

Eye on the World

June 9, 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 9, 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 by Holly Ellyatt titled "The Secretive Bilderberg Elite are Worried About the 'Post-Truth' World" was posted at cnbc.com on June 6, 2018. Following is the article.

Some of the planet's most powerful people will take part in the infamously secretive Bilderberg meeting that begins Thursday to discuss their most pressing concerns, including Russia, free trade and the "post-truth" world.

Political leaders and experts from industry, finance, academia and the media will take part in the annual conference, taking place this year in Turin from Thursday to Sunday.

So far, 131 participants from 23 countries have confirmed their attendance, Bilderberg's organizers said.

Some of the names on this year's guestlist include the president of the World Economic Forum, Borge Brende, the CEOs of Airbus, DeepMind and Total, as well as Mark Carney, governor of the Bank of England and Ryanair's Michael O'Leary.

The meeting is chaired by French businessman Henri de Castries and he leads the organization's "steering committee."

The key topics for discussion at this year's meeting were published by its organizers Wednesday, giving an insight into what are deemed the most pressing issues in global affairs:

1. Populism in Europe
2. The inequality challenge
3. The future of work
4. Artificial intelligence
5. The U.S. before midterms
6. Free trade
7. U.S. world leadership
8. Russia
9. Quantum computing
10. Saudi Arabia and Iran
11. The "post-truth" world
12. Current events

Some issues like the rise of anti-establishment politics and populism in Europe, persistent inequality, the West's tricky relationship with a resurgent Russia and Saudi Arabia and Iran's enmity have been around for a while.

Others, like the rise of artificial intelligence and quantum computing, reflect uncertainty over mankind's relationship with technology.

Politics and geopolitics dominate the list, however, with the themes of Russia, the Middle East, U.S. world leadership and the domestic political environment ahead of midterm elections in November.

The arrival of President Donald Trump in the White House has thrown out the old way of doing politics and heralded a renegade style of politics.

Meanwhile, scandals involving allegations of the mass use of social media to influence elections also relates to a blurring of objective fact and fiction—hence the "post-truth" world the Bilderberg group will discuss.

Post-truth, which was Oxford English Dictionary's word of the year in 2016, is an adjective defined by the dictionary compiler as "relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief."

Discretion is the word

Founded in 1954, the Bilderberg meeting is an annual event designed "to foster dialogue between Europe and North America," organizers say. The meeting is renowned for its secretive content.

About two thirds of participants come from Europe and the rest from North America; approximately a quarter from politics and government and the rest from other fields, organizers said in a statement Wednesday. Discretion, as always, is de rigeur.

“The conference is a forum for informal discussions about major issues facing the world. The meetings are held under the Chatham House Rule, which states that participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s) nor any other participant may be revealed.”

The organizers said that thanks to the private nature of the meeting, “the participants are not bound by the conventions of their office or by pre-agreed positions.”

“As such, they can take time to listen, reflect and gather insights. There is no desired outcome, no minutes are taken and no report is written. Furthermore, no resolutions are proposed, no votes are taken, and no policy statements are issued.”

With the great and the good attending the meeting, which has become synonymous with the elite, a frequently asked question is how the Bilderberg meeting is financed.

Organizers said the financing was a mixed bag: “Annual contributions by steering committee members cover the annual costs of the secretariat. The budget of the secretariat is limited to the costs of the meeting. The hospitality costs of the annual meeting are the responsibility of the steering committee member(s) of the host country. Participation is by invitation only, and there is no attendance fee. Participants take care of their own travel and accommodation costs.”



An article by Andrea Gagliarducci titled “Vatican Secretary of State Attending Elite Bilderberg Meeting” was posted at cruxnow.com on June 7, 2018. Following is the article.

Cardinal Pietro Parolin, Vatican Secretary of State, will take part in the Bilderberg Conference, an annual private gathering of global political, business and media leaders, taking place this year in Turin, Italy, June 7–10.

Parolin’s name is included in the list of 131 participants in this year’s event.

His participation in the meeting has not been officially announced by the Vatican, though sources within the Secretariat of State have confirmed that he is scheduled to take part in the meeting.

It would be the first time high-ranking Vatican official has taken part in the Bilderberg Conferences.

Started in 1954 the Hotel de Bilderberg in Oosterbeek, The Netherlands, and named after the same hotel, the Bilderberg Conference gathers each year some 120–150 participants, among them European and North American political elites, along with industrial, financial, academic and media figures.

The first meeting took place at the invitation of Prince Bernhard of Lippe-Biesterfeld. Co-founders of the meeting were Polish politician Jozef Retinger, former Belgian prime minister Paul van Zeeland, and Paul Rijkens, who was then the head of Unilever.

The success of the first meeting brought the organizers to stage an annual meeting.

According to the groups' official website, about two-thirds of the participants come from Europe, and the rest from North America, and one-third are political figures or government officials.

The original meeting objective was to strengthen U.S.–European relations. Over the years, the annual meetings became a forum for discussion on a wider range of topics, from ecology to trade and monetary policies.

This year's meeting is set to discuss populism in Europe, the challenges of inequality, the future of work, artificial intelligence, U.S. midterm elections, free trade, U.S. global leadership, Russia, quantum computing, Saudi Arabia and Iran, the post-truth world, and other current events.

The Bilderberg meeting's official website stresses that discussions are private, no minutes are taken and no reports are written.

The meetings are held under the so-called "Chatham House Rules," an agreement typical of off-the-record meetings among academics or political leaders.

According to that agreement, participants are free to use the information received, but they cannot disclose the identity nor the affiliation of speakers, nor can they disclose the other participants taking part in the conversation.

Dubbed by critics to be a kind of "global shadow government," and targeted by protesters who picket the meeting, the Bilderberg meeting has an official website since 2011, and publishes the names of participants in the annual meeting the day before the gathering begins.

Parolin's participation may be an expression of the "culture of the encounter" encouraged by Pope Francis. The pope has often asked officials to engage a dialogue with the world.

Receiving the Charlemagne Prize May 6, 2016, Pope Francis stressed that "today we urgently need to engage all the members of society in building 'a culture which privileges dialogue as a form of encounter' and in creating 'a means for building consensus and agreement while seeking the goal of a just, responsive and inclusive society.' "

The cardinal's participation in the Bilderberg Group could be part of a strategy of dialogue the Holy See is engaging with the small influential elite group.

It is noteworthy that last year, Parolin took part in the World Economic Forum in Davos, and there he delivered a speech in which he listed the aims of pontifical diplomacy.



An article by Patrick Donahue titled "Merkel Urges Europe to Step Up in Trump's New World Order" was posted at bloombergquint.com on June 7, 2018. Following is the article.

Chancellor Angela Merkel made a forceful pitch for Europe to play a more assertive role in global affairs as U.S. President Donald Trump dismantles the post-World War II order, setting the stage for a potential tense standoff at the Group of Seven summit this week.

The German leader again questioned the durability of trans-Atlantic relations by referring to eye-raising comments she made over a year ago in which she said that "the times when we could fully rely on others are to some extent over."

Those words, spoken at a beer-tent election rally, were a reaction to Trump hectoring European leaders for not spending enough on defense at a North Atlantic Treaty Organization summit in Brussels. Since then, more fuel has been added to the fire.

"That was my takeaway from the NATO summit, and in the meantime I continue to feel confirmed by my statement," Merkel said in Munich on Wednesday, this time to a meeting of the European People's Party, a grouping of center-right parties in the European Parliament.

In addition to the disruptive effects of the rift in NATO and Trump's exit from the Paris global climate treaty, Merkel pointed to the fresh conflict over trade and the U.S. leader's withdrawal from the Iran nuclear accord last month.

"All of that confirms the assessment that the world is being reorganized," Merkel told the EPP.

The German chancellor has taken a firmer stance leading up to the two-day G-7 gathering in Canada, which starts Friday. Earlier on Wednesday, Europe's most experienced government leader vowed to challenge Trump on trade and climate, saying the lack of room for compromise means leaders may fail to agree on a final statement.

Trump's "America First" doctrine shows that "we have a serious problem with multilateral agreements," Merkel told German lawmakers, adding that failure to reach common ground could lead to the highly unusual step of host Canada issuing a concluding statement not agreed to by all participants.

U.S. isolationism

With Trump's unpredictable leadership and the U.S. turn toward isolationism, Merkel said that the European Union needs to hone its response to a raft of issues in an environment in which global institutions need to be "newly proven."

The 28-member bloc—soon to lose the U.K. after the 2016 referendum to exit the EU—managed to grapple with a financial meltdown and the biggest influx of refugees since World War II only with “great effort,” Merkel said. “But we don’t have a sufficient foundation to confront crises of the future,” she added, underscoring her push for reforms.

To give the region more political heft, she called for joint action on security and migration, saying the bloc should “Europeanize” its presence on the United Nations Security Council.

A rotating group of about 10 member states could work with veto-power France and the European Commission in order to “speak with one European voice” on the global stage, the chancellor said.

Migration tensions

The effort involves resolving tensions over migration. The contentious issue has driven a wedge between states calling for asylum seekers to be distributed within the bloc and those—particularly in central and eastern Europe—insisting migrants must be kept out.

“I’ll tell you very openly and deeply seriously, if we don’t manage to form a common response to illegal immigration, then certain foundations of the European Union will be placed in question,” Merkel said, citing freedom of movement across the EU’s borders.



“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 Elisabeth Malkin titled “Guatemala’s Fuego Volcano Erupts, Killing at Least 62” was posted at nytimes.com on June 4, 2018.
 - An article by Nicole Winfield titled “New Italian Govt. Vows to Create Jobs, Deport Migrants” was posted at apnews.com on June 2, 2018.
 - An article titled “‘Pack Your Bags’: Italy’s New Interior Minister Talks Tough on Migrants” was posted at france24.com on June 3, 2018.
 - An article by Douglas Murray titled “Tommy Robinson Drew Attention to ‘Grooming Gangs’; Britain has Persecuted Him” was posted at nationalreview.com on May 31, 2018.
 - A video titled “Watch: First Female Driving License Being Issued in Saudi Arabia” was posted at alarabiya.net on June 4, 2018.
 - An article by Suha Ma’ayeh and Raja Abdulrahim titled “Jordan’s Prime Minister Steps Down in Wake of Protests” was posted at wsj.com on June 4, 2018.

■ An article titled “Turkey Students Go on Trial Over ‘Terror Propaganda’ ” was posted at france24.com on June 6, 2018.



An article titled “Apple: We’re Going to Pick the News Stories You Read” was posted at ntknetwork.com on June 4, 2018. Following is the article.

Apple’s Vice President of Product Marketing Susan Prescott made an alarming announcement that Apple would be selecting the top news stories that appear in Apple News during the company’s Worldwide Developers Conference on Monday.

According to Prescott, Apple News’ editorial team will be selecting the top news stories of the day for millions of potential readers.

“News is a personalized feed where you can see all the stories you want to read, pulled together from trusted sources, and our top stories are hand-picked by the Apple News editorial team,” Prescott said.

Prescott did not say what the criteria would be for Apple News to consider a source “trusted,” but conservatives will find this announcement particularly alarming.

Last year, Apple announced that it hired to head Apple News Lauren Kern, who previously served as executive editor for the liberal New York Magazine.

Apple’s hiring of Kern raised questions about the Cupertino-based company’s impartiality when it comes to news.

Last August, Apple News was criticized for selecting anti-Trump stories as its top news story of the day.



An article by Gabriel Dance, Nicholas Confessore and Michael LaForia titled “Facebook Gave Device Makers Deep Access to Data on Users and Friends” was posted at wral.com on June 4, 2018. Following is the article.

As Facebook sought to become the world’s dominant social media service, it struck agreements allowing phone and other device-makers access to vast amounts of its users’ personal information.

Facebook has reached data-sharing partnerships with at least 60 device-makers—including Apple, Amazon, BlackBerry, Microsoft and Samsung—during the last decade, starting before Facebook apps were widely available on smartphones, company officials said.

The deals, most of which remain in effect, allowed Facebook to expand its reach and let device-makers offer customers popular features of the social network, such as messaging, “like” buttons and address books.

But the partnerships, whose scope has not previously been reported, raise concerns about the company’s privacy protections and compliance with a 2011 consent decree with the Federal Trade Commission.

Facebook allowed the device companies access to the data of users’ friends without their explicit consent, even after declaring that it would no longer share such information with outsiders. Some device-makers could retrieve personal information even from users’ friends who believed they had barred any sharing, *The New York Times* found.

Facebook came under intensifying scrutiny by lawmakers and regulators after news reports in March that a political consulting firm, Cambridge Analytica, misused the private information of tens of millions of Facebook users.

In the furor that followed, Facebook’s leaders said that the kind of access exploited by Cambridge in 2014 was cut off by the next year, when Facebook prohibited developers from collecting information from users’ friends. But the company officials did not disclose that Facebook had exempted the makers of cellphones, tablets and other hardware from such restrictions.

“You might think that Facebook or the device manufacturer is trustworthy,” said Serge Egelman, a privacy researcher at the University of California, Berkeley, who studies the security of mobile apps. “But the problem is that as more and more data is collected on the device—and if it can be accessed by apps on the device—it creates serious privacy and security risks.”

In interviews, Facebook officials defended the data sharing as consistent with its privacy policies, the FTC agreement and pledges to users. They said its partnerships were governed by contracts that strictly limited use of the data, including any stored on partners’ servers. The officials added that they knew of no cases where the information had been misused.

The company views its device partners as extensions of Facebook, serving its more than 2 billion users, the officials said.

“These partnerships work very differently from the way in which app developers use our platform,” said Ime Archibong, a Facebook vice president. Unlike developers that provide games and services to Facebook users, the device partners can use Facebook data only to provide versions of “the Facebook experience,” the officials said.

Some device partners can retrieve Facebook users’ relationship status, religion, political leaning and upcoming events, among other data. Tests by *The Times* showed that the partners requested and received data in the same way other third parties did.

Facebook's view that the device-makers are not outsiders lets the partners go even further, *The Times* found: They can obtain data about a user's Facebook friends, even those who have denied Facebook permission to share information with any third parties.

In interviews, several former Facebook software engineers and security experts said they were surprised at the ability to override sharing restrictions.

"It's like having door locks installed, only to find out that the locksmith also gave keys to all of his friends so they can come in and rifle through your stuff without having to ask you for permission," said Ashkan Soltani, a research and privacy consultant who formerly served as the FTC's chief technologist.

Details of Facebook's partnerships have emerged amid a reckoning in Silicon Valley over the volume of personal information collected on the internet and monetized by the tech industry.

The pervasive collection of data, while largely unregulated in the United States, has come under growing criticism from elected officials at home and overseas and provoked concern among consumers about how freely their information is shared.

In a tense appearance before Congress in March, Facebook's chief executive, Mark Zuckerberg, emphasized what he said was a company priority for Facebook users. "Every piece of content that you share on Facebook you own," he testified. "You have complete control over who sees it and how you share it."

But the device partnerships provoked discussion even within Facebook as early as 2012, according to Sandy Parakilas, who led Facebook's third-party advertising and privacy compliance department at the time.

"This was flagged internally as a privacy issue," said Parakilas, who left Facebook that year and has recently emerged as a harsh critic of the company. "It is shocking that this practice may still continue six years later, and it appears to contradict Facebook's testimony to Congress that all friend permissions were disabled."

The partnerships were briefly mentioned in documents submitted to German lawmakers investigating the social media giant's privacy practices and released by Facebook in mid-May.

But Facebook provided the lawmakers with the name of only one partner—BlackBerry, maker of the once-ubiquitous mobile device—and little information about how the agreements worked.

The submission followed testimony by Joel Kaplan, Facebook's vice president for global public policy, during a closed-door German parliamentary hearing in April. Elisabeth Winkelmeier-Becker, one of the lawmakers who questioned Kaplan, said in an interview that she believed the data partnerships disclosed by Facebook violated users' privacy rights.

“What we have been trying to determine is whether Facebook has knowingly handed over user data elsewhere without explicit consent,” Winkelmeier-Becker said. “I would never have imagined that this might even be happening secretly via deals with device-makers. BlackBerry users seem to have been turned into data dealers, unknowingly and unwillingly.”

In interviews with *The Times*, Facebook identified other partners: Apple and Samsung, the world’s two biggest smartphone makers, and Amazon, which sells tablets. An Apple spokesman said the company relied on private access to Facebook data for features that enabled users to post photos to the social network without opening the Facebook app, among other things. Apple said its phones no longer had such access to Facebook as of last September.

Samsung declined to respond to questions about whether it had any data-sharing partnerships with Facebook. Amazon also declined to respond to questions.

Usher Lieberman, a BlackBerry spokesman, said in a statement that the company used Facebook data only to give its own customers access to their Facebook networks and messages. Lieberman said that the company “did not collect or mine the Facebook data of our customers,” adding that “BlackBerry has always been in the business of protecting, not monetizing, customer data.”

Microsoft entered a partnership with Facebook in 2008 that allowed Microsoft-powered devices to do things like add contacts and friends and receive notifications, according to a spokesman. He added that the data was stored locally on the phone and was not synced to Microsoft’s servers.

Facebook acknowledged that some partners did store users’ data—including friends’ data—on their own servers. A Facebook official said that regardless of where the data was kept, it was governed by strict agreements between the companies.

“I am dumbfounded by the attitude that anybody in Facebook’s corporate office would think allowing third parties access to data would be a good idea,” said Henning Schulzrinne, a computer science professor at Columbia University who specializes in network security and mobile systems.

The Cambridge Analytica scandal revealed how loosely Facebook had policed the bustling ecosystem of developers building apps on its platform. They ranged from well-known players like Zynga, the maker of the “FarmVille” game, to smaller ones, like a Cambridge contractor who used a quiz taken by about 300,000 Facebook users to gain access to the profiles of as many as 87 million of their friends.

Those developers relied on Facebook’s public data channels, known as application programming interfaces, or APIs. But starting in 2007, the company also established private data channels for device manufacturers.

At the time, mobile phones were less powerful, and relatively few of them could run stand-alone Facebook apps like those now common on smartphones.

The company continued to build new private APIs for device-makers through 2014, spreading user data through tens of millions of mobile devices, game consoles, televisions and other systems outside Facebook's direct control.

Facebook began moving to wind down the partnerships in April, after assessing its privacy and data practices in the wake of the Cambridge Analytica scandal. Archibong said the company had concluded that the partnerships were no longer needed to serve Facebook users. About 22 of them have been shut down.

The broad access Facebook provided to device-makers raises questions about its compliance with a 2011 consent decree with the FTC.

The decree barred Facebook from overriding users' privacy settings without first getting explicit consent. That agreement stemmed from an investigation that found Facebook had allowed app developers and other third parties to collect personal details about users' friends, even when those friends had asked that their information remain private.

After the Cambridge Analytica revelations, the FTC began an investigation into whether Facebook's continued sharing of data after 2011 violated the decree, potentially exposing the company to fines.

Facebook officials said the private data channels did not violate the decree because the company viewed its hardware partners as "service providers," akin to a cloud computing service paid to store Facebook data or a company contracted to process credit card transactions.

According to the consent decree, Facebook does not need to seek additional permission to share friend data with service providers.

"These contracts and partnerships are entirely consistent with Facebook's FTC consent decree," Archibong, the Facebook official, said.

But Jessica Rich, a former FTC official who helped lead the commission's earlier Facebook investigation, disagreed with that assessment.

"Under Facebook's interpretation, the exception swallows the rule," said Rich, now with the Consumers Union. "They could argue that any sharing of data with third parties is part of the Facebook experience.

And this is not at all how the public interpreted their 2014 announcement that they would limit third-party app access to friend data."

To test one partner's access to Facebook's private data channels, The Times used a reporter's Facebook account—with about 550 friends—and a 2013 BlackBerry device, monitoring what data the device requested and received.

(More recent BlackBerry devices, which run Google's Android operating system, do not use the same private channels, BlackBerry officials said.)

Immediately after the reporter connected the device to his Facebook account, it requested some of his profile data, including user ID, name, picture, "about" information, location, email and cellphone number.

The device then retrieved the reporter's private messages and the responses to them, along with the name and user ID of each person with whom he was communicating.

The data flowed to a BlackBerry app known as the Hub, which was designed to let BlackBerry users view all of their messages and social media accounts in one place.

The Hub also requested—and received—data that Facebook's policy appears to prohibit. Since 2015, Facebook has said that apps can request only the names of friends using the same app.

But the BlackBerry app had access to all of the reporter's Facebook friends and, for most of them, returned information such as user ID, birthday, work and education history and whether they were currently online.

The BlackBerry device was also able to retrieve identifying information for nearly 295,000 Facebook users. Most of them were second-degree Facebook friends of the reporter, or friends of friends.

In all, Facebook empowers BlackBerry devices to access more than 50 types of information about users and their friends, *The Times* found.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Past Versus Present America" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on June 6, 2018. Following is the article.

Having enjoyed my 82nd birthday, I am part of a group of about 50 million Americans who are 65 years of age or older. Those who are 90 or older were in school during the 1930s. My age cohort was in school during the 1940s. Baby boomers approaching their 70s were in school during the 1950s and early '60s.

Try this question to any one of those 50 million Americans who are 65 or older: Do you recall any discussions about the need to hire armed guards to protect students and teachers against school shootings?

Do you remember school policemen patrolling the hallways?

How many students were shot to death during the time you were in school? For me and those other Americans 65 or older, when we were in school, a conversation about hiring armed guards and having police patrol hallways would have been seen as lunacy. There was no reason.

What's the difference between yesteryear and today?

- The logic of the argument for those calling for stricter gun control laws, in the wake of recent school shootings, is that something has happened to guns.
- Guns have behaved more poorly and become evil.

■ Guns themselves are the problem.

The job for those of us who are 65 or older is to relay the fact that guns were more available and less controlled in years past, when there was far less mayhem. Something else is the problem.

Guns haven't changed. People have changed. Behavior that is accepted from today's young people was not accepted yesteryear. For those of us who are 65 or older, assaults on teachers were not routine as they are in some cities.

For example, in Baltimore, an average of four teachers and staff members were assaulted each school day in 2010, and more than 300 school staff members filed workers' compensation claims in a year because of injuries received through assaults or altercations on the job.

In Philadelphia, 690 teachers were assaulted in 2010, and in a five-year period, 4,000 were. In that city's schools, according to *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, "on an average day 25 students, teachers, or other staff members were beaten, robbed, sexually assaulted, or victims of other violent crimes. That doesn't even include thousands more who are extorted, threatened, or bullied in a school year."

Yale University legal scholar John Lott argues that gun accessibility in our country has never been as restricted as it is now.

Lott reports that until the 1960s, New York City public high schools had shooting clubs. Students carried their rifles to school on the subway in the morning and then turned them over to their homeroom teacher or a gym teacher—and that was mainly to keep them centrally stored and out of the way. Rifles were retrieved after school for target practice (<http://tinyurl.com/yapuaehp>).

Virginia's rural areas had a long tradition of high school students going hunting in the morning before school, and they sometimes stored their guns in the trunks of their cars during the school day, parked on the school grounds.

During earlier periods, people could simply walk into a hardware store and buy a rifle. Buying a rifle or pistol through a mail-order catalog—such as Sears, Roebuck & Co.'s—was easy. Often, a 12th or 14th birthday present was a shiny new .22-caliber rifle, given to a boy by his father.

These facts of our history should confront us with a question: With greater accessibility to guns in the past, why wasn't there the kind of violence we see today, when there is much more restricted access to guns?

There's another aspect of our response to mayhem. When a murderer uses a bomb, truck or car to kill people, we don't blame the bomb, truck or car. We don't call for control over the instrument of death. We seem to fully recognize that such objects are inanimate and incapable of acting on their own.

We blame the perpetrator. However, when the murder is done using a gun, we do call for control over the inanimate instrument of death—the gun. I smell a hidden anti-gun agenda.



An article by Michelle Malkin titled "No Pardon for Partisan Hypocrisy" was posted at michellemalkin.com on June 6, 2018. Following is the article.

Quick, grab the smelling salts and clear the fainting couches.

President Trump's pardon of conservative author Dinesh D'Souza last week violently triggered Beltway media elites. It's peanut butter, weed pollen, gluten, manspreading, Chick-fil-A, the national anthem, and Kryptonite all rolled into one giant political allergen. Allow me to administer the rhetorical, metaphorical antihistamine.

To *The Washington Post* editorial board, President Trump's use of the pardon is "another show of disrespect for the justice system." Outspoken D'Souza was the subject of a highly politicized prosecution by former U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara (now an anti-Trump resistance leader) over campaign finance violations totaling \$20,000.

The WaPo punditocracy grudgingly admits that the president "has constitutional power to do this" and that it is "Mr. Trump's prerogative" to pardon individuals the newspaper considers "unsavory."

Yet, the editorialists fulminate that what "is offensive here is not the pardon power, but the use of it" for "arbitrary, political and unjustified" reasons.

G-U-Double F-Awww. The protesting Posties wouldn't be capable of acknowledging an acceptable exercise of the pardon power by Trump if it body-slammed them off the ropes on UFC Fight Night.

Former Navy sailor Kristian Saucier received a Trump pardon after serving a year in prison for taking photos on his submarine to show his family where he worked (in contrast to the hands-off treatment of the classified information-breaching Clinton brigade). Too political, the pundits cry.

The late boxer Jack Johnson, America's first black heavyweight champion, received a Trump pardon after being jailed under Jim Crow for traveling with a white woman (who later became his wife) across state lines. Publicity stunt, the bitchers bitched. Not enough, the moaners moaned. Trump's still a racist, the grievance-mongers mongered.

Indeed, *The Washington Post* opinion writers have depleted their Bank of Selective Outrage accounts while spewing about Trump's pardons. "Nothing but right-wing trolling," harumphed Paul Waldman. "Twisted brand of mercy," decried Ruth Marcus. "A warm-up for a constitutional crisis," squawked Jennifer Rubin.

Spare us all the hot air, media heavers. Democrats have long wielded pardon powers to reward deep-pocketed cronies, absolve unrepentant domestic terrorists and lionize national security leakers. The "democratic values" that

WaPo-lemicists claim are now under siege thanks to Trump's pardons got crushed under the wheels of the corruptocrat bus a long, long time ago.

Self-dealing Bill Clinton handed out pardons and commutations like Pez candy to relatives like half-brother Roger Clinton (convicted of cocaine possession) and family-tied associates like his brother-in-law Hugh Rodham's clients, including convicted cocaine distributor Carlos Vignali and convicted herbal supplement fraudster and perjurer A. Glenn Braswell; the two felons had forked over \$400,000 to Rodham in legal fees to win their clemencies.

Hillary's other brother, Tony, raked in more than \$240,000 from a couple convicted of bank fraud, who he just happened to mention to his brother-in-law in the White House, who granted the pardon—after which brother Tony denied being paid for any work having to do with a pardon.

Meanwhile, Madame HRC's Senate campaign treasurer, William J. Cunningham III, pocketed \$4,000 to prepare clemency for two Arkansas-based convicted tax cheats, Robert Fain and James Manning. President Clinton granted both; Hillary played dumb and feigned shock, shock that political favor-trading was going on in Clinton land.

And don't even get me started on the putrid Marc and Denise Rich pardon scandal, overseen by Clinton/Obama alum Eric Holder.

If systemic pay-for-play pardons aren't a "twisted brand of mercy," what else are?

Critics assail President Trump for "bypassing the traditional review process," which (1) is his prerogative; (2) was standard operating procedure during the Clinton years; and (3) has been questioned by watchdogs on all sides of the ideological aisle because of the inherent conflict in the federal pardon lawyer's office being overseen by federal government prosecutors reluctant to undo any convictions.

No one did more damage to the integrity of the federal pardon attorney's office than Eric Holder, who pressured its staff to abandon its full-scale opposition to Clinton's clemency for 16 members of the deadly FALN Puerto Rican terrorist group and Los Macheteros.

The office tossed its original report rejecting clemency at Holder's behest and replaced it with a new and improved "neutral" memo giving Clinton cover to grant the pardons without contradicting the "traditional review process," to borrow a phrase.

These Clinton/Holder beneficiaries were linked by the FBI to more than 130 bombings and six murders. Nearly two decades later, Holder was at the DOJ helm as attorney general when President Obama commuted the sentence of another seditious FALN terrorist, Oscar Lopez Rivera, who proudly declared to a federal judge, "I am an enemy of the United States government."

"Unsavory" is in the eye of the beholder. So is the "arbitrary" use of the presidential pardon. Will the resistance ever acknowledge a legitimate use of this power by President Trump?

Quoth the raving ravers: Never. Never. And never more.



An article by Ann Coulter titled "I Have a Dream . . . About Gay Wedding Cakes" was posted at anncoulter.com on June 6, 2018. Following is the article.

The Supreme Court's recent decision on whether a Christian baker can be forced to make a wedding cake for a gay marriage (no) arriving on the same day that Bill Clinton reared his syphilitic head on NBC's "Today" reminded me how liberals always use black people as props.

Midway through the last century, bedrock legal principles about property rights and freedom of association were abrogated to deal with a specific, intractable problem: We could not get Democrats to stop discriminating against blacks.

So Republicans, with very little Democratic help, passed a slew of laws saying: No, even though you own that restaurant, you cannot discriminate against black customers. And no, even though we are a free people, you cannot refuse to associate with black people in your clubs, universities or sports teams.

This should have been a one-time exception to the law for one specific group of people based on an emergency.

But Democrats, never wild about freedom in the first place, saw "civil rights" as a great gig. Instead of civil rights being used to remedy historic injuries done to a specific group of people, they'd use "civil rights" as a false flag for all their pet projects.

Just six years after passage of the historic 1964 Civil Rights Act, Democrats in New York had dropped black people from the equation and moved onto legalized abortion. State senator Manfred Ohrenstein of Manhattan explained why killing the unborn was a "right": "It was the end of the civil rights era, and we viewed [abortion] as a civil right."

In the 1991 case *Kreimer v. Morristown*, a Carter-appointed federal district judge, H. Lee Sarokin, ruled that a public library's discrimination against smelly, frightening homeless people violated the equal protection clause because it had a "disparate impact" on people who refuse to bathe compared to those who bathe regularly. Three years later, President Clinton promoted him to an appellate judgeship. (The judge, not the homeless person.)

In 2007, then-governor Eliot Spitzer vowed that "New York state will continue to be a beacon of civil rights"—when proposing a state law that would guarantee access to late-term abortions.

In June 2012, *The New York Times* chirpily reported "gay rights the fastest-moving civil rights movement in our nation's history"!

These days, you could be forgiven for not realizing that civil rights ever had anything to do with black people. According to Equal Opportunity Employment Commission statistics, for a least a decade, 65 percent of all “civil rights” claims have had absolutely nothing to do with race discrimination.

The gay wedding cake caper is only the most recent example of our majestic “civil rights.”

Instead of basing favored treatment under the law on a history of brutal and widespread injustice in America, liberals thought it should also be based on other forms of suffering, such as: being a woman, being a Muslim, wanting an abortion, having been born in Mexico, being a smelly homeless person stinking up the public library and—according to Ruth Bader Ginsburg this week—being a gay couple who wants to force a Christian to bake a cake for your wedding.

It must make blacks feel great being compared to daft women, smelly homeless people and bossy gays harassing a Christian baker.

And apes!

Princeton ethics professor Peter Singer compares black people to apes, citing the black liberation movement as a model for the liberation of apes. We must “extend to other species,” Singer says, “the basic principle of equality” that we extend “to all members of our own species.”

This wasn’t an Ambien-induced Twitter rant by a comedian. Singer wrote it, calmly and deliberately, in a book on “ethics.”

Still, I believe the greatest insult black Americans have had to endure from liberals was when they called Bill Clinton the “first black president.”

I notice that he was not the first black president when Democrats were singing Fleetwood Mac at his inauguration, nor when he was appointing the first woman attorney general or passing welfare reform. Only after Clinton was caught in the most humiliating sex scandal in U.S. history did he suddenly become “the first black president.” (Which is not true, according to Monica Lewinsky’s description of Clinton’s private parts.)

During the House impeachment hearings, Rep. Maxine Waters ferociously defended Clinton, saying, “I am here in the name of my slave ancestors.” She said she had woken up in the middle of the night, “with flashes of the struggles of my African ancestors for justice.”

What this had to do with Clinton perjuring himself about molesting a chubby Jewish White House intern was anyone’s guess.

Always the master of subtlety, as soon as the Lewinsky scandal broke, Clinton promptly invited the Rev. Jesse Jackson to the White House to “pray” with him. Two months later, he took off on an 11-day, six-nation \$43 million trip to—guess where? Africa!

Haven't black people suffered enough without this horny hick piggybacking on their oppression?



"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 Terence P. Jeffrey titled "\$119,050,900,000 Merchandise Trade Deficit With China Hit Record Through April" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 6, 2018.
- An article by Thomas Franck titled "Buffett Says Economy is Feeling Strong: 'If We're in the Sixth Inning, We Have Our Slugger Coming to Bat' " was posted at cnbc.com on June 7, 2018.
- An article by Gavi Greenspan titled "Ben Carson: HUD Now Measuring Success by How Many People 'Graduate Out' of Government Programs" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 7, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- A Reuters article by Sarah N. Lynch and Kristina Cook titled "Exclusive: U.S. sending 1,600 immigration detainees to federal prisons" was posted at reuters.com on June 7, 2018.
- An article by Katie Pavlich titled "New DOJ Report: 1-in-5 Federal Prisoners are Illegal Aliens" was posted at townhall.com on June 7, 2018.

Comments about weapons

- An article by Karen Berkowitz titled "Gun Groups Want a Restraining Order Against Deerfield's Assault Weapons Ban Before It Takes Effect in 2 Weeks" was posted at chicagotribune.com on June 1, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

- An article by Katie Pavlich titled "D'Souza: Obama's Goons Tried to Destroy My Faith in America, Trump Restored It" was posted at townhall.com on June 1, 2018.
- Looking back to 2014, an article by Katie Pavlich titled "Documents: Federal Prosecutors Mised Judge in Pursuit of Prison Time for Dinesh D'Souza" was posted at townhall.com on Sept. 23, 2014.

Comments about Trump opposition

- An article by Chris Reeves titled "Report: Mueller's Probe Cost Taxpayers \$17 Million, With Over \$4 Million Paid to His Staff" was posted at townhall.com on June 1, 2018.

- An article by Dominic Patton titled "Barack's Back Baby! Obama Coming to Town for Hollywood Cash for DNC" was posted at deadline.com on June 2, 2018.
- A Reuters article by Jane Ross titled "California City [Stockton] Fights Poverty With Guaranteed Income" was posted at reuters.com on June 4, 2018.
- An article by Kyle Olson titled "Maxine Waters Plays to Empty Seats As Only 10 Millennials Show Up to Campaign Event" was posted at theamericanmirror.com on June 4, 2018.
- An article by Tim Reynolds titled "LeBron James: Golden State Warriors, Cleveland Cavaliers Don't Want Invite to White House" was posted at nba.com on June 5, 2018.
- An article by Abbie Vansickle and Paige St. John titled "Big Spending by George Soros and Liberal Groups Fails to Sway D.A. Races in California" was posted at latimes.com on June 6, 2018.

News about the media

- An article by Maureen Dowd titled "Obama Just Too Good for US" was posted at nytimes.com on June 2, 2018.
- An article by Katie Pavlich titled "CNN Claims Melania Trump is Missing; She's Not and Just Had Surgery" was posted at townhall.com on June 4, 2018.
- An article by Katie Pavlich titled "Trump's Morning Tweets: Why Isn't Samantha Bee Being Fired Like Roseanne Was? Double Standard!" was posted at townhall.com on June 1, 2018.
- An article by Matt Vespa titled "Sam Bee: Why are You Focusing on Me Sexually Degrading Ivanka and Not Trump's Immigration Agenda?" was posted at townhall.com on June 1, 2018.
- An article by Brian Steinberg titled "Madison Avenue Seems Wary of Samantha Bee's 'Full Frontal,' Despite Apology" was posted at variety.com on June 6, 2018.

General interest

- Looking back to early May, an article titled "Quake That Shook Big Island was Biggest [6.9] in Hawaii Since 1975" was posted at hawaiinewsnow.com on May 4, 2018.
- An article titled "5.5 Magnitude Quake Rattles Big Island; No Tsunami Generated" was posted at Hawaiinewsnow.com on June 4, 2018.
- An article by Marilyn Marchione titled "Many Breast Cancer Patients Can Skip Chemo, Big Study Finds" was posted at apnews.com on June 3, 2018.



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.”