave Havir

Luke 21:34-36—"But take heed to yourselves, lest your souls be weighed down with self-indulgence, and drunkenness, or the anxieties of this life, and that day come on you suddenly, like a falling trap; for it will come on all dwellers on the face of the whole earth. But beware of slumbering; and every moment pray that you may be fully strengthened to escape from all these coming evils, and to take your stand in the presence of the Son of Man" (Weymouth New Testament).



An article titled "Israel Targets Palestinians Launching 'Fire Balloons' From Gaza" was posted at yahoo.com on June 16, 2018. Following is the article.

The Israeli army on Saturday [June 16] wounded two Palestinians in the Gaza Strip attempting to launch incendiary balloons across the border into Israel, officials said.

An Israeli military spokeswoman said an "aerial device" had fired at a group near the Gaza border that was launching "fire balloons" carrying flammable material into Israel.

Palestinian security sources said a drone had fired on people east of the al-Bureij refugee camp in the central Gaza Strip.

Two people were wounded, according to Ashraf al-Qudra, spokesman for Gaza's health ministry.

Some twenty fires were started Saturday by balloons and kites carrying flammable material from the enclave over the border fence and into Israel, Eli Cohen, spokesman for fire brigades in southern Israel, told AFP.

Since major border protests broke out on March 30, more than 300 fires have been recorded, he added.

At least 130 Palestinians have been killed by Israeli gunfire in the same time span.

No Israelis have been killed.

On Wednesday, the UN General Assembly approved a resolution condemning Israel for excessive use of force against Palestinian civilians in Gaza—under Israeli siege for more than a decade.

Palestinians are calling to return to the homes their families fled or were forced from in 1948 during the war surrounding the creation of Israel.

Israel says any such return would mean the end of it as a Jewish state and accuses Gaza's Islamist rulers Hamas of using protesters as human shields.

Israel and Hamas have fought three wars since 2008 and observe a tense ceasefire.



An article by Jonah Mandel titled "Israel Says Could Get Tougher on Gaza After Warplanes Hit Hamas" was posted at yahoo.com on June 20, 2018. Following is the article.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Israel could step up its "intensity" on Gaza, after a new flare-up that saw Israel carrying out air strikes and Palestinians launching rockets and mortar shells.

The latest spike in tensions follows weeks of deadly protests and clashes along the Gaza-Israel border as well as the worst military escalation last month since a 2014 war.

It comes as US President Donald Trump's special envoy Jason Greenblatt and adviser Jared Kushner visit the region to discuss issues including the Palestinian-Israeli peace process.

Israeli planes initially targeted three Hamas military positions overnight in Gaza in response to kites and balloons carrying incendiary and explosive devices launched into Israel from the Palestinian territory, the army said.

"Hamas and other terrorists, but mainly Hamas" hit back after the first air raids with more than 45 rockets and mortar rounds fired from Gaza towards Israel, seven of which were intercepted by the Iron Dome missile defence system, Israeli military spokesman Jonathan Conricus said.

Three more landed inside the Jewish state, he said, but did not account for the remainder.

In response, Israeli planes carried out more raids against 25 “terror objectives” including an underground training compound, according to the army.

Medical sources in Gaza, which is controlled by Hamas, said five people were lightly injured in the strikes.

Speaking about Israel’s plans regarding Gaza, Netanyahu said he would not go into detail, pledging however that “the intensity will be stepped up as necessary.”

“We are prepared for any scenario and our enemies would do well to understand this,” he said at a military ceremony in southern Israel.

Sirens sound

In a joint statement, the military wings of Hamas and allied militant group Islamic Jihad vowed to respond to Israeli attacks, saying they had “targeted seven Israeli military positions near Gaza . . . in response to continued Israeli aggression against resistance sites in Gaza.”

“The equation will be: bombardment in return for bombardment,” they said.

Kobi Ivri, a resident of an Israeli kibbutz neighbouring the southern Gaza Strip whose house was damaged by the Gaza fire, said he and his family ran into their bomb shelter after being woken at 5:20 am by a siren.

“There was a boom. I heard glasses breaking, but I understood it (the mortar shell) fell outside, close,” he said.

Ivri described “a routine of tension, a routine of anticipation (of attacks), a routine of understanding that not too much is being done in order to help us,” noting that an incendiary balloon from Gaza fell at the entrance to his kibbutz on Tuesday.

A spokesman for the Israeli fire services told AFP that firefighters had put out 12 blazes in areas adjacent to Gaza caused by airborne incendiary devices.

Early Wednesday afternoon, Israeli aircraft fired near Palestinians in southern Gaza who were launching incendiary kites, and later in the day, aircraft fired near Palestinians attempting to do the same in northern Gaza, a military spokesman told AFP.

Deteriorating path

Tensions have soared in Gaza since mass protests and clashes broke out along the border on March 30. At least 132 Palestinians have been killed. There have been no Israeli fatalities.

Palestinians are demanding the right to return to the homes their families fled or were expelled from during the 1948 war surrounding the creation of Israel.

Israel has defied international condemnation over the Palestinian deaths, maintaining the use of live ammunition is necessary to defend its borders and stop infiltrations.

It accuses Hamas of seeking to use the protests as cover for attacks.

UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres has warned that Gaza is close to the brink of war.

Israel and Hamas have fought three wars since 2008 and observe a tense ceasefire that is regularly shaken by hostile acts.

Peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians have been stalled since 2014.

On Wednesday Greenblatt and Kushner were in Saudi Arabia where they met Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman and discussed Gaza and "the Trump administration's efforts to bring peace between the Israelis and Palestinians," according to a White House statement.

The duo's regional tour started in Jordan and will also take them to Israel, Egypt and Qatar.

Trump's controversial December decision to recognise the disputed city of Jerusalem as Israel's capital prompted Palestinians to freeze all contacts with US officials.



A Reuters article titled "Israel's Netanyahu Warns of Cyber Risks That Can Down Fighter Jets" was posted at reuters.com on June 20, 2018. Following is the article.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu called on governments worldwide on Wednesday to join forces to defend against cyber threats that he said could even bring down military and civilian aircraft.

Cyber security also represents an enormous business opportunity, Netanyahu told a cyber conference at Tel Aviv University, adding that Israel receives about 20 percent of global investment in the sector.

"We cannot go back to the world of levers, pulleys and couriers. Since we are going forward, we are absolutely vulnerable. Our airlines can be brought down, our fighter planes can be brought down," he said.

While Israel monitors attacks at its cyber security center in the southern city of Beersheba, Netanyahu said there was "no silver bullet."

"This is a supreme test for our civilization. It's going to be tested not only by criminal organizations, by terrorists, but by other states. We have to combine forces," said Netanyahu.

As he spoke, lights flashed and another voice boomed out in the room in a simulation of a hacking attack, saying that the hackers were "based in a country not far from Israel"—an apparent reference to the country's arch-foe Iran.

The voice told attendees their bank accounts had been frozen and their information was being shared with their enemies.

Israeli cyber exports last year amounted to \$3.8 billion, Netanyahu said, adding: "We are punching about 200 times above our weight here."

The Beersheba center brings together military, academia and businesses, which is a risk with regard to Israel's military applications.

"But I'm willing to take on that risk because I think cyber security growth through cooperation and cyber security as a business is tremendous," he said.



An article by Michael Brown titled "Canada's Supreme Court Rules Against the Bible" was posted at townhall.com on June 16, 2018. Following is the article.

In a ruling that is sure to send shock waves through the nation, Canada's Supreme Court ruled 7-2 against Trinity Western University's (TWU) Law School. In effect, what the court declared is that universities must choose between biblical standards and accreditation. Put another way, the court ruled that Christianity and higher education are incompatible. I am not exaggerating in the least.

Here's a brief summary of the case for those who are not familiar with it. Trinity Western is a Christian university that requires its students and faculty to live by basic Christian standards. This means that to be a student or faculty member in good standing, you can't commit fornication or adultery, nor can you engage in homosexual relationships.

There's nothing surprising with these requirements, and there are thousands of schools in North America with similar standards. These include Christian schools from K-12, Christian colleges, Bible schools, seminaries, and universities.

These standards have long been part of TWU's mandatory covenant, which requires "that all students and faculty pursue a holy life 'characterized by humility, self-sacrifice, mercy and justice, and mutual submission for the good of others.' It requires members to abstain from using vulgar language, lying or cheating, stealing, using degrading materials such as pornography, and 'sexual intimacy that violates the sacredness of marriage between a man and a woman.' "

Again, this is gospel 101, the basic requirements of Christian discipleship. And it is honorable that TWU seeks to live this out on its campus.

Unfortunately, when TWU opened its law school, it fell afoul of Canada's LGBT activists and their allies. They argued that TWU was discriminating against LGBT students, because of which students graduating with a bona fide law degree should not be allowed to practice law in Canada.

There was a ray of hope for TWU when a regional court ruled in its favor. But now, "In a pair of 7-2 rulings, the majority of justices found the law societies of British Columbia and Ontario have the power to refuse accreditation based on Trinity Western University's so-called community covenant."

Or, to paraphrase, the Supreme Court ruled that if a Christian law school wants accreditation, it must abandon biblical values. How else can this be interpreted?

"The majority judgment said the covenant would deter LGBT students from attending the proposed law school, and those who did attend would be at risk of significant harm."

Significant harm? If so, why? Because of biblical teaching. Because of Christian values. This the locus of the battle. This is the point of conflict.

Parse it however you like, but this is the hardcore truth.

"[The judgment] found the public interest of the law profession gives it the right to promote equality by ensuring equal access, support diversity within the bar and prevent harm to LGBT students."

In other words, "diversity" according to the LGBT lexicon. Diversity meaning "the LGBT way or the highway." Diversity meaning, "all views are welcome other than biblical Christian views."

That's why we've been raising our voices for so many years. That's why we've been warning. That's why we've said that those who came out the closet want to put us into the closet. That's why we've said that LGBT activism was never simply about "tolerance." It was about the silencing of competing views.

And if it could happen in Canada, it could happen in America. (For the skeptics and mockers, give me one good reason why this could not happen here. And note that TWU was not some tiny school hidden in a corner. It has "40 undergraduate programs and 17 graduate programs.")

On a more personal, individual level, what happens to all the law students at TWU? What happens to those who spent years studying and invested tens of thousands of dollars in getting a law degree, only to be banned from practicing law in Canada because their school holds to Christian values? What about the significant harm experienced by them?

Honestly, I don't know where TWU goes from here. And I don't know how the believers in Canada will respond.

But I can say this to my friends and colleagues and fellow-educators and communicators here in America: We either use our liberties or lose them. We either stand fast and stand tall and stand strong, or we cower in a corner. We either do what's right today, or we apologize to our children tomorrow.

It's time to push back.

What will you do?



An article by Emilie Cochran titled “Bolton on Levin: US Withdrew From UN Human Rights Council to Protect American Sovereignty” was posted at cnsnews.com on June 20, 2018. Following is the article.

On his nationally syndicated radio talk show Tuesday, host Mark Levin hosted President Donald Trump’s National Security Adviser John Bolton regarding Trump’s decision to withdraw from the United Nations Human Right Council, a decision that Bolton explains was made in an effort to protect American sovereignty.

“But the real issue here, I think, is American sovereignty,” stated National Security Adviser John Bolton about the reason the US withdrew from the UN Human Rights Council. “I think it’s something you’re gonna see the administration keen to defend over the next couple of years—a lot of different institutions, a lot of different questions, a lot of different ways of looking at it.”

Levin hosted Bolton in response to Monday’s decision from the Trump administration concerning the UN Human Rights Council. UN Ambassador Nikki Haley said in a statement Tuesday that “this step is not a retreat from human rights commitments. On the contrary, we take this step because our commitment does not allow us to remain a part of a hypocritical and self-serving organization that makes a mockery of human rights.”

Below is a transcript of Trump national security adviser John Bolton and Mark Levin’s remarks from The Mark Levin Show Tuesday:

National Security Adviser John Bolton: “Well, the president authorized uh the United States to withdraw from the UN Human Rights Council, and in fact, to go beyond that, we will now no longer fund our share of the cost of the Human Rights Council or the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights.

“And the reason for that is that the Human Right Council, the High Commissioner, we think are just fundamentally misdirected, misguided. They don’t advocate human rights. They’ve been actually used by human rights abusers against the United States, against Israel, and it’s time to get off. You know, this is very important.”

Mark Levin: “And why did Obama so desperately want us to be a member of this?”

Bolton: “Because it’s part of the theology of the left in America, that, really, all nations basically are equal. Everybody’s human rights record is fully subject to scrutiny by the international community. You know, Iran, the United States, pretty much all the same thing. Everybody gets judged performance.”

“And I really think that the rejection of that worldview is perhaps the most important aspect of the president’s decision here. Because it’s certainly true

the Human Rights Council is filled with human rights abusers. They get on the council to protect themselves.

“It’s true that the council has been used in just grossly unfair ways against Israel and indeed against the United States in many respects.

“But the real issue here, I think, is American sovereignty. I think it’s something you’re gonna see the administration keen to defend over the next couple of years—a lot of different institutions, a lot of different questions, a lot of different ways of looking at it.

“But fundamentally here, this is a rejection of the notion that multilateral organizations are in a position to judge representative governments like the United States, or to try and impose their view of what an adequate human rights performance is.

Levin: “We ought to create a new organization of relatively free countries and free countries, relatively democratic countries and democratic countries, and leave all the genocidal police states to their own organization. Is that something that you could foresee one day—if not in this administration, maybe one day in the future?”

Bolton: “Well, I think, I think, that’s the sort of thing that we should aspire to when we’ve dealt with a lot of the problems we’ve got today around the world. But in the meantime, I think the most important thing is for the United States—and I know you agree with this—is to stick with its own Constitution and not fall to the blandishments of others who say, ‘Oh my goodness, this problem or that problem is so complicated.’

“We have to give up American sovereignty to international organizations. We have to succumb to international law. We have to recognize some authority greater than that conferred by the legitimacy of our own Constitution.

“You know, I don’t think for secular purposes I’m leaving religious beliefs out here, of course, but for secular purposes, for purposes of government, I think it’s very clear: There’s no higher law on earth than the U.S. Constitution. And that’s something that the left gags on when they hear it.

“But we’ve struck a small blow for that today in getting out of the Human Rights Council. As I say, there are many reasons to justify it. Ambassador Nikki Haley laid them out in her statement. Mike Pompeo concurred in that, so it’s a, it’s a noteworthy decision in and of itself. But I just wanted people to know, this is not the last we’re gonna hear about the president’s concern for our sovereignty.”



“Eye on the World” comment: The following list of articles consists of headlines of extra articles, which are considered international. The articles were not posted, but the headlines give the essence of the story.

-
- An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Haley: We Tried for More Than a Year to Reform UN Human Rights Council, With Virtually No Open Support" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 20, 2018.
 - An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Bolton: U.S. Will Also Stop Funding U.N. Human Rights Council" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 20, 2018.
 - An article by Alice Ritchie titled "Death Threats 'Become Routine' in Toxic Brexit Debate" was posted at yahoo.com on June 20, 2018.
 - A Reuters article titled "Hungary Approves 'Stop Soros' Law, Defying EU, Rights Group" was posted at reuters.com on June 20, 2018.
 - An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Hitting Back at Erdogan's Policies, Senate Targets Sale of F-35 Fighters" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 19, 2018.
 - An article by Monique Scotti titled "Marijuana to Be Legal in Canada Starting October 17, Trudeau Confirms" was posted at globalnews.ca on June 20, 2018.



An article by Jayme Metzger titled "6 Revelations From 'The Swamp' Documentary That Show Just How Dirty DC Is" was posted at thefederalist.com on June 18, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Every grassroots political activist knows something is deeply wrong in Washington, D.C. No matter how hard we work to send good people to Congress, the majority of them go native upon arrival, forgetting their campaign rhetoric and falling in line with the political establishment.

The few who retain their principles often seem sidelined and ineffective. Meanwhile, the legislative process is an unfunny joke: the Republican Congress can't manage to keep its promises and repeal Obamacare, but it can pass a 2,232-page, \$1.3 trillion omnibus spending bill without reading it.

What's less clear is why the system is so broken, and what happens to turn our hometown congressmen into swamp critters.

What is going on in those smoke-filled rooms?

When brand-new representatives and senators arrive in D.C., what do they find?

A new documentary series, "The Swamp," seeks to answer those questions, pulling back the curtain on the inner workings of Capitol Hill. Created by 28-year-old filmmaker Matt Whitworth, "The Swamp" has been releasing episodes to Facebook since April 4, with three 10-minute episodes released to date.

For a documentary featuring members of Congress, “The Swamp” is striking in how unfiltered it feels. Whitworth was granted unprecedented access to film and interview several House members as they work, meet with staff, and visit with constituents back home. Shockingly, the congressmen signed a film participation release relinquishing all editorial and creative control of the project.

“People in the House Freedom Caucus told these guys they were crazy to do this,” Whitworth told me in an interview. “I let them know up front: this isn’t going to be partisan. It’s not going to be either a hit piece or a puff piece. It’s not going to be a platform for your campaign message. We really want to show people what happens behind the scenes in Congress.”

To date, the few brave souls willing to accept these terms have been Reps. Dave Brat and Tom Garrett of Virginia, Ken Buck of Colorado, Rod Blum of Iowa, Thomas Massie of Kentucky, and Ted Yoho of Florida—all Republicans, and all members of the House Freedom Caucus.

Whitworth tried to recruit Democrats as well—“these activities take place on both sides of the aisle”—but none were willing to take the risk.

What We’ve Learned From ‘The Swamp’ So Far?

“The Swamp” focuses heavily on the top-down power structure in Washington, D.C., where just a few party leaders make the majority of decisions, punishing members who won’t toe the line.

After watching the first three episodes, I found these six revelations the most striking:

1. Partisan gridlock? Nah, the parties work together when they want to.

“We have a bipartisan bankruptcy going on,” Rep. Buck says near the beginning of Episode 1. “I think both parties are engaged in a quiet deal that we will support our base, and if it leads to bankruptcy, okay, and you will support your base, and if it leads to bankruptcy, okay.”

In Episode 2, the congressmen cite an example: Republican and Democrat leadership worked together to make sure the bloated omnibus spending bill came up for a vote. When a number of conservative Republicans voted against the rule in an attempt to stop the bill, the Democrats changed just enough of their customary “no” votes to make sure it passed.

“You could just see the Democrats huddled around Nancy Pelosi, and she would just send the next one down to make sure that the rule passed,” Buck recalls. “When it comes to bankrupting the country, they cooperate all the time.”

2. Your congressman might be learning about a bill the same way you do: through the media, via lobbyists.

In Episode 2, Rep. Buck explains how leadership keeps its members in the dark about spending legislation: “On a number of spending bills, I have read

about provisions that affect my district before I ever heard anything from Republican leadership. They will talk to lobbyists and get something in the bill to help the lobbyists, and then the lobbyists will talk to the media, and then I read about it. But I have no participation in what goes into a spending bill, and I'd venture to say that 95 percent of the members here don't know what's in a spending bill until we're supposed to vote on it."

Rep. Blum adds to the picture of a federal legislature run by a just a handful of people: "Most all the decisions around here are made by a few people at the very top, without the input of any other congressional members or U.S. senators. That's not good representative government, wouldn't you say?"

3. The rules are just for show.

Several congressmen express their frustration over the ease with which the House leadership is able to waive its own rules. In Episode 2, Freedom Caucus members excoriate GOP leadership for waiving several rules in order to pass the omnibus, most notably the rule requiring 72 hours for members to actually read the laws they're about to foist upon the nation. "We do that every time," Buck says. "Whatever rule we pass at the beginning of a session can be waived before we violate it in any bill."

4. The party will make your congressman literally "pay to play" to sit on a committee.

One of the most shocking revelations comes in Episode 3, when Rep. Massie details how the party forces members to pay "rent" for their committee assignments and chairmanships. If a congressman wants to sit on a committee, he is expected to raise a certain amount of money for the National Republican Congressional Committee, the body that works to elect House Republicans. There is an identical system on the Democrat side. In an interview, Rep. Buck told me this system has been in place for Republicans since the days of Newt Gingrich, and even longer for Democrats.

The NRCC sends members a written "assessment" telling how much money they owe each session, based on committee assignments. (Massie displays his current assessment on camera. He says he's left over a million dollars unpaid to the NRCC since his early days in Congress.) Committees are ranked by desirability and prestige—A, B, or C—and priced accordingly. "Veterans Affairs—that's a C committee," Massie says. "What if people back home knew that taking care of our veterans was considered the lowest-priority committee in Congress?"

The really perverse part of this system is that the amount of money required by the party—often totaling six or seven figures—can only be raised from one place: lobbyists. "The problem is, the incentive structure is set up to get you to sell out to lobbyists, because they're the only ones who have the currency you need, which is campaign dollars, to buy your committee assignment," Massie says in "The Swamp." "It's a terrible choice! Why should you have to do this?"

You're faced with coming up here and prostituting yourself just so you can get a committee assignment where you can represent your constituents the best."

5. The pressure to compromise starts on Day One.

Several congressmen talk on camera about their first experience of D.C. culture. Rep. Buck describes his freshman orientation this way: "It's all designed to introduce members to how D.C. works, introduce members to the fact that there's a good life if you play ball with the lobbyists, if you play ball with the power structure in D.C. . . . If you don't play ball, there's a set of punishments. They will do their best to isolate you and make sure that they take you out."

Buck and Massie both describe amusing run-ins with staffers, who tried to pressure them into voting with the party when they were newcomers to Washington. "This is a staffer," Massie says. "She's giving me permission to vote my conscience, to vote for my constituents? It was ridiculous, but that was just the tip of the iceberg."

6. Rep. Massie has the perfect nickname for his congressional pin.

"This is my congressional pin," Massie says in Episode 3. "I try not to wear it all the time. I call it 'Precious.' " I don't care who you are, that's just funny.

What's Coming In Future Episodes?

Whitworth plans to release a new episode of "The Swamp" roughly every three weeks, aiming for a total of six to eight episodes. "I can't give away too much," he says, "other than saying Facebook is just the first step for this series."

Shooting will continue throughout the summer, which means "The Swamp" will follow its protagonists on the campaign trail ahead of midterm elections. It may even give us a behind-the-scenes look at machinations to elect a new Speaker of the House.



An article by Ben Shaprio titled "The Banality of Bias" was posted at jewish-worldreview.com on June 20, 2018. Following is the article.

Peter Strzok is an FBI agent with a career spanning more than two decades.

He was section chief of the counterespionage section in 2016 and thus in a position to oversee both the Hillary Clinton email investigation and the Russian election interference investigation.

And he was supposedly perfect for the job: a Georgetown University graduate with a master's degree, married to a Securities and Exchange Commission official.

Strzok was qualified and patriotic. He was a lifelong civil servant.

He was also a heavily biased, blatantly political bureaucrat.

Strzok, it turns out, was cheating on his wife with then-fellow FBI agent Lisa Page.

Page and Strzok traded thousands of texts—so many that one is tempted to ask when they ever found time for their affair.

The texts were extraordinarily political. Strzok hated President Trump and loved Clinton; his paramour felt the same.

After the 2016 election, Strzok wrote, “Omg I am so depressed.”

Among those texts, a few stood out.

First, one from Strzok to Page suggested that the Russia investigation could serve as an “insurance policy” against a Trump presidency.

Second, in a text from Page to Strzok, she questions whether Trump would actually be president, and a response from Strzok reads, “We’ll stop it.”

Third, a text from Strzok to Page after the election cycle and upon his involvement in the Robert Mueller probe reads, “For me, and this case, I personally have a sense of unfinished business.”

All of these texts—and Strzok’s conduct during the election cycle—led the Department of Justice inspector general to conclude that he couldn’t exonerate Strzok from the charge of bias in his investigation.

The IG report stated that Strzok’s texts were “not only indicative of a biased state of mind but, even more seriously, implies a willingness to take official action to impact the presidential candidate’s electoral prospects.

This is antithetical to the core values of the FBI and the Department of Justice.”

Here’s the thing: Strzok wasn’t alone.

At least four other FBI agents sent pro-Clinton messages throughout the Clinton investigation.

One agent stated that nobody would prosecute Hillary Clinton “even if we find unique classified” material on former Rep. Anthony Weiner’s laptop. Another texted, “Vive le resistance” after the election.

And the IG report subtly slip in this rather shocking revelation: “We identified numerous FBI employees, at all levels of the organization and with no official reason to be in contact with the media, who were nevertheless in frequent contact with reporters.”

That contact included employees receiving “benefits from reports,” such as golf outings, drinks and meals.

This is how bureaucratic agencies lose legitimacy: not with overt acts of evil but through the echo-chamber mentality that exists in every social setting.

We all live within cliques; we all deal with a select group of people. If that select group of people thinks alike, the group tends to radicalize over time. And if there are no checks in place—if that clique has enormous power—it's easy to see how cases can get botched.

This is the problem with unelected, unaccountable, nontransparent bureaucracies: They are subject to ideological perversion that they themselves may not even notice until it is too late.

That's why they should be extraordinarily careful in how they wield power.

Unfortunately, our law enforcement agencies aren't, and the result is a dramatic loss of trust that they can ill afford.



An article by Michelle Malkin titled "Weapons of Mass Manipulation" was posted at michellemalkin.com on June 20, 2018. Following is the article.

Confirmation bias damages reputations. It ruins credibility. It destroys lives.

When researchers ignore contradictory data that undermines their assumptions, junk science prevails. When police conduct investigations with predetermined outcomes, wrongful convictions abound. And when reporters cherry-pick facts and distort images to serve political agendas, media outlets become dangerous weapons of mass manipulation.

Take Talia Lavin, a young journalist who has enjoyed a meteoric rise. Her pedigree appears impeccable on its face: She graduated with a degree in comparative literature from Harvard University six years ago. After graduation, she won a Fulbright Scholar fellowship to study in Ukraine. She "worked in all realms" of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency news agency and wire service, copy-edited for the feminist *Lilith Magazine*, and contributed stories and translations for the *Huffington Post*.

Lavin has held the coveted position of "fact-checker" for the revered *New Yorker* for the past three years. The publication brags that its "fact-checking department is known for its high standards." It demands the ability "to quickly analyze a manuscript for factual errors, logical flaws, and significant omissions." The editorial department requires "a strong understanding of ethical reporting standards and practices" and prefers "proficiency or fluency in a second language."

Impressively, Lavin speaks four languages (Russian, Hebrew, Ukrainian and English). Her abdication of ethical reporting standards, however, raises fundamental questions not only about her competence, but also about her integrity—not to mention the *New Yorker's* journalistic judgment.

With a single tweet, the *New Yorker's* professional fact-checker smeared Justin Gaertner, a combat-wounded war veteran and computer forensic analyst for the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency.

Lavin, the professional fact-checker, rushed to judgment. She abused her platform. Amid the national media hysteria over President Donald Trump's border enforcement policies, Lavin derided a photo of Gaertner shared by ICE, which had spotlighted his work rescuing abused children. Scrutinizing his tattoos, she claimed an image on his left elbow was an Iron Cross—a symbol of valor commonly and erroneously linked to Nazis.

The meme spread like social media tuberculosis: Look! The jackboots at ICE who hate children and families employ a real-life white supremacist.

Only it wasn't an Iron Cross. It was a Maltese Cross, the symbol of double amputee Gaertner's platoon in Afghanistan, Titan 2. He lost both legs during an IED-clearing mission and earned the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal with Combat Valor and the Purple Heart before joining ICE to combat online child exploitation.

When actual military veterans, whom Lavin failed to consult before defaming Gaertner so glibly, pointed out that the image looked more like a Maltese Cross, Lavin deleted her original tweet "so as not to spread misinformation."

Too damned late. The harm to Gaertner's name and honor is irreparable and cannot be unseen, unread or unpublished.

The *New Yorker* issued an obligatory apology and acknowledged that "a staff member erroneously made a derogatory assumption about ICE agent Justin Gaertner's tattoo."

But what consequences will there be for her journalistic malpractice?

Who is supervising her work at the famed publication?

What other lapses might she be responsible for during her present and past stints as a checker of facts and arbiter of truth?

The magazine editors claim "we in no way share the viewpoint expressed in this tweet," yet the abject ignorance of, and knee-jerk bigotry against, law enforcement, immigration enforcement and the military underlying Lavin's slime run rampant in New York media circles. And they all know it.

Lavin has not commented on the matter and instead turned her Twitter account private. But we can infer her attitude about her present troubles from a defiant piece she published just last week in *The Forward* magazine, where she pens a regular column. Titled "No, We Don't Have To Be Friends with Trump Supporters," the piece, laden with Nazi allusions, decries asylum reform, strengthened borders and ICE agents enforcing the law.

Rejecting calls for decency in public debate over these contentious matters, she spat:

“Tough nuts, sugar. When they go low, stomp them on the head.”

She further raged:

“It is high time, when you find yourself next at a dinner party with someone who has gone Trump, to smash your glass to shards and leave. It is time to push yourself away from the table. It is time to cease to behave with subservient politesse towards those who embrace barbarity with unfettered glee.”

Better “gone Trump” than gone mad. In her unfettered haste to condemn those with whom she disagrees, the *New Yorker’s* professional fact-checker failed to check her own toxic biases. Lavin’s act was no innocent gaffe.

Like the journalists-turned-propagandists who have falsely spread Obama-era photos of immigrant detention centers to attack the Trump White House, Lavin engaged in mass manipulation under the guise of resistance journalism.

Truth is collateral damage.



An article by Ann Coulter titled “Google ‘Internet,’ Media” was posted at anncoulter.com on June 19, 2018. Following is the article.

Journalists know absolutely nothing about immigration and refuse to learn, so when I cited the fraudulent “humanitarian” cases on TV Sunday night, I footnoted myself live on air, citing a *New Yorker* article as well as my book, “Adios, America,” which has nearly 100 pages of footnotes. That should make it easy for even the stupidest reporters.

You haven’t met The Hill’s Jacqueline Thomsen! She was at a loss. The *New Yorker*? What’s that? Jacqueline thought and thought and thought, until her head hurt! Finally, she decided, as she wrote in *The Hill*, “It’s unclear what *New Yorker* article Coulter was referring to.”

Armed only with the information that there was an article in a tiny little publication known as “The *New Yorker*” about asylum applicants being coached on their fake asylum claims, how could an American reporter ever hope to locate “The Asylum Seeker” in the Aug. 1, 2011, *New Yorker*? Forget “Adios, America,” where it is cited, along with many, many other sources. I can’t read a BOOK, Thomsen thought to herself.

I Googled “*New Yorker* asylum,” and the article I was referring to came up as the third item in the list. Add “coaching” or “coached,” and it’s the very first item Google gives you. It took 3 seconds.

Thomsen: HOW DOES GOOGLE WORK, ANYWAY?

The *New Yorker* article begins with "Caroline," an illegal alien from a middle-class family in Africa, who passed herself off to U.S. immigration authorities as a victim of rape and torture. As she admitted to *The New Yorker*, while giggling: "I have never been raped."

Fortunately, "Caroline had been tutored in how to act like a rape victim by her landlady in the Bronx, who hadn't been raped, either, but had successfully applied for asylum."

As she prepared to weep and lie through her interview with a very tough American immigration officer about her nonexistent torture and rape, Caroline said of the country she was lying her way into: "I don't know why I didn't just go back. They are racists and xenophobes here."

Glad to have you, too, Caroline! (At least you'd make a better reporter than Thomsen.)

Luckily, we have the very best government officials reviewing asylum applications. (Pasted on the window of one immigration official's office was a cover from the official Cuban Communist newspaper.) Caroline's completely apocryphal asylum application was, naturally, approved.

Our immigration officials are so thorough, so hard to fool, that they granted Beatrice Munyenyezi asylum and citizenship, allowing her and her kids to live off the U.S. taxpayers for 10 years before federal prosecutors noticed, Hey! Munyenyezi wasn't a victim of the Rwandan genocide; she was a perpetrator! Munyenyezi had personally sentenced thousands of Rwandan women and children to death.

And now the poor murderess has been SEPARATED FROM HER CHILDREN!

Crack reporter Thomsen must have missed that story, too. For her reading pleasure, assuming she can read: Chris McGreal, "Rwandan woman stripped of U.S. citizenship after lying about genocide," *The Guardian*, Feb. 22, 2013.

One asylum applicant written about in *The New York Times* claimed she was being persecuted in Russia because she was gay. She told her immigration lawyer, "I'm not gay at all. I don't even like gay people." (For ace Hill reporter Thomsen, who is hopelessly confused about "books" and "Google," the cite is: Sam Dolnick, "Asylum Ploys Play Off News to Open Door," *The New York Times*, July 12, 2011.)

Usually, frauds are only exposed when the asylum applicant makes the news. You'd think one of these times, an asylee would become famous and we'd find out: Hey, this person really was fleeing persecution!

Nope. The pattern is: They make the news; we find out their asylum applications were total frauds.

Here are a few:

Ramzi Yousef was the mastermind of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and the Bojinka plot, as well as the nephew of 9/11 architect Khalid Sheik Mohammed. Poor Yousef almost didn't make it through customs. Not only was his own passport of dubious provenance, but his traveling companion was carrying bomb manuals, car bombing videos—and instructions on how to lie to U.S. immigration inspectors. Yousef claimed asylum and was released into our country to execute the first WTC attack.

Sofitel hotel maid Nafissatou Diallo falsely accused the head of the International Monetary Fund, Dominique Strauss-Kahn, of rape. She had been granted asylum after memorizing a tape given to her by an American immigration activist about being gang raped in Guinea. (For Jackie "How does Google work?" Thomsen: That's from the same *Times* article cited above.)

Amadou Diallo was all over the news after being killed by four New York City police officers in 1999. Only because of that, we found that, in his asylum application, he had claimed his parents had been murdered by the Mauritanian government. APPROVED!

In fact, Diallo was born into a prosperous Guinean family and his parents were alive and well—and looking for a settlement from New York taxpayers. (For super reporter Thomsen, you'll find that story here: Alan Feuer, "\$3 Million Deal in Police Killing of Diallo in '99," *The New York Times*, Jan. 7, 2004.)

America is the most generous country on Earth, but—as *The New York Times'* John Tierney demonstrated 20 years ago—even denizens of the "nicest" town lose patience when the third panhandler asks them for money. (For reporters who couldn't find their asses if you drew them a map: John Tierney, "Mean Streets," *The New York Times*, May 12, 1996.)

Our country is being victimized by a network of con-artist foreigners and America-hating left-wingers passing out fake papers, fake stories and fake scripts to Third-Worlders, who lie about seeking "asylum" to get in on the American gravy train and wreck our country.

And that's in normal times.

The crisis on the border today is no ordinary asylum fraud. It's a political stunt by a left-wing organization, "Pueblo Sin Fronteras"—People Without Borders—which believes, as its name suggests, that the U.S.A. has no right to have a border. This group has very publicly marched hordes of Latin Americans through thousands of miles of another country to demand entry into our country. Pueblo Sin Fronteras' monthlong trek has been so well publicized that everyone in the country knows about it—except, apparently, our media.

The New York Times describes the horror thus: "At some border crossings, migrants are being forced to wait for days or longer in Mexico."

Wait. Why don't they just stay in Mexico? Isn't Mexico a fantastic country with ZERO rapists? If not, maybe we should build something at the border—I don't know, maybe a wall?

"Wall" is a one-syllable word, so even Jacqueline Thomsen can understand that.



"Eye on the World" comment: The following list of articles consists of headlines of extra articles, which involve the United States. The articles were not posted, but the headlines give the essence of the story.

Finances

■ An article by Danielle Wienerl-Bronner titled "Starbucks Says It Will Close 150 Stores Next Year" was posted at cnn.com on June 20, 2018.

Illegal immigration

■ An article by Craig Bannister titled "ICE Director: 'If You Want to Blame Somebody for Separating Families, Blame the Parents'" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 20, 2018.

■ An article by Ed Straker titled "Democrats Are Responsible for Tent Cities for Illegal Alien Kids" was posted at americanthinker.com on June 15, 2018.

■ An article by Susan Jones titled "Trump: 'We're Not Going to Give Any More Aid' to Countries That Send Illegal Immigrants to U.S." was posted at cnsnews.com on June 20, 2018.

■ An article by Christina Wilkie and Jacob Pramuk titled "Trump Signs Order That He Says Will Keep Migrant Families Together" was posted at cnbc.com on June 20, 2018.

■ An article by Jaweed Kaleen titled "'Freedom City'? Going Beyond 'Sanctuary,' Austin, Texas, Vows to Curtail Arrests" was posted at latimes.com on June 15, 2018.

■ An article by Katie Pavlich titled "Leftist Group Shows Activists How to Kill an ICE Agent, Pledges to Go After Their Families" was posted at townhall.com on June 20, 2018.

Comments about weapons

■ An article by Matt Vespa titled "New Jersey to Gun Owners: Hand Over Those Magazines Or We Could Throw You in Jail" was posted at townhall.com on June 15, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

■ An article by Thomas J. Facnan titled "Why Doesn't the 'We'll Stop' Trump Text End the Russia Investigation?" was posted at townhall.com on June 16, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

■ An article by Laretta Brown titled "McCain Claims Trump Is 'Parroting' North Korean Propaganda" was posted at townhall.com on June 14, 2018.

■ An article by Katie Pavlich titled "FBI Attorney Who Worked on Russia Investigation Pledged Loyalty to 'Le Resistance' Days After Trump Was Elected" was posted at townhall.com on June 15, 2018.

■ An article by Michael W. Chapman titled "Peter Fonda: Let's 'Rip Barron Trump From His Mother's Arms and Put Him in a Cage With Pedophiles" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 20, 2018.

■ An article by Emilie Cochran titled "Kathy Griffin Drops F-Bomb on Melanie Trump Over Immigration Comments" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 20, 2018.

■ An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled "Memory Lapses at the FBI" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 20, 2018.

■ An article by Alexander Burns titled "Michael Bloomberg Will Spend \$80 Million on the Midterms; His Goal to Flip the House for the Democrats" was posted at nytimes.com on June 20, 2018.

News about the media

■ An article by Tamar Auber titled "Rachel Maddow Breaks Down in Tears Delivering News of Migrant Babies Being Detained" was posted at mediate.com on June 19, 2018.

■ An article by Benny Johnson titled "Here Are the Photos of Obama's Illegal Immigrant Detention Facilities the Media Won't Show You" was posted at dailycaller.com on June 19, 2018.

■ An article by Tom Blumer titled "Press Ignores Obama's Lie About Emails to Hillary's Private Server" was posted at newsbusters.org on June 15, 2018.

■ An article by Leah Barkoukis titled "Chris Matthews: Republicans Who Support Trump Are Acting 'Like North Korean' " was posted at townhall.com on June 14, 2018.

■ An article by Donna Carol Voss titled "Meghan McCain Schools Joy Behar on Immigration After Ridiculous 'Nazi Germany' Comparison" was posted at thefederalist.com on June 15, 2018.

■ An article by Craig Bannister titled "ABC Posts Graphic Claiming 'Manafort Pleads Guilty to 5 Charges of Manslaughter,' Apologizes" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 20, 2018.

General interest

■ An article by Ben Renner titled “Mosquitoes Might Like Your Smell, but They Remember Your Swat; Study Finds” was posted at studyfinds.org on June 19, 2018.



An article by Mollie Hemingway titled “11 Quick Things to Know About the Inspector General’s Report” was posted at thefederalist.com on June 15, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

On Thursday [June 14], the Justice Department’s inspector general released a long-anticipated report on the FBI’s handling of the criminal investigation into Hillary Clinton’s use of a private server that handled classified information. Here are some quick takeaways from the report.

1. Learn How To Interpret An IG Report

The best way to understand an inspector general (IG) report is less as a fiercely independent investigation that seeks justice and more like what you’d expect from a company’s human resources department.

The IG is also a government bureaucrat producing government products that are supposed to be calm and boring. In the previous report that led to Andrew McCabe’s firing as deputy director of the FBI and referral for criminal prosecution, his serial lying under oath was dryly phrased as “lack of candor.”

In this report detailing widespread problems riddled throughout the Clinton email probe, the language is similarly downplayed. That’s particularly true in the executive summary, which attempts to downplay the actual details that fill the report with evidence of poor decision-making, extreme political bias, and problematic patterns of behavior.

2. FBI Agent Who Led Both The Clinton and Trump Probes Promised He’d Prevent Trump’s Election

On page 420, the IG says that the conduct of five FBI employees who were caught talking about their extreme political bias in the context of their duties “has brought discredit to themselves, sowed doubt about the FBI’s handling of the Midyear investigation, and impacted the reputation of the FBI.”

The Midyear investigation was the code for the Clinton probe. Note this blistering passage:

“When one senior FBI official, [Peter] Strzok, who was helping to lead the Russia investigation at the time, conveys in a text message to another senior FBI official, [Lisa] Page, that ‘we’ll stop’ candidate Trump from being elect-ed—after other extensive text messages between the two disparaging candi-

date Trump—it is not only indicative of a biased state of mind but, even more seriously, implies a willingness to take official action to impact the presidential candidate’s electoral prospects. This is antithetical to the core values of the FBI and the Department of Justice.”

The report goes on to say that the text messages and Strzok’s decision to prioritize the counterintelligence probe of the Trump campaign over the Clinton email criminal investigation “led us to conclude that we did not have confidence that Strzok’s decision was free from bias.”

This text is not just interesting because the FBI’s deputy head of the counterintelligence division who was investigating a major-party candidate told the woman he was cheating on his wife with that “we” would stop the candidate from becoming president. It’s also interesting because this text was hidden from congressional committees performing oversight of the FBI.

3. Comey Mishandled The Clinton Probe In Multiple Ways

It’s worth re-reading Acting Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein’s May 9, 2017, recommendation that James Comey be fired as FBI director. He cited Comey’s usurpation of the attorney general’s authority in his press conference announcing that Clinton’s case would be closed without prosecution, the release of derogatory information about Clinton despite the decision to not indict her, and Comey’s letter to Congress announcing the FBI had reopened a probe against Clinton.

The IG backs up each and every one of those critiques, and adds much more detail to them.

“We concluded that Comey’s unilateral announcement was inconsistent with Department policy and violated long-standing Department practice and protocol by, among other things, criticizing Clinton’s uncharged conduct. We also found that Comey usurped the authority of the Attorney General, and inadequately and incompletely described the legal position of Department prosecutors.”

The IG said Comey violated longstanding department practice to avoid “trashing people we’re not charging.” He also inadequately and incompletely explained how Justice prosecutors came to make decisions. “Many of the problems with the statement resulted from Comey’s failure to coordinate with Department officials,” the IG wrote. Had he talked with them, they would have warned him about the problems his statement posed. What’s more, the prosecutors had a very different understanding of why they were declining to charge Clinton than the one Comey claimed they had in his public press conference.

Comey also violated departmental practice in announcing publicly he reopened the probe after additional relevant emails were found on Anthony Weiner’s laptop. Both of these decisions were controversial inside and outside the agency.

4. Comey Is Slippery and Weird

The 568-page report includes many examples of Comey being duplicitous and sneaky during his handling of the Clinton email probe. For instance, he asked Attorney General Loretta Lynch how to handle questions regarding the criminal investigation into Hillary Clinton's handling of classified information on a secret server. She told him to call it a "matter." He didn't object and even complied.

But a year later, the conversation was leaked to *The New York Times* in a story that painted Comey as a non-partisan truth-teller beset by both Democrats and Republicans. Daniel Richman, the same man who was used to leak Comey's anti-Trump memos, was a source for the anti-Lynch story.

Comey threatened to appoint a special counsel in the Clinton probe if Justice officials didn't help him get what he wanted. He bizarrely claimed he was going to announce he'd make no recommendation on the Clinton email probe. He decided he was going to make a solo announcement trashing Clinton while announcing she was not being charged, but let the Justice Department think they would be making a statement together:

"Comey admitted that he concealed his intentions from the Department until the morning of his press conference on July 5, and instructed his staff to do the same, to make it impracticable for Department leadership to prevent him from delivering his statement. We found that it was extraordinary and insubordinate for Comey to do so, and we found none of his reasons to be a persuasive basis for deviating from well-established Department policies in a way intentionally designed to avoid supervision by Department leadership over his actions."

He claimed that he didn't grasp the significance of the hundreds of thousands of Clinton emails being found on Weiner's computer because he didn't know that Weiner was married to Clinton aide Huma Abedin. Beyond being too ridiculous to believe, the claim is hardly exonerating. It would mean he was not interested to learn that hundreds of thousands of Clinton emails relevant to a highly charged criminal investigation were found on the laptop of an unrelated man.

Comey asked Justice officials for feedback on his decisions but did so through assistants, suggesting he viewed any feedback as a dangerous encroachment on his decision-making.

"We asked Comey why he asked for the Department's feedback and then ignored the feedback that he received," the IG wrote. Later, "Both Lynch and [Deputy Attorney General Sally] Yates explained that they were concerned that any direct discussion with Comey—particularly any discussion in which they told him not to send the letter—would be perceived as an attempt to prevent him from fulfilling his 'personal ethical obligation' to notify Congress. Both stated that they were concerned that the fact of any such direct discussions would leak and would be portrayed as Department leadership attempting to 'prevent information damaging to a candidate from coming out' (Lynch) or 'strong-arming' Comey (Yates)."

5. FBI Has a Massive Leak Problem and Is Doing Nothing About It

As mentioned, both Lynch and Yates were worried that performing legitimate oversight of Comey would be leaked against them to the media. Fear of leaks was also mentioned by many top FBI officials as a major reason that the Southern District of New York was able to force the FBI to reopen the Clinton probe.

“We have profound concerns about the volume and extent of unauthorized media contacts by FBI personnel that we have uncovered during our review,” the report stated.

Two attachments were included showing rampant discussions with reporters by people not authorized to be talking to reporters.

One FBI executive was caught having had 26 conversations with one reporter and seven conversations with another reporter. They even created charts to help show how rampant the conversations were:

The report showed myriad FBI employees violating FBI policy and department ethics rules.

The IG said the leaks were difficult to track down because of how many people had access to classified and non-public information. The IG also said the culture of widespread leaking made it difficult to crack down.

6. FBI Almost Got Away With Ignoring Clinton Emails on Weiner Laptop

In September 2016, when an investigator in the Southern District of New York found hundreds of thousands of Clinton emails and Blackberry messages on a laptop being searched in relation to an investigation of former Rep. Anthony Weiner, he immediately alerted his supervisors. They alerted the FBI, who sat on the information for weeks, only acting after the New York office complained repeatedly.

By October 3, the case agent assigned to the Weiner investigation expressed concern that the FBI appeared to be sitting on what he'd told them. Later he told the IG:

“The crickets I was hearing was really making me uncomfortable because something was going to come crashing down . . . And my understanding, which is uninformed because . . . I didn't work the Hillary Clinton matter. My understanding at the time was I am telling you people I have private Hillary Clinton emails, number one, and BlackBerry messages, number two. I'm telling you that we have potentially 10 times the volume that Director Comey said we had on the record. Why isn't anybody here? Like, if I'm the supervisor of any CI squad in Seattle and I hear about this, I'm getting on with headquarters and saying, hey, some agent working child porn here may have [Hillary Clinton] emails. Get your -ss on the phone, call [the case agent], and get a copy of that drive, because

that's how you should be. And that nobody reached out to me within, like, that night, I still to this day I don't understand what the hell went wrong.

"And I told her, I'm a little scared here. I don't know what to do because I'm not political. Like I don't care who wins this election, but this is going to make us look really, really horrible. And it could ruin this case, too. And . . . I said the thing that also bothers me is that Comey's testimony is inaccurate. And as a big admirer of the guy, and I think he's a straight shooter, I wanted to, I felt like he needed to know, like, we got this. And I didn't know if he did."

Although all the relevant information was given to the FBI by September 29, they came back to the agent weeks later to ask questions he'd repeatedly answered. But the FBI agents claimed that the information they learned in late October was new to them. The IG says this is not true: "By no later than September 29, the FBI had learned virtually every fact that was cited by the FBI in late October as justification for obtaining the search warrant for the Weiner laptop."

The FBI claimed that they didn't take action on the laptop because

- "1. The FBI Midyear team was waiting for additional information about the contents of the laptop from NYO, which was not provided until late October."
- "2. The FBI Midyear team could not review the emails without additional legal authority, such as consent or a new search warrant."
- "3. The FBI Midyear team and senior FBI officials did not believe that the information on the laptop was likely to be significant."
- "4. Key members of the FBI Midyear team had been reassigned to the investigation of Russian interference in the U.S. election, which was a higher priority."

The IG said these excuses were hogwash, saying that the first was "unpersuasive," the second "illogical," the third "inconsistent" and "insufficient," and the fourth "unpersuasive and concerning." The overarching feeling of the report is that the FBI leaders who handled both the Clinton and Trump probes worked very hard to pretend the Weiner incident didn't happen, only being forced by the New York office's insistence that protocol be followed.

7. Breathtaking Bias

Some FBI defenders latched onto the IG's claim that he "did not find documentary or testimonial evidence that improper considerations, including political bias, directly affected the specific

investigative decisions we reviewed."

All that means is that none of the politically biased texts specifically said political bias was leading them to make certain decisions. Of course, that would be a weird thing to find in any case.

What the investigators found, however, was breathtaking anti-Trump and pro-Clinton bias from five of the key employees handling the Clinton email probe. No evidence was found of pro-Trump bias.

And this evidence of profound bias is only for those who were foolish enough to record their extreme views. The IG also apparently had no texts from Justice Department officials, perhaps because Justice didn't preserve them.

The texts range from vile insults of Trump and his supporters to fears about how awful a Trump presidency would be and the need to prevent it. One employee said Trump voters were "all poor to middle class, uneducated, lazy POS."

One FBI lawyer discussed feeling "numb" by Trump's November 2016 election win, later proclaiming "Viva le Resistance" when asked about Trump.

Strzok wrote in July 2016, "Trump is a disaster. I have no idea how destabilizing his Presidency would be."

After the election, Page wrote that she'd bought "All the President's Men," adding, "Figure I needed to brush up on watergate."

The two openly fantasize about impeachment.

In the preparation to interview Clinton as part of the criminal probe, Page tells a handful of her colleagues to take it easy on Clinton. "One more thing: she might be our next president. The last thing you need us going in there loaded for bear."

After each text exchange, the IG report includes defenses from the agents, some even harder to believe than the previous.

- August 8, 2016: In a text message on August 8, 2016, Page stated, "[Trump's] not ever going to become president, right? Right?!"

- Strzok responded: "No. No he's not. We'll stop it."

When asked about this text message, Strzok stated that he did not specifically recall sending it, but that he believed that it was intended to reassure Page that Trump would not be elected, not to suggest that he would do something to impact the investigation.

Sure, hoss.

All five of the FBI employees were referred back to the FBI for disciplinary action.

8. Clinton Got Breaks, but Some Backfired

While Comey harmed Clinton with how he handled his public announcements about her case, the IG report paints an investigation that was overall quite favorable toward her and her associates. During the Robert Mueller investigation, the federal government has played hardball with Trump associates, ringing them up on false statement charges, raiding their offices, arresting

them without warning, and encroaching on attorney-client relationships. For Clinton, a much different approach was taken.

To take just one example, look at the case of Paul Combetta, an employee who handled the migration of Clinton's email accounts across servers then later deleted the emails. Clinton probe members were sure he was lying about the deletion of the emails in violation of a congressional preservation order. In repeated interviews, he claimed he didn't delete her emails.

The agents had an email where he talked about the "Hillary coverup operation." They decided that wasn't a big deal. One agent said he believed Combetta should have been charged with "false statements for lying multiple times." But overall they decided it was just so confusing, that the failure to tell the truth was "largely due to a lack of sophistication and poor legal representation." They gave him immunity, and he started singing. He admitted deleting the emails "despite his awareness of Congress's preservation order and his understanding that the order meant that 'he should not disturb Clinton's email data on the PRN server.'" Sounds nice.

It seems likely that Clinton's handling of classified information on a secret server, and the FBI's investigation of it, caused her problems during the 2016 election. But it's also interesting how the efforts by many to help Clinton kept backfiring. More than anything, there is a lack of confidence that political considerations were absent from the decision to let Clinton skate.

President Obama gave interviews where he stated that Clinton didn't have intent to harm national security, a talking point later carried by Comey himself. Even before Comey followed Obama's lead, observers worried that Obama was giving guidance as opposed to offering his opinion.

An Obama White House spokesman said he knew Clinton was not a "target" of the investigation, suggesting he had insider knowledge. The FBI claimed he didn't have insider knowledge.

When the New York office told the FBI about Weiner's laptop, it appears that the FBI tried to run out the election clock before dealing with it. It would have worked, too, if the New York office hadn't pushed the matter right before the election—the absolute worst time to deal with a reopening of the investigation.

9. Obama Lied When He Said He Knew Nothing About Hillary's Secret E-mail Scheme

The IG found that Obama was "one of the 13 individuals with whom Clinton had direct contact using her clintonemail[.]com account."

In fact, Clinton used her private email for "an exchange with then President Obama while in the territory of a foreign adversary," a move that led investigators to believe hostile actors had likely gained access to her server. But a paragraph in a draft of Comey's exoneration of Clinton was changed from Obama to "another senior government official," and later deleted.

Obama had falsely told reporters he didn't know of Clinton's private email system.

10. FBI Agent Joked Clinton Associate Who Lied Would Never Be Charged, Questioned Legitimacy Of Investigation

FBI agents discussed how a witness who obviously lied to them about the Clinton probe would never be charged:

FBI Employee: 'boom . . . how did the [witness] go'

Agent 1: 'Awesome. Lied his -ss off. Went from never inside the scif [sensitive compartmented information facility] at res, to looked in when it was being constructed, to removed the trash twice, to troubleshot the secure fax with HRC a couple times, to everytime there was a secure fax i did it with HRC. Ridic,'

FBI Employee: 'would be funny if he was the only guy charged n this deal'

Agent 1: 'I know. For 1001. Even if he said the truth and didnt have a clearance when handling the secure fax—aint no one gonna do sh-t'

That same agent also openly discussed political considerations affecting the Clinton probe. The IG gave a few examples:

January 15, 2016: Responding to a question of when the investigation would be finished, Agent 1 stated, 'My guess is March. Doesnt matter what we have, political winds will want to beat the Primarys.'

January 28, 2016: '. . . The case is the same is all of them. Alot of work and bullsh-t for a political exercise.'

February 1, 2016: ' . . Its primary season—so we're being dictated to now . . .'

February 1, 2016: 'This is the biggest political sh-t show of them all. No substance. Up at dawn—pride swallowing seige. No headset and hermetically sealed in SIOC.'

February 2, 2016: Responding to a question about how the investigation was going, 'Going well . . . Busy, and sometimes I feel for naught (political exercise), but I feel good . . .'

May 6, 2016, to Agent 5: 'pretty bad news today . . . someone has breathed some political urgency into this . . . Everyday DD brief and once a week D brief from now on.'

11. FBI's Insulting Response

FBI Director Christopher Wray gave a press conference in front of a compliant press corps where he said, "nothing in this report impugns the integrity of our workforce as a whole or the FBI as an institution." In fact, the report paints a picture of an FBI with a problematic culture.

It's not just Comey's usurpation of authority and failure to comply with practices. Multiple people were involved in his condemned decisions. Others were cited for bad judgement in recusal decisions or failure to adhere to recusals. Political bias was rampant in the team of people who handled both the Clinton and Trump email probes. So were leaks, accepting gifts from reporters, incompetence, and other problems.

Instead, Wray issued a strawman defense of employees, bragged about the high number of applicants to the agency, and talked about the low percentage of recruits who were accepted.



An article by Brent Bozell titled "The Media Insulate Obama From Scandal" was posted at townhall.com on June 20, 2018. Following is the article.

Former President Barack Obama is swaggering around and claiming he didn't really have any scandals as president. In February, he said we "didn't have a scandal that embarrassed us." This only means shamelessness can seem like a winning tactic. In May, he said, "I didn't have scandals, which seems like it shouldn't be something you brag about."

By any objective measure, this man is a liar.

Obama can claim he was only following the lead of his servile press corps. CNN, which screams about Donald Trump scandals all day long, ran a two-hour Obama special at the end of his second term during which host Fareed Zakaria claimed: "He ran an administration that was largely scandal-free. . . . And he did it all the while under a microscope—because he looked different."

This man is a liar as well. There's no other way to put it.

So when the Justice Department inspector general released a report on the Hillary Clinton email scandal on June 14, it's not surprising that the network newscasts ignored any reference to Obama, who is certainly scolded in the report, including pages 66 to 69.

ABC, CBS, NBC and PBS did multiple segments on the IG report, and all of them completely skipped an Obama angle. They centered their coverage on how the IG scolded former FBI Director James Comey, and they ignored that Comey was appointed by . . . who? Obama in 2013.

These networks also skipped over the report's discussion of the scandal of then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch meeting with former President Bill Clinton on a tarmac shortly before the Justice Department announced it would not prosecute.

Naturally, in their liberal eyes, the scandal here was that President Trump was claiming he was vindicated by the IG report. This was apparently the false statement.

Obama can lie without any consequences. For starters, in 2015 he denied knowing that Hillary Clinton used a private email address for her government business. The IG report makes clear that Obama “was one of the 13 individuals with whom Clinton had direct contact using her clintonemail.com account.” As he so often did during eight years of assorted scandals, Obama claimed he only learned about it “through news reports.” No one called him a) dishonest or b) clueless.

But it was worse than that. Obama caused indigestion inside the FBI when he went on television and insisted nothing Clinton did was worth prosecuting.

On “60 Minutes” on Oct. 11, 2015, Obama insisted, “I can tell you that this is not a situation in which America’s national security was endangered.” CBS’ Steve Kroft nudged him, saying, “This administration has prosecuted people for having classified material on their private computers.” Obama replied: “there’s no doubt that there had been breaches, and these are all a matter of degree. We don’t get an impression that here there was purposely efforts . . . to hide something or to squirrel away information.”

Lynch told the IG that Obama stepped in it by prematurely proclaiming on CBS that there was no national security damage. It created a suspicion of political bias at the top of the Justice Department. Obama repeated his line about Clinton’s lack of harm to national security in a “Fox News Sunday” interview on April 10, 2016.

It’s not like the networks couldn’t find these video clips. As energetically as they create a persistent “crisis” for Donald Trump, they have put a protective bubble around their precious Obama. He can boast that he has no scandals because the “facts first” media have manufactured that false perception for 10 years.



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.”