

Eye on the World

Jan. 13, 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 January 13, 2018.

Compiled by Dave Havir

Luke 21:34-36—“But take heed to yourselves, lest your hearts be weighed down with carousing, drunkenness, and cares of this life, and that Day come on you unexpectedly. For it will come as a snare on all those who dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch therefore, and pray always that you may be counted worthy to escape all these things that will come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man.”



An article by Lucas Tomilinson titled “US Deploys 3 B-2 Stealth Bombers to Guam in Message to North Korea” was posted at foxnews.com on Jan. 11, 2018. Following is the article.

The U.S. Air Force announced it has deployed three nuclear-capable B-2 stealth bombers and 200 air personnel to Guam—sending a strong signal to North Korea just a few days after its talks with South Korea.

The B-2s join a number of B-1 conventional bombers already deployed on the Pacific island.

Approximately 200 Airmen and three B2 Spirits deployed to @AndersenAFBGuam to support @PacificCommand’s Bomber Assurance and Deterrence mission.

It is unclear how long the B-2s will stay at Andersen Air Force Base in Guam.

“The bomber deployment is part of an ongoing planned deployment that affects not only the Korean Peninsula, but also a broader alliance structure in the Pacific,” said Marine Corps Lt. Gen. Kenneth F. McKenzie Jr. about the decision to deploy the bombers to Guam—the delay of joint training with the South Koreans.

“You’d be wrong if you viewed a bomber deployment in a single lens of what it means to the Korean Peninsula. It affects allies across the Pacific,” he added.

“So when we begin to talk de-confliction of activities more directly related to the peninsula, there’s where you could see why we would have chosen to de-

conflict and adjust the timing of some of those activities because of the Olympics and the Paralympics," McKenzie said.

The Air Force last sent a lone B-2 bomber to Guam in October, but only for a few hours as part of a long-range training mission from its home base in Missouri.

The last time the U.S. sent three of the stealth bombers to Guam was January 2017.



A video and an article by Susan Jones titled "UN Ambassador Nikki Haley: 'A Lot of Things Have to Happen' Before the US Talks to North Korea" was posted at cnsnews.com on Jan. 8, 2018. Following is the article.

"A lot of things have to happen" before the United States holds direct talks with North Korea, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Nikki Haley said on Sunday.

She was reacting to comments made by President Donald Trump over the weekend.

Speaking to reporters at Camp David on Saturday, Trump said he is very happy that North and South Korea will hold their first formal talks in two years: "I hope it works out. I very much want to see it work out between the two countries. I'd like to see them (North Korea) getting involved in the Olympics, and maybe things go from there," Trump said.

Asked if he would be willing to engage in telephone talks with North Korean dictator Kim Jong-un right now, Trump replied, "Sure, I always believe in talking."

But last October, President Trump tweeted that Secretary of State Rex Tillerson was "wasting his time trying to negotiate with Little Rocket Man."

"So why the turnaround?" George Stephanopoulos, host of ABC's "This Week," asked Ambassador Haley on Sunday.

"There is no turnaround," Haley said.

"What he has basically said is yes, there could be a time where we talk to North Korea, but a lot of things have to happen before that actually takes place. They have to stop testing. They have to be willing to talk about banning their nuclear weapons. Those things have to happen.

"What we're trying to do is make sure we don't repeat what's happened the last 25 years, which is them start to act like they're coming to the table; them ask for a lot of money and then them cheat their way through. We're going to be smart this time. We're going to make sure that whatever happens makes the United States safer and make sure that we denuclearize the peninsula."

Haley said progress regarding North Korea will be measured in stages. First the North has to stop its nuclear tests for a "significant amount of time," she said, and then "you go and you work toward the next step." She said denuclearization won't happen "overnight."

Asked if the U.S. is closer than ever to nuclear war with North Korea, Haley said, "It's a dangerous situation," but nuclear war is "not something we want."

"We have said that multiple times," Haley noted. "The president said it. Every member of this administration has said it. But the reality is, this is a very dangerous situation."

Stephanopoulos asked if President Trump's tweet about my-button-is-bigger-than-your-button made things worse by undermining U.S. credibility among its allies:

"They don't wonder if we know what the hell we're doing. I think it's very clear we do. What they know is, we're not letting up on the pressure. We're not going to let them go and dramatize the fact that they have a button right on their desk and they can destroy America. We want to always remind them, we can destroy you too, so be very cautious and careful with your words and what you do. I know it's something that makes people nervous, but if we didn't do it, we would be in a more dangerous—"

Stephanopoulos cut her off: "So you think the tweet was a good idea?" he asked Haley.

Haley said Trump "always has to keep Kim on his toes. It's very important that we don't ever let him get so arrogant that he doesn't realize the reality of what would happen if he started a nuclear war."

Haley repeated that Kim Jong-un "can't sit there and imply that he's going to destroy the United States without us reminding him of the facts and the reality that if you go there, it's not us that's going to be destroyed, it's you."



A Reuters article by Maayan Lubell titled "Israel Changes Law to Make It Harder to Cede Jerusalem Control" was posted at reuters.com on Jan. 2, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Israel's parliament passed an amendment on Tuesday [Jan. 2] that would make it harder for it to cede control over parts of Jerusalem in any peace deal with the Palestinians, who condemned the move as undermining any chance to revive talks on statehood.

The legislation, sponsored by the far-right Jewish Home coalition party, raises to 80 from 61 the number of votes required in the 120-seat Knesset to approve any proposal to hand over part of the city to "a foreign party".

Last month U.S. President Donald Trump angered the Palestinians, Middle East leaders and world powers by recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital.

As home to major Muslim, Jewish and Christian holy sites, Jerusalem's status is one of the most sensitive issues in the decades-old Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Trump's Dec. 6 decision sparked regional protests and prompted the Palestinians to rule out Washington as a peace broker in any future talks.

Nabil Abu Rdainah, a spokesman for Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas, described Trump's policy shift on Jerusalem and the passage of the amendment as "a declaration of war against the Palestinian people".

"The vote clearly shows that the Israeli side has officially declared an end to the so-called political process," Abu Rdainah said, referring to U.S.-sponsored talks on Palestinian statehood that collapsed in 2014.

Israel captured East Jerusalem in the 1967 Middle East war and annexed it in a move not recognized internationally. It says the entire city is its "eternal and indivisible" capital.

Palestinians seek to make East Jerusalem the capital of a state they seek to establish in the occupied West Bank and in the Gaza Strip.

The amendment, long in the legislative pipeline, was passed with 64 lawmakers voting in favor and 52 against.

Opposition head Isaac Herzog said Jewish Home was leading Israel "toward a terrible disaster". Jewish Home's leader, Naftali Bennett, said the vote showed that Israel would keep control of all of Jerusalem forever.

"There will be no more political skulduggery that will allow our capital to be torn apart," Bennett said on Twitter.



An editorial by Alexander Gorchakov titled "Is Angela Merkel Done For?" was posted at nytimes.com on Jan. 11, 2018. Following is the article.

The year is still new, but in German politics, an end seems already at hand: Chancellor Angela Merkel, who failed to form a new coalition government after the federal elections last September, sees herself confronted with a public that is fast losing patience with her political leadership.

In a recent poll, half of German voters said they wanted her to resign and allow another member of her center-right Christian Democratic Party to negotiate the formation of a governing coalition. Grumblings are heard within the party too, which did relatively poorly in the elections. Recently, members of the Junge Union, the party's youth organization, directly called for her to step aside.

Ms. Merkel may be one of the world's most admired leaders and an inspiration for a new generation of women politicians, but at home her appeal has been more pragmatic: Her political capital derives from her ability to react to crises rather than on her conceptualizing and shaping of the country's political agenda. To be blunt, she's not much of a vision person.

For a time, that worked. But over Ms. Merkel's three terms as chancellor, she led so-called grand coalitions with the center-left Social Democrats twice. Such a coalition should be able to use its supermajority to enact major reforms, to get big projects done. And yet very little has come of it. To the contrary: After 12 years and the unsolved refugee crisis that made the German public crazy, Merkel fatigue is setting in.

Meanwhile, the country yearns for a comprehensive approach to migration, a strategy for digitalization, educational reform and a long list of infrastructure upgrades. Instead, moving from one crisis to another, the biggest economy in the European Union has lost track of the path of modernization.

And now, it seems, she can't even form a government. The Social Democrats have rejected another grand coalition, though Ms. Merkel continues to press them. And talks with two smaller parties, the ecologically focused Greens and the pro-civil liberties Liberals, fell apart late last year.

The most controversial part of the various coalition negotiations has been refugees: not so much the premise of accepting them, but the awkward and inconsistent manner they were handled once they arrived. After putting out a well-publicized welcome mat—the so-called Willkommenskultur, or welcome culture—refugees and German citizens alike were stunned when the government did not set up obvious programs to shelter and register before allowing them in. At the same time, Ms. Merkel seemed to give up on the notion of limits on accepting more refugees; she said in 2015 that she wasn't quite sure if Germany's borders could still be protected as they once were.

Her poll numbers dropped overnight; while they have improved since, many in her party still blame her for leaving the door open to a right-wing backlash in the form of the far-right Alternative for Germany party, which siphoned votes away from the Christian Democrats in last year's election.

Many also blame her stance on immigration, and her failure to promote concrete agendas, for the failure of three-party negotiations in the fall. The Christian Democrats, Greens and Liberals couldn't single out a project that should shape their tenure. The Liberals left the table in late November after several tiring weeks. Politicians of the Green Party admitted that they also considered bailing on the talks over the chancellor's attitude.

The Social Democrats have reluctantly started negotiations in January; more than a few conservatives wonder if they would perk up if a fresh face replaced Ms. Merkel's on the other side of the table. The Social Democrats, after all, are in the same place, with a growing number trying to push out Martin Schulz, the head of the party and its candidate for chancellor in 2017. Under him, the once-grand party, once Germany's largest, delivered its poorest performance in history.

Ms. Merkel's only other option is to rule as a minority government, which would mean building coalitions on the fly, behind every new piece of legislation, always worrying about an insurrection. It's unlikely that Ms. Merkel could succeed in such an environment, or that she'd even want to try.

Should none of these options pan out, the German president, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, will be forced to call new elections, something no one wants with the current slate of leaders—at best, the results will be the same. This is why pundits are calling for a fresh start at the top of Germany's major parties.

In both parties, there are younger, rising politicians who are eager to enter the big stage: For the Christian Democrats, there's 37-year-old Jens Spahn; Germans looking south to Austria, which just elected the 31-year-old Sebas-

tian Kurz as chancellor, might be willing to get behind a new young leader. Already, in the Christian Democrats' Bavarian sister party, the Christian Social Union, its chairman Horst Seehofer is stepping down as state premier in favor of the much younger Markus Söder.

Mr. Spahn in particular might be ready for the top spot, given his ability to tack between cosmopolitanism—he's openly gay, and recently married his longtime partner—and public angst over the dissolution of German identity: He recently complained that he couldn't order a coffee in Berlin without speaking English. With Ms. Merkel still floundering in the mess she created over immigration, it may be that Mr. Spahn—or someone like him—needs to take the reins.



An article by AJ Willingham titled "By 2040, Islam Could Be the Second-Largest Religion in the US" was posted at cnn.com on Jan. 10, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

The Muslim population is growing, and in the next two decades Muslims could become the second-largest religious group in the United States, according to a Pew Research study.

However, that's not the whole story.

The Pew Research Center combined studies they conducted in 2007, 2011 and 2017 with yearly data from the US Census (which does not track religious affiliation) to put together a portrait of the future of Muslims in America.

According to their data, the Muslim population is growing at an accelerated rate, and will more than double from an estimated 3.45 million in 2017 to an estimated 8.1 million in 2050. In the meantime, Muslims are expected to surpass Jews as the second-largest religious group.

Why?

- One easy answer is immigration—Pew's research showed a record number of Muslims immigrated to the US in 2016. In fact, according to Pew, three-quarters of Muslims currently in the US are immigrants or children of immigrants.
- There is another factor as well. On average, according to Pew, the Muslim population is younger than other religious groups, which means they have a higher fertility rate.

However, even as the Muslim population in America is set to double in the next few decades, they will still account for a tiny fraction of the overall US population, and shifts in other groups will also have a big impact on the country's makeup.

For instance, in 2020, the projected Christian population will be 252,970,000—almost 70 times the projected Muslim population.

In 2050, the projected Christian population will be 261,960,000—a massive growth in numbers, but because of the growth of other religious groups, a declining percentage of the population.

Even then, even as the *second largest religious group*, Muslims will still only account for 2.1% of the population.

That number is expected to grow more than the Muslim population in the coming decades.

In 2020, there will be a projected 62,310,000 Americans who are unaffiliated. By 2050, that number is expected to grow to 100,860,000.

So in short, the Muslim population in America is expected to rise considerably in the US as more and more Muslims make their homes and families here.

But even with the population boom, Christianity is far and away the predominant religious group in the US, followed by those who identify with no religion at all.



An article by Bill Donahue titled “Calling Out Hollywood’s Phony #MeToo Crusade” was posted at cnsnews.com on Jan. 11, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

All the Hollywood gals, and many of the guys, are desperate to show how protective they are of women being exploited by men, but few of them mean it. If they did, they wouldn’t continue to make shows and movies that debase women. Hollywood literally created the culture which spawned the objectification of women, and now it is reaping what it has sown. Worse, its support for the #MeToo crusade shows how utterly disconnected from reality it is.

The latest example of this phoniness comes by way of CBS. The CBS Corporation owns Showtime, and one of its programs, “Shameless,” proves my point beyond a shadow of a doubt. (Many thanks to Brent Bozell’s Newsbusters for providing a script summary.)

The New Year’s Eve episode of “Shameless” nicely teed up the next installment, which aired January 7. Both were vulgar, misogynistic, and anti-Christian, but it was the latter episode that was clearly over the top. As is often the case with this kind of sick programming, it was gay themed from beginning to end.

On December 31, Ian, played by Cameron Monaghan, is depicted as the gay son of a crook played by William H. Macy. He is confronted by a pastor who believes in conversion therapy for both homosexuals and persons who reject their nature-ordained sex. The pastor, of course, is a zealot who goads a sexually confused female, asking her if she wants “to be cured of the homosexuality disease and go back to being a normal girl again.” Ian, the gay activist, is so upset that he pledges to “beat the f*** out of this guy.”

On January 7, Ian kicks it into high gear, summoning an angry gay mob to confront Christians in the Chicago area. Ian tells religious leaders that “Jesus is nonbinary,” a concept that might have gotten one institutionalized in the past but is now an accepted dogma in liberal circles.

The following exchange shows how morally corrupt the script is, underlining the charge being made here: Hollywood, and in this case the CBS Corporation, is responsible for the climate that debases women.

[The dialogue was not included in this excerpt.]

The CBS Corporation’s Board of Directors lists fifteen members, three of whom are women; there are 10 Executives, none of whom is female. That sounds about what we would expect from a media giant that touts its support for women’s rights—its leadership is 88 percent male.

I am writing to the three women, Shari Redstone, Linda M. Griego, and Martha Minow, asking if they support the #MeToo movement. If so, it would be instructive to know how they feel about shows that celebrate [mention of explicit sexual act] and whether they see such fare as being contradictory to this cause. All the men will receive a copy of my correspondence as well, along with this news release.

I will not ask if they are offended by anti-Christian shows; I already know the answer.

One final thought. At the Golden Globes Awards, William H. Macy spoke out strongly in favor of #MeToo. That he is undermining this cause by participating in [mention of explicit sexual act] shows is not something he is likely to comprehend. Thus, no attempt will be made to contact him.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled “Dirty College Secrets” was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Jan. 10, 2018. Following is the article.

A frequent point I have made in past columns has been about the educational travesty happening on many college campuses.

Some people have labeled my observations and concerns as trivial, unimportant and cherry-picking. While the spring semester awaits us, let’s ask ourselves whether we’d like to see repeats of last year’s antics.

An excellent source for college news is Campus Reform, a conservative website operated by the Leadership Institute (<https://www.campusreform.org>). Its reporters are college students. Here is a tiny sample of last year’s bizarre stories.

Donna Riley, a professor at Purdue University’s School of Engineering Education, published an article in the most recent issue of the peer-reviewed Journal of Engineering Education, positing that academic rigor is a “dirty deed” that upholds “white male heterosexual privilege.”

Riley added that “scientific knowledge itself is gendered, raced, and colonizing.” Would you hire an engineering education graduate who has little mastery of the rigor of engineering? What does Riley’s vision, if actually practiced by her colleagues, do to the worth of degrees in engineering education from Purdue held by female and black students?

Sympathizing with Riley’s vision is Rochelle Gutierrez, a math education professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

In her recent book, she says the ability to solve algebra and geometry problems perpetuates “unearned privilege” among whites. Educators must be aware of the “politics that mathematics brings” in society. She thinks that “on many levels, mathematics itself operates as Whiteness.”

After all, she adds, “who gets credit for doing and developing mathematics, who is capable in mathematics, and who is seen as part of the mathematical community is generally viewed as White.” What’s worse is that the university’s interim provost, John Wilkin, sanctioned her vision, telling Fox News that Gutierrez is an established and admired scholar who has been published in many peer-reviewed publications. I hope that the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign’s black students don’t have the same admiration and stay away from her classes.

Last February, a California State University, Fullerton professor assaulted a CSUF Republican member during a demonstration against President Donald Trump’s executive order on immigration. The students identified the assailant as Eric Canin, an anthropology professor. Fortunately, the school had the good sense to later suspend Canin after confirming the allegations through an internal investigation.

Last month, the presidents of 13 San Antonio colleges declared in an op-ed written by Ric Baser, president of the Higher Education Council of San Antonio, and signed by San Antonio Mayor Ron Nirenberg and 12 other members of the HECSA that “hate speech” and “inappropriate messages” should not be treated as free speech on college campuses. Their vision should be seen as tyranny. The true test of one’s commitment to free speech doesn’t come when he permits people to be free to make statements that he does not find offensive. The true test of one’s commitment to free speech comes when he permits people to make statements he does deem offensive.

Last year, University of Georgia professor Rick Watson adopted a policy allowing students to select their own grade if they “feel unduly stressed” by their actual grade in the class. Benjamin Ayers, dean of the school’s Terry College of Business, released a statement condemning Watson’s pick-your-own-grade policy, calling it “inappropriate.” He added: “Rest assured that this ill-advised proposal will not be implemented in any Terry classroom. The University of Georgia upholds strict guidelines and academic policies to promote a culture of academic rigor, integrity, and honesty.” Ayers’ response gives us hope that not all is lost in terms of academic honesty.

Other campus good news is a report on the resignation of George Ciccariello-Maher, a white Drexel University professor who tweeted last winter, “All I Want For Christmas is White Genocide.” He said that he resigned from his tenured position because threats against him and his family had become

“unsustainable.” If conservative students made such threats, they, too, could benefit from learning the principles of free speech.



An article by Todd Starnes titled “Did Dolly Parton Banish ‘Dixie’ Over Political Correctness?” was posted at townhall.com on Jan. 11, 2018. Following is the article.

Dolly Parton’s famous “Dixie Stampede” just got trampled by a politically correct mob.

The popular dinner show with locations in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee and Branson, Missouri, will now be called, “Dolly Parton’s Stampede.”

For nearly 30 years, the Dixie Stampede has been a family-friendly dinner show attraction—featuring great food and expert horsemanship—steeped in Civil War history. The Starnes family has attended on numerous occasions (we sat on the Southern side).

It’s unclear what—specifically—Miss Dolly will be stampeding in the culturally-cleansed revision. And it’s also not clear why the sudden name change (but I have a suspicion).

“Our shows currently are identified by where they are located,” Miss Dolly said in a press statement. “Some examples are Smoky Mountain Adventures or Dixie Stampede. We also recognize that attitudes change and feel that by streamlining the names of our shows, it will remove any confusion or concerns about our shows and will help our efforts to expand into new cities.”

Last year, Slate sent a Yankee reporter to Pigeon Force to write a scathing review of the Dixie Stampede—described as the “Lost Cause of the Confederacy meets Cirque du Soleil.”

The writer went on to call the show a “lily-white extravaganza” that celebrates the “Old South.”

Again, Miss Dolly did not say what influenced the decision to culturally cleanse the Dixie Stampede—but others share my thoughts.

“Well, like everybody else, I love Dolly, and I love all that she’s done for our community, which is her community, and I’m disappointed that they’re yielding to political correctness,” Knox County Mayor Tim Burchett told the Knoxville News Sentinel. “What’s next? Are we going to change the name of Dixie cups and the Dixie sugar company? You know, I just hope they don’t change their Christmas program.”

I reckon somebody ought to give the Dixie Chicks a call . . .



A video and an article by Matt Vespa titled "Author of Error-Filled Trump Book: Yeah, I Caused Steve Bannon's Downfall" were posted townhall.com on Jan. 10, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

The palace intrigue is everywhere with Michael Wolff's error-riddled book, "Fire and Fury: Inside the Trump White House."

Yet, there's also *some pushback from the news media* over its veracity.

- Maggie Haberman of *The New York Times* said there are parts of it that are just wrong.

- CNN's Jake Tapper also torched the book's accuracy.

- His colleague Alisyn Camerota also told her viewers that this book really isn't journalism.

You would think that a book about the Trump White House would include speaking with members of the president's cabinet; Wolff did no such thing.

The book caused a rift between Breitbart's soon to be former executive chairman Steve Bannon, who served as chief White House strategist, and President Trump, namely over calling Donald Trump Jr.'s July 2016 meeting with the Russians, which amounted to nothing, treasonous. Trump responded by saying that Bannon, who had already left the White House, had lost his mind.

It didn't take long for Bannon's allies to bolt from him. The Mercer family, Bannon's main financial ally, decided to cut ties shortly after this blow up. Matt Drudge decided to move on, even Rush Limbaugh said he was done with him.

Bannon had returned to Breitbart News upon leaving the Trump White House last August. Even there, the board was mulling ousting the chairman. Yesterday, it was announced that Bannon *would be stepping down*. The man who claims responsibility for his downfall: Michael Wolff.

"So you're the reason he's out?" Joy Behar, one of the hosts on "The View," asked.

"I'm the reason he's out," Wolff responded.

It's certainly given the newsrooms of the Big Three—ABC, NBC, and CBS—a lot of material, flooding their evening and morning news programs about this book at the expense of burying other significant news stories that, of course, would either help Trump or trash Hillary.

Newsbusters broke down the numbers.

- From January 3 through January 9, the networks stuffed their evening and morning programs with over two hours of coverage of the Wolff book and the subsequent fallout for former Donald Trump aide Stephen Bannon.

- But other big news, like the FBI re-opening the investigation into the Clinton Foundation scandal (11 minutes, 10 seconds) and the Dow Jones

cracking the 25,000 mark (5 minutes, 46 seconds) were swamped by the Wolff book coverage (2 hours, 20 minutes, 5 seconds).

- CBS was the most obsessed network, as it jammed its programs with 49 minutes and 40 seconds of coverage of the Wolff book and Bannon news.
- ABC wasn't far behind as it spent 46 minutes and 22 seconds on the book and its repercussions for Bannon.
- NBC devoted 44 minutes and 3 seconds to the Wolff and Bannon topics.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled "It Turns Out Bannon was Trump's Brain" was posted at townhall.com on Jan. 10, 2018. Following is the article.

In order to prove he doesn't have dementia, as alleged in a recent book, President Trump called a meeting with congressional leaders on Tuesday—and requested that it be televised.

Ivanka: *Show them at your best, Daddy!*

He then proceeded to completely sell out the base and actually added to his problems by appearing senile.

In a half-dozen exchanges—which, again, he wanted televised—Trump responded to remarks as if he had no clue what the person was saying. One senator would talk—he'd agree. Someone else would say the exact opposite—he'd agree with that, too.

Actual exchange:

SEN. DIANNE FEINSTEIN: "What about a clean DACA bill now, with a commitment that we go into a comprehensive immigration reform procedure? . . ."

TRUMP: ". . . I have no problem . . . We're going to come up with DACA. We're going to do DACA, and then we can start immediately on the phase two, which would be comprehensive."

SEN. FEINSTEIN: "Would you be agreeable to that?"

TRUMP: "I think a lot of people would like to see that, but I think we have to do DACA first."

REP. KEVIN MCCARTHY: "Mr. President, you need to be clear though. I think what Sen. Feinstein is asking here: When we talk about just DACA, we don't want to be back here two years later. You have to have security, as the secretary would tell you."

TRUMP: "But I think that's what she's saying."

REP. MCCARTHY: "No, no, I think she's saying something different . . ."

TRUMP: "I do believe that. Because once we get DACA done—if it's done properly—with, you know, security and everything else . . ."

Trump was more than willing to sell out the base to solve a personal problem of his—the Michael Wolff book—but managed to not convince a single American that he's articulate, bright or a good leader.

On MSNBC, the hosts didn't say, "You know, we saw a new side of Trump today . . ." Instead, they could barely suppress their giggles over the great negotiator being rolled.

The Democrats' opening bid is: *Not only does every poor person in the world get to come live here, but all their relatives get to come, too!*

They don't control any branch of government, and they're not budging from that.

Trump's counteroffer is: *OK! My immigration policy is whatever you send me!*

The end result was: On the left, they're happy, but still think Trump's a moron. On the right, they're unhappy, and also think Trump's a moron.

The people who do not realize Tuesday was the lowest moment of the Trump presidency have no idea what they're talking about. The headline on Trump's sit-down could have been:

"TRUMP ANNOUNCES SAME FAILED AMNESTY DEAL WE HAD 30 YEARS AGO"

The media have done such a fantastic job lying to the public that no one knows that.

To the average viewer, it sounds like a totally fair deal. We give only the BEST illegals a "pathway" to citizenship, they'll have to jump through all sorts of hoops, and in return, we'll get REAL security.

That's exactly what we were promised the last time. What we got: No hoops, no security and everyone got amnesty.

You don't need chain migration for the alleged 800,000 "Dreamers" to swell to 60 million—or 100 or 200 million. First, there are already at least 50 million illegals (aka Dreamers) living here. (For more, see "*Adios, America!*" pp 72-74.)

Second, ANY amnesty means there will be lawsuits, whereupon the courts will grant amnesty to everyone. All of Latin America, including Latin Americans still living in Latin America, can mosey up sometime in the next 20 years, present themselves to a Ninth Circuit judge and claim they were brought here as children.

HOW CAN PEOPLE BROUGHT HERE AS CHILDREN BE EXPECTED TO PROVE IT?

Application approved!

How do I know this? Because that's how the 1986 amnesty worked.

The Ninth Circuit was still approving applications under the 1986 amnesty *in 2007*—i.e. 20 years later—from applicants who claimed it wasn't fair that they weren't in the country at the time to apply for amnesty.

The 1986 law was also loaded with all sorts of requirements on the illegals. We'd be getting only the best! As Trump said on Tuesday, "It's an incentive for people to do a good job, if you want to know the truth. That whole path is an incentive for people."

Result of requirements placed on illegals in the 1986 amnesty:

English-language requirement—dropped by the INS.

Fines—dropped by the INS.

Fees—waived by the INS.

Back taxes—dropped by the IRS.

Congress could pass a law giving amnesty ONLY to left-handed Ph.D.'s in nuclear physics, and everyone would get amnesty. Even illegals who haven't arrived yet.

If there is a silver lining, it's that this isn't the first time Trump has sold out the base. He did it in the March 2016 GOP debate; in his "Hannity" interview in August 2016; in the meeting with tech leaders at Trump Tower in December 2016; and in his meeting with Nancy Pelosi and Chuck Schumer last year.

But it's now Trump's second year in office, we don't have a wall, and he just called a meeting to say, over and over again: "We have to do DACA first."

At this point, any sentient person has to see that the most plausible scenario is:

Lucy's gonna move the football. Lucy's gonna move the football. Lucy's gonna move the football . . . She moved the football.



Isaiah 55:6-11—"Seek 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."