

Eye on the World

June 3, 2017

This compilation of material for “Eye on the World” is presented as a service to the Churches of God. The views stated in the material are those of the writers or sources quoted by the writers, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Church of God Big Sandy. The following articles were posted at churchofgodbigandy.com for the weekend of June 3, 2017.

Compiled by Dave Haver

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 Katie Pavlich titled “Pay for Slay: Palestinian Authority Shells Out Billions to Terrorists and Their Families” was posted at townhall.com on May 30, 2017. Following is the article.

When President Trump met with Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas at the White House last month, he condemned the practice of paying terrorists and their families for killing Israelis and Americans. The practice, better known as “pay for slay,” was also referenced during Trump’s visit to Bethlehem last week.

“President Trump emphasized the importance of making a clear commitment to preventing inflammatory rhetoric and to stopping incitement, and to continue strengthening efforts to combat terrorism. President Trump raised his concerns about payments to Palestinian prisoners in Israeli jails who have committed terrorist acts, and to their families, and emphasized the need to resolve this issue,” a readout of the White House meeting states.

According to a new report, the Palestinian Authority has paid terrorists and their families a whopping \$1 billion over the past four years.

■ The Palestinian Authority has paid out some NIS 4 billion—or \$1.12 billion—over the past four years to terrorists and their families, a former director general of the Ministry of Strategic Affairs and ex-head of the army’s intelligence and research division told a top Knesset panel on Monday.

■ Setting out the figures, Brig.-Gen (res.) Yossi Kuperwasser told the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee that the longer the period for which a Palestinian security prisoner is jailed, “the higher the salary . . . Anyone who has sat in prison for more than 30 years gets NIS 12,000 (\$3,360) per month,” said Kuperwasser, according to the (Hebrew) NRG website. “When they’re released, they get a grant and are promised a job at the Palestinian Authority. They get a military rank that’s determined according to the number of years they’ve served in jail.”

Republicans re-introduced a bill in February, the Taylor Force Act, cutting taxpayer funding to the Palestinian government so long as payments to terrorists continue. The legislation is named after West Point graduate Taylor Force, who was stabbed and killed by a Palestinian terrorist last year.



An article by Elizabeth McLaughlin and Luis Martinez titled “US Successfully Intercepts ICBM in Historic Test” was posted at yahoo.com on May 30, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

The U.S. has “successfully intercepted” an intercontinental ballistic missile during the first test of its ground-based intercept system, the U.S. Missile Defense Agency said Tuesday.

The test occurred just days after the North Korean regime launched its ninth missile this year. U.S. officials say today’s test had been planned for years.

The ground-based interceptor launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California shortly after 3:30 p.m. ET. A little more than one hour later, the Pentagon confirmed that it had successfully collided with an ICBM-class target over the Pacific Ocean.

The ICBM-target was launched from the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site on Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands, 4,200 miles away.

“The intercept of a complex, threat-representative ICBM target is an incredible accomplishment for the GMD [Ground-based Missile Defense] system and a critical milestone for this program,” said Missile Defense Agency Director Vice Adm. Jim Syring.

“This system is vitally important to the defense of our homeland, and this test demonstrates that we have a capable, credible deterrent against a very real threat. I am incredibly proud of the warfighters who executed this test and who operate this system every day.”

The ground-based interceptor system is mainly designed to counter a North Korean missile threat, but a U.S. official said Tuesday’s long-scheduled test was coincidental to North Korea’s increased missile testing this year.

This was the 18th test of the ground-based interceptor. The last one, in June 2014, was the first success since 2008. The system was nine for 17 since 1999 with other types of shorter-range target missiles. Tuesday's ICBM target had never been tested before.

There are 32 ground-based interceptors at Fort Greely, Alaska, and four at Vandenberg.

The Missile Defense Agency said in its 2018 fiscal year budget overview that it would deploy eight additional ground-based interceptors in Alaska by the end of 2017, for a total of 44, "to improve protection against North Korean and potential Iranian ICBM threats as they emerge."

The U.S. tests its ICBMs about twice every year. Earlier this month, the Air Force Global Strike Command test-launched an unarmed Minuteman III ICBM equipped with a single test re-entry vehicle from Vandenberg. The re-entry vehicle landed at Kwajalein Atoll.

"These test launches verify the accuracy and reliability of the ICBM weapon system, providing valuable data to ensure a continued safe, secure and effective nuclear deterrent," the Air Force Global Strike Command said in a statement.



An article by Suzanne Moore titled "Angela Merkel Shows How the Leader of the Free World Should Act" was posted at theguardian.com on May 29, 2017. Following is the article.

Angela Merkel—or "leader of the free world" as she is now to be known—did not wait long to see the back of Donald Trump before she made it clear that things have changed. She told a rally of 2,500 people in Munich where she kicked off her campaign to be re-elected that the EU must now be prepared to look after itself, that it could no longer depend on the UK or America.

"The times in which we could completely depend on others are, to a certain extent, over . . . I've experienced that in the last few days. We Europeans have to take fate into our own hands."

This is a truly dramatic statement from a leader who doesn't do drama. She is not going to be holding Trump's hand any time soon. He may be relieved to hear that, but then the underestimation of Merkel as a dowdy physicist has often allowed her to run rings around egotistical male leaders.

It was said to be a coincidence that she met Barack Obama the same day as Trump. It took a while for her to establish a friendship with Obama. She apparently disliked the "atmospherics" around him when he was first elected and wanted a more "conversational" relationship. She got it.

Watching her at the G7, her statesmanship, her ease, her ability to broker deals and relationships is ever more impressive. More and more I hear people say they that they like her. Even those on the left respect her though she is a centrist.

While Trump shambled around Europe with his goon display of ignorance of other languages, cultures or even basic manners, Merkel was in her element. While he was trailing behind in a golf cart as he lacked the stamina to actually walk anywhere at all, she strode out with the other leaders.

Every gif of Trump shows him vacantly bumbling away, arrogantly shoving or being batted away by Melania. Gifs of Merkel, on the other hand, are a delight: her bemused expression when she has to deal with him, that twinkle, that little shrug she gives. She is at the top of her game—a game he has no idea how to play.

Vladimir Putin knew she was afraid of dogs, so brought a labrador to meet her on 2007. She didn't flinch, later observing: "I understand why he has to do this—to prove he's a man . . . He's afraid of his own weakness." No wonder Emmanuel Macron pulled off that wonderful swerve last week walking straight to Trump but greeting Merkel first.

Of course not everyone likes her. The Irish, the Portuguese, the Greeks, the Spanish and the Italians have felt the force of her pushing through stark austerity measures as the price of EU membership. At one point Greek protesters portrayed her with a Hitler moustache.

Her expansionary politics, whereby every other country should seek to be as wealthy as Germany, have come at a huge price to countries she sees as fiscally irresponsible. Critics in Germany say she achieved a kind of "paralysed consent." They complain about the number of opinion polls she has commissioned and her methodical, scientific way of dealing with politics.

Yet this, in reality, is why Mutti is considered so good at crisis management. Theatrics don't interest her but there is a vision, a morality, a core to her that meant she could push through a policy of taking in refugees that required real guts.

Asked if she was a feminist while sitting next to Ivanka Trump, Ivanka immediately raised her hand to say she was, and Merkel, who has done so much for women, hesitated and then said: "If you think that I am one, go and vote on it." Friends say that she always considered herself emancipated by her studies and growing up in East Germany, where it was normal for women to work.

Her husband, professor of theoretical chemistry Joachim Sauer, needs no security. They lead an unshowy life. The pictures of Merkel nipping out for chips, ecstatic at the football, drinking beer, are not set up. It's what she does, though she no longer smokes or bites her nails to the quick in the way she did when she was younger. This all added to the geekiness that helped her to rise up through the party.

And look where she is now, unlike our prime minister, able to oppose Trump directly and to say his America is not a friend of Europe.

What an extraordinary woman. There are no problems, she says, only "tasks" to be solved, as she sits rapidly texting in meetings. Refusing to see herself as a female leader, she prefers to think of herself as part of a class of politi-

cal heavyweights. Increasingly she is in a class of her own and watching her, one thought comes to mind: this is what strong and stable actually looks like.



An article by Charlie Skelton titled "Bilderberg 2017: Secret Meeting of Global Leaders Could Prove a Problem for Trump" was posted at theguardian.com on June 1, 2017. Following is the article.

The storm around Donald Trump is about to shift a few miles west of the White House, to a conference centre in Chantilly, Virginia, where the embattled president will be getting his end-of-term grades from the people whose opinion really matters: Bilderberg.

The secretive three-day summit of the political and economic elite kicks off on Thursday in heavily guarded seclusion at the Westfields Marriott, a luxury hotel a short distance from the Oval Office. The hotel was already on lock-down on Wednesday, and an army of landscapers have been busy planting fir trees around the perimeter, to protect coy billionaires and bashful bank bosses from any prying lenses.

Perched ominously at the top of the conference agenda this year are these words: "The Trump administration: a progress report."

- Is the president going to be put in detention for tweeting in class?
- Held back a year?
- Or told to empty his locker and leave?
- If ever there's a place where a president could hear the words "you're fired!," it's Bilderberg.

The White House is taking no chances, sending along some big hitters from Team Trump to defend their boss: the national security adviser, HR McMaster; the commerce secretary, Wilbur Ross; and Trump's new strategist, Chris Liddell. Could the president himself show up to receive his report card in person?

Henry Kissinger, the gravel-throated kingpin of Bilderberg, visited Trump at the White House a few weeks ago to discuss "Russia and other things," and certainly, the Bilderberg conference would be the perfect opportunity for the most powerful man in the world to discuss important global issues with Trump.

The US president's extraordinary chiding of Nato leaders in Brussels is sure to be chewed over at Bilderberg, which takes its name from the hotel in the Netherlands where its conference first met in 1954.

The Bilderbergers have summoned the head of Nato, Jens Stoltenberg, to give feedback. Stoltenberg will leading the snappily titled session on "The transatlantic defence alliance: bullets, bytes and bucks." He'll be joined by the Dutch minister of defence and a clutch of senior European politicians and

party leaders, all hoping to reset the traumatised transatlantic relationship after Trump's galumphing visit.

The invitation list for this year's conference is a veritable covfefe of big-hitters from geopolitics, from the head of the IMF, Christine Lagarde, to the king of Holland, but perhaps the most significant name on the list is Cui Tiankai, China's ambassador to the US.

According to the meeting's agenda, "China" will be discussed at a summit attended by the Chinese ambassador, the US commerce secretary, the US national security adviser, two US senators, the governor of Virginia, two former CIA chiefs—and any number of giant US investors in the country, including the heads of the financial services firms the Carlyle Group and KKR. Oh, and the boss of Google.

Eric Schmidt, the executive chairman of Alphabet, Google's holding company, has just come back from a trip to Beijing, where he was overseeing Google AI's latest game of Go against puny humans. He declared it "a pleasure to be back in China, a country that I admire a great deal." Three days spent chatting to the Chinese ambassador certainly won't harm his ambitions there.

All this is the kind of thing that should be headline news, but with the president of Turner International attending, we can be fairly sure Bilderberg won't make many ripples at CNN. And British readers should not expect much coverage at the London Evening Standard either: their new editor and longtime Bilderberg attendee George Osborne is on the list, despite a general election looming in a week's time.

You could of course complain about a lack of press coverage of Bilderberg in the UK, but with the head of the media watchdog Ofcom at the conference, you may not get an immediate reply.

So will Trump be given his marching orders at Bilderberg, or will he be kept on as a useful doofus? There's a small but worrying clue for what Bilderberg might have in mind for Trump tucked away on the invitation list: one of the guests this year is the UK's former chief of the defence staff, Sir Nicholas Houghton. His new role? Constable of the Tower of London.



An article by Theresa Smith titled "Paris Treaty: Big Businesses Tell Trump to Stay In, Free-Market Groups Say Get Out" was posted at cnsnews.com on June 1, 2017. Following is the article.

The opinion of some of America's largest companies is at odds with free-market organizations over President Trump's eagerly awaited decision on the Paris Agreement on climate regulations.

Twenty-four CEOs of large companies sent a letter to President Trump yesterday urging him to “keep the United States in the Paris Agreement.” However, forty-four free-market organizations, such as the Heritage Foundation, the Eagle Forum, and the Competitive Enterprise Institute encouraged the president’s withdrawal in a letter sent on May 8:

■ “We, undersigned, write in enthusiastic support of your campaign commitments to withdraw fully from the Paris Climate Treaty and to stop all taxpayer funding of UN global warming programs.”

The big-business CEOs told the president that remaining in the Paris Agreement would support U.S. competition, grow the job market from clean energy technology, and reduce the risk of infrastructure damage from climate change.

On the other hand, the free-market organizations agreed with Trump when he campaigned that the Paris Agreement did not fit the vision for the U.S.:

“[We] agree that the treaty is not in the interest of the American people and the U.S. should therefore not be a party to it.”

The letter explained that the standards set up by the Obama administration set the bar too high for the U.S. and her industries. By 2020, America must “reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 17% below 2005 levels” and reduce emissions “to 28% below 2005 levels by 2025,” said the free-market organizations. These regulations pile on top of the other requirements of the Paris Agreement.

To meet these standards, the Obama administration set up several burdensome policies including rules for greenhouse gas emission for power plants, transportation, and other industries, said the free-market organizations. The letter referenced the “Clean Power” Plan and the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards.

This letter indicated that abolition of Obama’s Clean Power Plan would be difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish without withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. It said that Environmental pressure groups and state attorneys general are prepared to “block withdrawal of the ‘Clean Power’ Plan and other greenhouse gas rules” because they argue it cannot be done with the Paris Agreement in place.

“Failing to withdraw from Paris thus exposes key parts of your deregulatory energy agenda to unnecessary legal risk,” said the forty-four organizations.

Reducing the standards is not an option, according to the letter. It cited Article 4 Section 11 of the Agreement: “Section 11 states: ‘A Party may at any time adjust its existing nationally determined contribution with a view to enhancing its level of ambition’ (emphasis added).”

It also pointed out that the Paris Agreement standards increase every five years.

The free-market letter listed three options for the president to withdraw from the agreement, the first two options being preferred:

- Acknowledge the Senate’s constitutional authority to ratify treaties, and submit the Paris Agreement to the Senate and recommend “that the treaty not be ratified.”
- Withdraw from the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
- Simply withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

The letter said, “Of the three options listed . . . we think the first two are preferable to the third.”

Both letters conclude by claiming their course of action will benefit American interests and prosperity.



An article by Veronika Bondarenko titled “28 Major US Companies That Don’t Want Trump to Abandon the Paris Agreement” was posted at businessinsider.com on June 1, 2017. Following is the article.

With Donald Trump reportedly preparing to pull the US out of the Paris climate agreement, companies are speaking out—and saying that the American economy will suffer if he does.

In 2015, every country in the world except two signed the Paris agreement in a joint effort to combat the rising threat of global warming. Under former President Barack Obama, the US agreed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 26% to 28% for 2025.

Gap, Facebook, Google, Microsoft, Morgan Stanley, Mars, Adobe, and Apple are just some of the major companies that signed a letter to Trump asking him to keep the status quo. Over the last month, the letter appeared as full-page ads in the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and the New York Post.

“By strengthening global action over time, the agreement will reduce future climate impacts, including damage to business facilities and operations, declining agricultural productivity and water supplies, and disruption of global supply chains,” the letter states. It also argues that investing in various clean energy initiatives will generate jobs.

“A lot of US businesses are concerned about the potential trade ramifications of a US withdrawal,” Elliot Diringer, executive vice president of the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, the organization that sponsored the full-page ads, told Business Insider. “They think it’s important that the US remain in Paris to ensure them access to the growing clean energy markets around the world, and they see that a US withdrawal could hurt their access to those markets.”

While Exxon Mobil and ConocoPhillips did not participate in the ad campaign, leaders of both major oil producers have frequently said they oppose Trump’s plan to withdraw from Paris, arguing that it would leave the US out of negotiations on the state of fossil fuels.

During his time as CEO of Exxon Mobil, Trump's now Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said the company supported the agreement.

"At Exxon Mobil, we share the view that the risks of climate change are serious and warrant thoughtful action," Tillerson said at a speech in 2016. "Addressing these risks requires broad-based, practical solutions around the world."

In May, Tillerson signed a declaration with other Arctic nations agreeing that "the Arctic is warming at more than twice the rate of the global average, resulting in widespread social, environmental, and economic impacts in the Arctic and worldwide." He, along with Trump's economic adviser and former Goldman Sachs President Gary Cohn, have both encouraged Trump to stay in the accord.

Here is a list of companies that have urged Trump not to abandon the Paris agreement:

- Facebook
- Google
- Microsoft
- The Gap
- Exxon Mobil
- Conoco Phillips
- National Grid
- Apple
- Adobe
- Danfoss
- Levi Strauss & Co.
- Mars Incorporated
- Hewlett Packard Enterprise
- Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts
- Morgan Stanley
- Unilever
- Tiffany & Co
- Dignity Health
- Ingersoll Rand
- Intel Corporation
- PG&E Corporation

- Johnson Controls
- Royal DSM
- The Hartford
- Salesforce
- Schneider Electric
- VF Corporation



An article by Melanie Arter titled “Conservatives Applaud Trump for Keeping His Promise to Withdraw From Paris Climate Accord” was posted at cnsnews.com on June 1, 2017. Following is the article.

President Donald Trump’s decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Accord on Thursday was praised by conservatives for keeping the promise he made on the campaign trail.

“Tea Party Patriots thanks President Donald Trump for continuing to keep the promises he made during the campaign by announcing the United States will withdraw from the Paris Accord, which is a drag on our economy and a bad deal for American workers,” Jenny Beth Martin, president and co-founder of Tea Party Patriots said in a statement.

“Once again, President Trump has continued to keep his word to the American people both on specific initiatives like the Paris Accord and his broader promise to put our citizens and America first,” she said.

As CNSNews.com reported, the president announced Thursday his decision to withdraw from the agreement, saying it hamstringing the U.S. economy and its workers and gives an unfair economic advantage to foreign countries, like China and India, who aren’t held to the same standards.

“For example, under the agreement, China will be able to increase these emissions by a staggering number of years—13. They can do whatever they want for 13 years—not us,” he said. “India makes its participation contingent on receiving billions and billions and billions of dollars in foreign aid from developed countries. There are many other examples, but the bottom line is that the Paris Accord is very unfair at the highest level to the United States.”

Ken Blackwell, former Ohio secretary of state and former member of the Trump presidential transition team, who is currently a board member of the National Taxpayers Union, also praised the president for putting “America’s interests first.”

“The Paris climate agreement was a bad deal negotiated by the Obama administration, which would cost American jobs and economic growth, while requiring little of the countries who are causing the most pollution,” Blackwell said.

"Through free market innovation, the US is already making great strides in reducing emissions, while providing affordable energy to our citizens. The last thing we need is another meaningless international agreement where the US makes all the sacrifices and carrying the cost of other nations, with little actual impact on the climate," he added.

The Club for Growth applauded the president's decision, saying, "For far too long the Obama Administration allowed foreign governments and alarmist environmentalists to dictate, not only climate change policy, but worse our nation's economic policy."

"President Trump's decision sends a strong message to the environmentalist movement: no longer will the United States be strong armed by their scare tactics intended to harm our economy and inhibit economic growth," said Club for Growth President David McIntosh.

"With this announcement, President Trump takes a significant step toward putting American taxpayers and businesses back in the driver's seat. We encourage the President to continue to take actions that will unleash economic growth and create more American jobs and opportunities," McIntosh added.



An article by Melanie Arter titled "Liberals Pan Trump's Climate Accord Decision: 'One of the Most Ignorant and Dangerous Actions Ever Taken by Any President' " was posted at cnsnews.com on June 1, 2017. Following is the article.

Liberal groups like the Sierra Club, immediately panned President Donald Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Accord, calling it "one of the most ignorant and dangerous" actions any president can take.

"Generations from now, Americans will look back at Donald Trump's decision to leave the Paris Agreement as one of the most ignorant and dangerous actions ever taken by any President," Sierra Club Executive Director Michael Brune said in a statement.

"Trump's decision to ignore the vast majority of the American public and the scientific community will harm our country, costing us lives, jobs and our role as a world leader. Trump has isolated our country on the world stage, ceding our leadership position and our economic advantage on clean energy to India and China, and justifying it all by chanting a slogan from a baseball hat," Brune said.

As CNSNews.com reported, Trump announced Thursday that the accord hurts the U.S. economy and amounts to a redistribution of wealth to other countries.

He said even the U.S. and other countries fully complied with the Paris Agreement, it's estimated to result in only two-tenths of one degree Celsius reduction in global temperature by the year 2100. Furthermore, just two weeks of China's emissions would "wipe out the gains" made from the U.S.

"It's hard to overstate the negative consequences at home and abroad of this foolish, self-destructive move that will only help boost profits for few of the worst polluters while risking the health of our families and communities. Future scholars will search in vain to find a President with this level of disdain for reality and the future of humanity," Brune said.

"American climate advocates have a message for the world: we aren't waiting around for Donald Trump to pull his head out of the sand, and neither should you. The Paris Agreement is the collective achievement of leaders around the world, and it cannot and will not be derailed by the ignorance of one man whose term of office is highly uncertain," Brune added.

The NAACP, meanwhile, called the president's decision "a rejection of the undeniable science that has proven climate change exists."

Leon Russell, chairman of the NAACP's board of directors, said the decision "will send our nation and our planet down a path that will only lead to catastrophic destruction."

"In these dark times, one thing is for certain: the United States may be out of the Paris Agreement, but the NAACP is going to be all in for equity and our environment, now more than ever before," said Leon W. Russell, chairman of the Board of Directors.

"The NAACP asserts that anything less than a 100-percent commitment of adherence to the Paris Agreement is a flagrant and callous disregard of the urgent mandate to protect our people, and our planet," said Jacqueline Patterson, director of the NAACP's Environmental and Climate Justice Program.

She said poor black neighborhoods will be "among the most affected by exiting the Paris Agreement."

"Increased carbon dioxide emissions can cause extreme and unprecedented weather conditions, which can potentially devastate communities as we saw during Hurricane Katrina. The United States is the world's second-largest emitter of carbon dioxide emissions, only behind China," Patterson said.

"Our country should be showing model leadership and ending the politicization of climate change, rather than continuing to turn its back on African-Americans in the name of corporate greed and dependence on fossil fuels," she added.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled "Press Barking (Mad) Up the Wrong Tree" was posted at townhall.com on May 31, 2017. Following is the article.

The American media are so obsessed with their own Russian collusion story that they can't see the possibility of actual corruption right in front of their noses. It's gotten to the point that Trump could start shooting reporters on

the White House lawn and *The New York Times*' headline would be: In Trump's New Tack, Echoes of Russia.

In fairness to the media, this is all part of the liberal proclivity to embrace any conspiracy theory under the right conditions. There are random conservatives who might believe nutty things from time to time, but conspiracy-mongering is a plant that doesn't fully bloom except in the soil of liberalism.

The psychoanalyst Erich Fromm argued that because freedom is terrifying, one way to escape the anxiety is to have a strong belief system, providing a central magnet for all the metal filings to coalesce around.

Liberals have no strong belief systems, only base impulses. This is why their passions must be corralled into conspiracy theories, to bring conformity to their lives. They hate Trump, so everything he does must be on orders from Moscow.

- Meanwhile, it is a known fact that the FBI is looking at Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner.
- It is a known fact that the Kushner family has used its connections to President Trump to drum up Chinese investors for the family's real estate portfolio.
- It is a known fact that Jared is looking for investors in his 666 Fifth Avenue building, which is underwater.
- It is a known fact that Jared met with the Russian ambassador—as well as a representative of a state-owned Russian bank—during the transition.
- It is a known fact that he neglected to mention those meetings on his security clearance forms.

All of this is probably perfectly aboveboard. But if you weren't insane, the blindingly obvious question would be: Why did Kushner meet with the head of a state-controlled Russian bank?

That's not what our media want to know! Reporters see all those facts, put 2 and 2 together and ask: How does this advance the narrative that Russia colluded with the Trump campaign to steal the election from Hillary?

This is why the press blared alarmist headlines about Kushner's attempt to set up a "back channel" with Russia, a fact as important and disturbing as the square footage of Jared's office.

Liberals are desperate for anything sneaky with Russia because, unfortunately, there is still neither a coherent theory, nor any evidence, of Russian collusion with the Trump campaign to sway the election.

The argument is that Russia hacked John Podesta's emails and turned them over to Wikileaks in order to reveal to American voters that the Democratic National Committee . . . conspired against Bernie Sanders! And that would have swung the election against Hillary because—well, actually, there's no theory on how it was supposed to work, exactly, but liberals believe that trained Russian spymasters thought it was a capital idea.

Buttressing this crackpot theory, there is, helpfully, zero evidence. Despite the FBI investigating alleged Russian collusion for nearly one year now, there's still not a speck of evidence that Russia colluded with the Trump campaign, only insinuations and dramatic headlines.

The FBI itself never investigated the DNC email leaks, but outsourced review of the Democrats' servers to a cyber-security firm hired by the DNC. It raised no red flags with our Jacques Clouseau-like FBI that the DNC's chosen investigator, CrowdStrike, is affiliated with a fanatically anti-Russian Ukrainian billionaire.

CrowdStrike's smoking gun proving a Russian plot to elect Trump was the fact that the malware program used against the DNC was identical to a malware program used by the Russians to disable 80 percent of Ukraine's howitzers in its war with Russian separatists in 2014.

Except then it turned out that: a) Russia isn't the only hacker with that malware; b) Ukraine's howitzers hadn't, in fact, been disabled; and c) Ukraine's howitzer app had never even been hacked.

Other cyber-security firms scoffed at CrowdStrike's report, explaining that the "Fancy Bear" malware allegedly found in the DNC hacks may have originated with Russia, but once Russia had used it, every hacker had it. As cyber-security expert Jeffrey Carr explained to *The Miami Herald*, malware isn't "a bomb or an artillery shell. (It) doesn't detonate on impact and destroy itself."

The study cited by CrowdStrike for its claim about the Ukrainian howitzers was written by the International Institute for Strategic Studies. But IISS has since explained that CrowdStrike misunderstood its report. True, Ukraine's supply of howitzers was depleted. But that reduction occurred years earlier and had nothing to do with Russia.

Technical experts with Ukraine's military further denied that their artillery app had ever been hacked, at all.

Weirdly, liberals cite the very absence of evidence to say: That's why we need an investigation!

As long as we're calling for investigations of any kook theory, how about an independent commission to investigate whether Sen. Chuck Schumer is a child molester? Schumer was Anthony Weiner's mentor, which is already more evidence than the media have for their Russian collusion story.

True, I don't have proof that Schumer is a child molester, but I just started this investigation! Was there collusion between Schumer and Weiner in the selection of the underage girl Weiner sexted with? Neither man has yet issued a full and convincing denial.

Obviously, the point of an independent investigation isn't to find any actual wrongdoing. It's to hurt Trump. But if that's your objective, American media, as loath as I am to give you helpful suggestions, the wafer-thin evidence that exists all points to Kushner, not collusion.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Overpopulation Hoax" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on May 31, 2017. Following is the article.

In 1798, Thomas Malthus wrote "An Essay on the Principle of Population." He predicted that mankind's birthrate would outstrip our ability to grow food and would lead to mass starvation.

Malthus' wrong predictions did not deter Stanford University professor Paul Ehrlich from making a similar prediction.

In his 1968 best-seller, *The Population Bomb*, which has sold more than 2 million copies, Ehrlich warned: "The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970s and 1980s hundreds of millions of people will starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now."

This hoax resulted in billions of dollars being spent to fight overpopulation.

According to the standard understanding of the term, human overpopulation occurs when the ecological footprint of a human population in a specific geographical location exceeds the carrying capacity of the place occupied by that group.

Let's look at one aspect of that description—namely, population density. Let's put you, the reader, to a test. See whether you can tell which country is richer and which is poorer just by knowing two countries' population density.

North Korea's population density is 518 people per square mile, whereas South Korea's is more than double that, at 1,261 people per square mile. Hong Kong's population density is 16,444, whereas Somalia's is 36. Congo has 75 people per square mile, whereas Singapore has 18,513.

Looking at the gross domestic products of these countries, one would have to be a lunatic to believe that smaller population density leads to greater riches. Here are some GDP data expressed in millions of U.S. dollars: North Korea (\$17,396), South Korea (\$1,411,246), Hong Kong (\$320,668), Somalia (\$5,707), Congo (\$41,615) and Singapore (\$296,967).

The overpopulation hoax has led to horrible population control programs. The United Nations Population Fund has helped governments deny women the right to choose the number and spacing of their children.

Overpopulation concerns led China to enact a brutal one-child policy.

Forced sterilization is a method of population control in some countries.

Nearly a quarter-million Peruvian women were sterilized.

Our government, through the U.N. Population Fund, is involved in "population moderation" programs around the world, including in India, Bangladesh,

Pakistan, Nigeria, Mexico, Indonesia, Brazil, the Philippines, Thailand, Egypt, Turkey, Ethiopia and Colombia.

The entire premise behind population control is based on the faulty logic that humans are not valuable resources. The fact of business is that humans are what the late Julian L. Simon called the ultimate resource.

That fact becomes apparent by pondering this question: Why is it that Gen. George Washington did not have cellphones to communicate with his troops and rocket launchers to sink British ships anchored in New York Harbor?

Surely, all of the physical resources—such as aluminum alloys, copper, iron ore and chemical propellants—necessary to build cellphones and rocket launchers were around during Washington’s time. In fact, they were around at the time of the cave man. There is only one answer for why cellphones, rocket launchers and millions of other things are around today but were not around yesteryear.

The growth in human knowledge, human ingenuity, job specialization and trade led to industrialization, which, coupled with personal liberty and private property rights, made it possible. Human beings are valuable resources, and the more we have of them the better.

The greatest threat to mankind’s prosperity is government, not population growth. For example, Zimbabwe was agriculturally rich but, with government interference, was reduced to the brink of mass starvation. Any country faced with massive government interference can be brought to starvation.

Blaming poverty on overpopulation not only lets governments off the hook but also encourages the enactment of harmful, inhumane policies.

Today’s poverty has little to do with overpopulation. The most commonly held characteristics of non-poor countries are greater personal liberty, private property rights, the rule of law and an economic system closer to capitalism than to communism. That’s the recipe for prosperity.



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled “A Conservative Mom Breaks the Pot Taboo” was posted at townhall.com on May 31, 2017. Following is the article.

Let’s talk about marijuana.

Specifically, let’s talk about how and why I came to be one of the countless parents across America (and around the world) who have let their chronically ill children try it.

A groundbreaking new study published last week in the New England Journal of Medicine reported on the health benefits of cannabidiol for children with epilepsy. The randomized, double-blind, controlled study found that among children with Dravet syndrome taking cannabidiol, the decrease in the fre-

quency of convulsive seizures was 23 percentage points greater than the decrease in seizures among children taking a placebo.

Cannabidiol is one of hundreds of chemical components found in cannabis plants. Unlike THC, the most famous of marijuana's compounds, CBD is non-hallucinogenic and nonaddictive. It doesn't make you high. CBD can be extracted from hemp and sold as an oil.

That's what the pioneering Stanley Brothers of Boulder, Colorado, did several years ago when they conceived and manufactured "Charlotte's Web"—named after Charlotte Figi, a Colorado Springs girl with Dravet syndrome whose seizures dramatically decreased after using CBD.

Until now, evidence of marijuana's benefits for pediatric epilepsy patients has been largely anecdotal. The new CBD study, led by researchers at the NYU Langone's Comprehensive Epilepsy Center, is a hugely significant development because it uses the scientific gold standard of a randomized controlled trial.

Other limited clinical trials involving CBD have explored the drug's therapeutic benefits for pediatric patients with conditions ranging from anxiety to movement disorders to inflammatory diseases, multiple sclerosis and cancer.

My own interest in pediatric use of medicinal marijuana is more than academic.

When my daughter, Veronica, fell ill in late spring of 2015—unable to breathe normally, bedridden with chronic pain and fatigue—she saw dozens of specialists. Among those doctors was a leading neurologist at one of Denver's most well-regarded hospitals who treated intractable cases. The various drugs prescribed to my daughter weren't working and had awful side effects.

One of them, a potent anti-epileptic drug called Trileptal, was supposed to treat the severe motor tic that left her gasping for air nonstop for months. But Trileptal ended up causing extreme loss of appetite, more fatigue and temporary dystonia, while doing nothing to alleviate the tics. The constant jerking of her body caused one of my daughter's hypermobile shoulders to dislocate multiple times a day—increasing her pain and anxiety.

To our surprise, the mainstream neurologist suggested Veronica try CBD. This doctor had other young patients who used CBD oil with positive results, but she could not directly prescribe it because of her hospital affiliation. So we did our own independent research, talked to a Colorado Springs family whose son had great success using CBD to treat his Crohn's disease symptoms, consulted with other medical professionals and friends—and entered a whole new world.

Two physicians signed off on our daughter's application for a medical marijuana card. She became one of more than 360 children under 18 to join Colorado's medical marijuana registry in 2015.

And we became pediatric pot parents.

For Veronica, CBD provided more relief than all the other mainstream pharmaceutical interventions she had endured, and without the scary side effects.

But ultimately, it was a temporary remedy for her complicated basket of neurological and physiological conditions. We were glad for the chance to try CBD at the recommendation of medical professionals, and glad that so many other families are having success with it.

Our experience showed us the importance of increasing therapeutic choices in the marketplace for all families—and trusting doctors and patients to figure out what works best.

It flies in the face of current science to classify CBD oil as a Schedule I drug, as the feds did at the end of 2016. Nor does it make sense to draw the line at CBD if some patients and doctors believe that the benefits of using THC therapeutically outweigh the potential harm.

As a lifelong social conservative, my views on marijuana policy may surprise some of you.

I used to be a table-pounding crusader for the government's war on drugs. When I worked in Seattle in the 1990s, I initially opposed efforts to legalize medical marijuana. I also opposed efforts to loosen restrictions on conducting studies on the potential therapeutic effects of using marijuana.

But the war on drugs has been a ghastly quagmire—an expensive and selective form of government paternalism that has done far more harm than good. What has this trillion-dollar war wrought?

Overcrowded jails teeming with nonviolent drug offenders. An expanded police state enriched by civil asset forfeiture. And marginalization of medical researchers pursuing legitimate research on marijuana's possible therapeutic benefits for patients with a wide variety of illnesses.

The Trump administration has sent mixed signals on a medical marijuana crackdown.

So let me be clear as a liberty-loving, conservative mom: Keep your hands off. Let the scientists lead. Limited government is the best medicine.



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.”