

Eye on the World

Feb. 3, 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 Feb. 3, 2018.

Compiled by Dave Havir

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



A Reuters article by Matt Spetalnick titled “U.S. Says Syria May Be Developing New Types of Chemical Weapons” was posted at reuters.com on Feb. 1, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

The Syrian government may be developing new types of chemical weapons, and U.S. President Donald Trump is prepared to consider further military action if necessary to deter chemical attacks, senior U.S. officials said on Thursday.

President Bashar al-Assad is believed to have secretly kept part of Syria’s chemical weapons stockpile despite a U.S.-Russian deal under which Damascus was supposed to have handed over all such weapons for destruction in 2014, the officials said.

Assad’s forces have instead “evolved” their chemical weapons and made continued occasional use of them in smaller amounts since a deadly attack last April that drew a U.S. missile strike on a Syrian air base, the officials told reporters in a briefing.

Characteristics of some of those recent attacks suggest that Syria may be developing new weapons and methods for delivering poison chemicals, possibly to make it harder to trace their origin, the officials said, speaking on condition of anonymity, but they declined to provide specifics.

A deadly sarin attack on a rebel-held area in April prompted Trump to order a missile strike last year on the Shayrat air base, from which the Syrian operation is said to have been launched.

"We reserve the right to use military force to prevent or deter the use of chemical weapons," one official said, while declining to specify how serious a chemical attack would have to be to draw a fresh U.S. military response.

A second official said, however, that the Trump administration hopes that stepped-up international sanctions and diplomatic pressure will help rein in Assad's chemical weapons program.

If the international community does not act quickly to tighten the screws on Assad, Syria's chemical weapons could spread beyond its borders and possibly even "to U.S. shores," the second official said.

"It will spread if we don't do something," the official warned.

The officials echoed U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson's recent accusation that Russia, Assad's ally in Syria's multi-sided civil war, bears some responsibility for failing to enforce the chemical weapons ban.

Russia has denied any complicity, and the Syrian government has said it has not carried out any of the attacks.

The U.S. officials suggested that if left unchecked there would be more smaller chemical attacks as an "instrument of terror" to compensate for Assad's lack of adequate manpower to retake some opposition-held areas.

"They think they can get away with it if they keep it under a certain level," an official said.



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "CAIR Slams Trump's Move to Keep Gitmo Open; 'Exclusively Muslim-Populated Military Prison' " was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 1, 2018. Following is the article.

The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) is unhappy about President Trump's executive order keeping open indefinitely the terrorist detention facility—or as CAIR describes it, "the illegal, exclusively Muslim-populated military prison"—at Guantánamo Bay.

Trump's order, signed just before he delivered his State of the Union address and announced in the speech, allows for the possibility that the center—where 41 men are still being held—could see newcomers, a decade after the last known arrival in March 2008.

"The United States may transport additional detainees to U.S. Naval Station Guantánamo Bay when lawful and necessary to protect the Nation," the order states.

"We condemn President Trump's order to keep the illegal, exclusively Muslim-populated military prison in Guantánamo Bay open," the director of CAIR's government affairs department, Robert McCaw, said in a statement.

"Reports of abuse and a lack of due process at Guantánamo have tarnished our nation's image in the international community and diminished our moral authority to prosecute suspected terrorists in U.S. custody."

CAIR advocates for the detention center to be shut down and for the remaining detainees to be released or put on trial in civilian courts.

"Guantánamo subverts the criminal justice system by not giving the 41 men detained there due process and their day in court. Those determined to be innocent should be released and sent back to their families," said McCaw.

"The accused should be given a fair trial, consistent with our nation's constitutional values. Only the guilty should be sentenced, providing closure to their victims. Moreover, our government should not prolong the imprisonment of detainees already cleared for release."

(Of the 41 remaining detainees, five cleared by the Obama administration for transfer to their home countries or third countries remain at the facility, according to human rights monitors.)

In his address on Tuesday night, Trump said when possible, the U.S. has no choice but to "annihilate" terrorists—but that "when necessary, we must be able to detain and question them."

Trump said terrorists were not just criminals, but unlawful enemy combatants. When they are captured abroad, he said, they "should be treated like the terrorists they are."

He criticized previous administrations for "foolishly" releasing hundreds of dangerous terrorists—including ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. (Baghdadi was not held at Guantánamo Bay, but was imprisoned by U.S. forces in Iraq in 2005. He was held at the U.S. military-run Camp Bucca in southern Iraq, but was later released.)

Trump then announced that just before the speech he had directed Defense Secretary James Mattis "to re-examine our military detention policy and to keep open the detention facilities in Guantánamo Bay."

'Legal, safe, humane'

President Obama came into office promising to close the detention center and although almost 200 detainees were allowed to leave during his tenure—mostly repatriated or resettled in third countries willing to take them—he was unable to keep the pledge due mostly to opposition in Congress. By the time he left the White House there were still 41 detainees being held.

Before Obama took office, more than 500 detainees had been transferred out during the administration of President George W. Bush, which established the facility in 2002, following the al-Qaeda terrorist attack on the U.S. the previous fall.

In his executive order, Trump notes that the U.S. remains in conflict with al-Qaeda and the Taliban, "and associated forces, including with the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria."

The order describes the detention operations as "legal, safe, humane, and conducted consistent with United States and international law."

"Those operations are continuing given that a number of the remaining individuals at the detention facility are being prosecuted in military commissions, while others must be detained to protect against continuing, significant threats to the security of the United States, as determined by periodic reviews," it says.

"Given that some of the current detainee population represent the most difficult and dangerous cases from among those historically detained at the facility, there is significant reason for concern regarding their reengagement in hostilities should they have the opportunity."

Support for the president's decision came from John Bolton, who served as the Bush administration's top arms control official and as ambassador to the United Nations.

"There was no better manifestation of the president's commitment to winning the 'long war' than his unequivocal statement that our terrorist prison at Guantánamo Bay would remain open," Bolton wrote in an op-ed on the State of the Union.

"Trump thereby emphatically rejected the Clinton and Obama administrations' 'law enforcement' paradigm for handling terrorism, and embraced the 'war paradigm,' which brings into play a different mind set, different national powers and different legal authorities and constraints."



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled " Hamas Cries Foul After US Designates Its Leader As 'Global Terrorist' " was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 1, 2018. Following is the article.

The Trump administration has designated the leader of Hamas, Ismail Haniyeh, as a "specially designated global terrorist" (SDGT), targeting the head of a violent Palestinian group that has been trying to clean up its image.

Hamas called the move a "dangerous violation of international law" and said it would not deter the group from "liberating its land and holy places."

Specially designated global terrorist designation takes place under executive order 13224, a post-9/11 tool designed to disrupt funding to terrorists. Americans are prohibited from engaging in transactions with SDGTs, and any assets they may have in the U.S. are frozen.

Haniyeh's designation was first announced Wednesday by Nathan Sales, the State Department's coordinator for counterterrorism, while addressing a conference of the Institute for National Security Studies in Tel Aviv.

"Haniyeh is the president of Hamas' political bureau," he said. "He's also closely tied to the group's terrorist operations, including attacks on Israel citizens. Haniyeh has been a member of Hamas since the 1980s and he rose through the ranks in large part by continually championing terrorism against Israel."

Sales noted that as recently as last month, Haniyeh called for a new uprising (*intifada*) against Israel. Haniyeh issued the call after President Trump recognized Jerusalem as Israel's capital.

"His calls for a renewed *intifada* just last month underscore how important today's designation is," Sales said.

"We will not be distracted by Hamas' efforts to obscure its true and bloody nature."

Last year, the terrorist group—an offshoot of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and a beneficiary of Iranian and Turkish support—launched a new political program in a bid to improve its international image.

Many media outlets at the time noted favorably that the document drew a distinction between Jews and "Zionists" as the enemy—a supposed concession since Hamas' 1988 founding charter refers repeatedly to Jews as the enemy.

Some media also reported that Hamas had dropped longstanding calls for Israel's destruction, although the document in fact explicitly endorsed "armed resistance" to "liberate" what Hamas calls all of Palestine.

"Hamas rejects any alternative to the full and complete liberation of Palestine, from the [Jordan] river to the [Mediterranean] sea," it said, referring to territory that encompasses all of Israel as well as the disputed territories.

'American bias'

Responding to Wednesday's designation of Haniyeh, Hamas spokesman Fawzi Barhoum said the move was further proof of "American bias" toward Israel, providing "cover" for Israeli crimes and encouraging the targeting of the "symbols" of the Palestinian people.

Barhoum also called the decision a "dangerous violation of international law" under which, he said, the Palestinians have "the right to defend themselves and to resist the occupation and to choose their leadership."

He said Hamas believes the timing of the U.S. move shows that it is trying to combat Hamas' leadership as it works to "abort" Trump's yet-to-be-unveiled "deal of the century" Middle East peace plan.

Hamas has been a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization since 1997 and an SDGT since 2001. It seized control of the Gaza Strip from Mahmoud Abbas' Fatah organization a decade ago. (Hamas and Fatah have negotiated numerous "unity" agreements over the years since, most recently late last year.)

Haniyeh, formerly Hamas' "prime minister" in Gaza, succeeded Khaled Meshaal as the group's overall leader ("president of the political bureau") last year.

The State Department said in a statement later Wednesday that Haniyeh "has close links with Hamas' military wing and has been a proponent of armed struggle, including against civilians."

Hamas's "armed struggle" has over the years taken the form of suicide bombings, shootings, stabbings and rocket attacks from Gaza that have left hundreds of Israelis dead. Americans are among its victims too—at least 17, according to the State Department.

According to the House Oversight subcommittee on national security, as of early 2016, at least 64 Americans had been killed by Palestinian terrorists since the Oslo Accords were signed in 1993.

Although that count covers victims of all Palestinian terror groups, Hamas has been the most violent since Oslo. Attacks included suicide bombings through the second half of the 1990s and the early years of this century, with targets including restaurants, buses and a university cafeteria.

The State Department on Wednesday also announced SDGT designation for three relatively new terrorist groups operating in the region.

They are Harakat al-Sabireen, an Iranian-backed group formed in Gaza in 2014; and Liwa al Thawra and Harakat Sawa'd Misr (HASM), two Muslim Brotherhood offshoots formed in Egypt in 2016 and 2015, and held responsible for attacks including bombings and assassinations.



An article by Rebecca Hagelin titled "Working to End Black Genocide " was posted at townhall.com on Jan. 28, 2018. Following is the article.

Have you heard about the heroic efforts of the man who is working to save the lives of black children in our inner cities?

Or how he destroyed a project by American elitists who used our tax dollars to kill children of indigent people in African countries?

You must have heard of him. Of course, you have.

The mass media relentlessly attack him because he threatens the false narrative they have been spewing for years—that America is an awful country. So they call him a racist, in hopes that you will hate him too.

The radical feminists hate him because he threatens their "right" to base decisions about who lives or dies strictly on what is convenient for them. So they call him a sexist, in hopes that you will hate him too.

Who fights fearlessly for the most vulnerable among us, undaunted by the relentless lies of those who seek to destroy him?

President Donald Trump. And most Americans will never know it.

But the fact remains that in one year, Mr. Trump has done more than any other president in the last 50 years to save the lives of black children. He has done more than any other president in history to end the American holocaust that is abortion. He seeks to end this blight on our nation, which has snuffed out the lives of 60 million children thus far, a disproportionate number of whom are black babies.

The architect of the abortion industry, Planned Parenthood's racist founder Margaret Sanger, envisioned abortion as the means to control an "ignorant" and "unfit" population. She called it the "Negro Project," which centered on shaming or forcing black women into sterilization and abortions.

Planned Parenthood has succeeded in active American genocide: Today, approximately one in every two black pregnancies will result in the death of a baby through abortion. (Visit blackgenocide.org for the dreadful statistics.)

Alveda King, the niece of Martin Luther King, has been a tireless voice exposing Planned Parenthood's continued mass execution of black babies. In her current work through "Civil Rights for the Unborn," Ms. King reveals that abortion is the No. 1 killer of African Americans. She notes that "abortion mills are in predominantly black communities." Indeed, more than 70 percent of abortion clinics are located in minority neighborhoods.

In her efforts to expose and end the worst racism imaginable, Ms. King has found a great ally in President Trump.

In proclaiming Jan 22 as National Sanctity of Human Life Day, the president spoke from his heart: "Today, we focus our attention on the love and protection each person, born and unborn, deserves regardless of disability, gender, appearance, or ethnicity."

"Much of the greatest suffering in our nation's history, and indeed, our planet's history, has been the result of disgracefully misguided attempts to dehumanize whole classes of people based on these immutable characteristics," he said. "We cannot let this shameful history repeat itself in new forms, and we must be particularly vigilant to safeguard the most vulnerable lives among us."

The president went on to say, "This is why we observe National Sanctity of Human Life Day—to affirm the truth that all life is sacred, that every person has worth and that no class of people should ever be discarded as 'non-human.'"

The president's decisive actions match his words. During his first week in office, he put an end to taxpayer funds being used under the guise of "foreign aid" to fund or promote abortions in other countries. He later championed and signed into law legislation allowing states to defund abortion service providers, including Planned Parenthood.

The president seeks passage of the Pain Capable Bill, which would end late-term abortions nationwide. He is a champion of policies that protect those in the medical community from being forced to participate in abortions against their conscience.

President Trump's first year also is marked by his commitment to overturn *Roe v. Wade* through his appointment of Justice Neil Gorsuch to the U.S. Supreme Court.

In his address to those gathered for the March for Life, our president promised, "Under my administration, we will always defend the very first right in the Declaration of Independence. And that is 'the right to Life.'"

So the next time you hear people call Donald Trump a racist, ask them if they support his efforts to end the genocide taking place in our black communities.

Their silence might just reveal the real racists among us.



An article by Dennis Prager titled "3 Reasons the Left Wants Evermore Immigrants" was posted at townhall.com on Jan. 30, 2018. Following is the article.

On one thing we can all agree: The left wants more and more immigrants—including immigrants who enter or are in the country illegally—to come to America and become American citizens.

The question is, why?

■ The first and most obvious reason is political.

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, chain migration, sanctuary cities and citizenship for immigrants living in the country illegally will give the left political power. An estimated 70 to 80 percent of Latin American immigrants will vote Democrat. So, with enough new voters from Latin America alone, the Democrats would essentially be assured the presidency and Congress for decades.

Conservatives and Republicans fool themselves when they argue that Latin Americans are "social conservatives" because they oppose abortion and support a strong nuclear family. Even to the extent that those statements are true—and regarding the second claim, it is worth noting that Latinos have the third-highest percentage of births to unwed women in America—those arguments are irrelevant. Latin Americans are overwhelmingly on the political left, and they vote accordingly. Think about the Latin American Pope Francis' beliefs about big government, small militaries and the social welfare state, and his contempt for capitalism ("terrorism against all humanity")—and you know how the vast majority of Latin Americans think.

What is likely to change Latino immigrants' leftism? America's public schools and universities? The Spanish-language media? The compelling outreach to them by the Republican Party?

Moreover, the Democrats don't believe they have to compromise with a Republican president or a Republican Congress on immigration policy. They are confident they will gain control of the Senate and, quite possibly, the House this year; and they believe they will win the presidency in 2020. So, why compromise?

■ The second reason for the left's support for virtually unlimited immigration is that one of the most enduring tenets of the left—from Karl Marx to the present-day Democratic Party and left-wing parties in Western Europe—is that the nation-state is an anachronism.

The American left doesn't believe in America, just as the English left doesn't believe in England. That's why the American left supported the football players who refused to stand for the national anthem. For the left, reverence for the national anthem and the flag is a pathetic "patriotism" celebrated by the simple-minded and the deplorable.

Marx's "Communist Manifesto" ends with an appeal to class solidarity, not national solidarity: "Proletariat of the world unite; you have nothing to lose but your chains." The left has never divided the world by nation-states but by economic classes. In its view, the German, Korean and American working classes have everything in common, but these workers have nothing in common with fellow Germans, Koreans and Americans who are not working-class.

Thus, virtually all communist genocides—and virtually every major genocide of the 20th century was a communist genocide—did not entail the mass murder of another nationality. Communist Chairman Mao Zedong killed between 60 and 80 million people—millions of his fellow Chinese. Cambodian leader Pol Pot murdered nearly a quarter of his fellow Cambodians. Soviet leader Josef Stalin murdered about 20 million of his fellow Russians and deliberately starved 4 million Ukrainians—because of their class (the "kulaks": peasants who owned land or even just some cows).

That's why the left opposes a wall at America's southern border. The wall signifies the affirmation of America as a distinct nation.

■ The third reason is the power of feeling good about oneself.

It would be difficult to overstate the significance of feeling good about oneself as a primary factor in why people adopt left-wing policies.

Those who support bestowing American citizenship on the children of illegal immigrants—the so-called "Dreamers," based on never-passed proposals in Congress called the DREAM Act—feel very good about themselves. They are the compassionate, the progressive, the enlightened.

This is why German Chancellor Angela Merkel brought a million refugees into Germany, a majority of them Middle East Muslims: She wanted to feel good about herself and Germany—especially in light of Germany's evil history—"Look, world. We Germans really are good people."

Why do Democrats support sanctuary cities, and even sanctuary states? Because, in addition to first two reasons, it enables them to feel good about

themselves. In their eyes, they are moral heroes protecting the stranger, the oppressed, the marginalized, the destitute.

If any one of these reasons accurately describes the left's attitude toward America and immigration, America is headed for trouble. If all three are accurate, America is headed for an existential crisis.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Immigration Lies and Hypocrisy" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Jan. 31, 2018. Following is the article.

President Donald Trump reportedly asked why the U.S. is "having all these people from s-hole countries come here." I think he could have used better language, but it's a question that should be asked and answered. I have a few questions for my fellow Americans to consider.

How many Norwegians have illegally entered our nation, committed crimes and burdened our prison and welfare systems?

I might ask the same question about Finnish, Swedish, Welsh, Icelanders, Greenlanders and New Zealanders.

The bulk of our immigration problem is with people who enter our country criminally from Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean, Africa and the Middle East.

It's illegal immigrants from those countries who have committed crimes and burdened our criminal justice and welfare systems. A large number of immigrants who are here illegally—perhaps the majority are law-abiding in other respects—have fled oppressive, brutal and corrupt regimes to seek a better life in America.

In the debate about illegal immigration, there are questions that are not explicitly asked but can be answered with a straight "yes" or "no": Does everyone in the world have a right to live in the U.S.? Do Americans have a right to decide who and under what conditions a person may enter our country? Should we permit foreigners landing at our airports to ignore U.S. border control laws just as some ignore our laws at our southern border? The reason those questions are not asked is that one would be deemed an idiot for saying that everyone in the world has a right to live in our country, that Americans don't have a right to decide who lives in our country and that foreigners landing at our airports have a right to just ignore U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents.

Immigration today, even when legal, is different from the immigration of yesteryear. People who came here in the 19th century and most of the 20th century came here to learn our language, learn our customs and become Americans. Years ago, there was a guarantee that immigrants came here to work, because there was no welfare system; they worked, begged or starved. Today, there is no such assurance. Because of our welfare state, immigrants can come here and live off taxpaying Americans.

There is another difference between today and yesteryear. Today, Americans are taught multiculturalism throughout their primary, secondary and college education. They are taught that one culture is no better or worse than another.

To believe otherwise is criticized at best as Eurocentrism and at worst as racism. As a result, some immigrant groups seek to bring to our country the cultural values whose failures have led to the poverty, corruption and human rights violations in their home countries that caused them to flee.

As the fallout from President Trump's indelicate remarks demonstrates, too many Americans are afraid and unwilling to ask which immigrant groups have become a burden to our nation and which have made a contribution to the greatness of America.

Very unfortunate for our nation is that we have political groups that seek to use illegal immigration for their own benefit. They've created sanctuary cities and states that openly harbor criminals—people who have broken our laws.

The whole concept of sanctuary cities is to give aid, comfort and sympathy to people who have broken our laws. Supporters want to prevent them from having to hide and live in fear of discovery.

I'd ask whether, for the sake of equality before the law, we should apply the sanctuary concept to Americans who have broken other laws, such as robbers and tax evaders.

We should not fall prey to people who criticize our efforts to combat illegal immigration and who pompously say, "We're a nation of immigrants!" The debate is not over immigration. The debate is over illegal immigration.

My sentiments on immigrants who are here legally and who want to become Americans are expressed by the sentiments in Emma Lazarus' poem "The New Colossus," which is on a plaque inside the Statue of Liberty and in part says, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."



An article by Leah Barkoukis titled "Cruz Slams Path to Citizenship for 'Anybody Here Illegally' " was posted at townhall.com on Jan. 26, 2018. Following is the article.

Sen. Ted Cruz lashed out over the White House's proposal to grant a path to citizenship for 1.8 million young illegal immigrants.

"I do not believe we should be granting a path to citizenship to anybody here illegally," Cruz told reporters. "Doing so is inconsistent with the promises we made to the men and women who elected us."

President Trump on Thursday offered a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants who have applied for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals pro-

gram as well as those who are eligible but haven't yet applied or entered the system. This, he put forth in exchange for \$25 billion for the border wall and other security measures.

"We're going to morph into it," Trump said. "It's going to happen, at some point in the future, over a period of 10 to 12 years. I think it's a nice thing to have the incentive of after a period of years being able to become a citizen."

Cruz said this offer is "inexplicable" and went further than former President Obama because even his administration did not include a provision for citizenship.

"For some reason that to me is utterly inexplicable, we see Republicans falling all over themselves to gallop to the left of [former President] Obama in a way that is contrary to the promises made to the voters who elected us," he added.

Trump announced last year that he would be ending DACA with a six-month delay to allow members of Congress to find a solution by March 5.



A video and an article by Guy Benson titled "Flashback: Bill Clinton Gets Standing Ovation for SOTU Pledge to Crack Down on 'Illegal Aliens' " were posted at townhall.com on Jan. 26, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

The RNC dug up this little gem and is circulating it in an email blast under the subject line, 'SOTU: Preview.' I opened the email, assuming it would include some insights into how the president plans to frame the current immigration debate, or tout the significant economic progress that's occurred on his watch, in next week's major national address. But the message turned out to be a cheeky bait-and-switch. Rather than highlighting a passage from President Trump's upcoming speech, it quoted a portion of a previous State of the Union Address.

Watch in wonder as Bill Clinton tackles the topic of illegal immigration in 1995, earning a bipartisan standing ovation. In light of the way the Democratic Party talks about the issue these days, this is even more startling than the throwback clip of Obama we showcased a few weeks ago.

"All Americans, not only in the States most heavily affected but in every place in this country, are rightly disturbed by the large numbers of illegal aliens entering our country. The jobs they hold might otherwise be held by citizens or legal immigrants. The public service they use impose burdens on our taxpayers. That's why our administration has moved aggressively to secure our borders more by hiring a record number of new border guards, by deporting twice as many criminal aliens as ever before, by cracking down on illegal hiring, by barring welfare benefits to illegal aliens. In the budget I will present to you, we will try to do more to speed the deportation of illegal aliens who are arrested for crimes, to better identify illegal aliens in the workplace . . . We are a nation of immigrants. But we are also a nation of laws. It is wrong and ultimately self-defeating for a nation of

immigrants to permit the kind of abuse of our immigration laws we have seen in recent years, and we must do more to stop it." [Applause] . . .

Clinton employs the term "illegal aliens" on several occasions, which would be hugely problematic among his party's hardcore, race-baiting backers today. Even "illegal immigrants" has been declared insensitive or racist by the Social Justice crowd—who insist upon the anodyne moniker "undocumented immigrants," which whitewashes violators' lawbreaking. He also describes illegal immigrants as a drain on taxpayer resources and a threat to American workers. Clinton pledges to address these "abuses," by cracking down on illegal border crossings and illegal hiring, and chamber reacts with loud approval.

Roughly two decades later, Clinton's wife (who once adopted a much harder line on illegal immigration, too) offered unsubtle winks and nods to open borders zealots during her presidential run, as her party's base now demands:

There's lots of evidence that the Democratic Party has lurched *far* to the left on immigration in recent years; there's really no denying it. Significant elements of the party don't even seem to feel the need to *pretend* to oppose unlawful immigration anymore, preferring to cast any meaningful effort at curbing the practice or reforming the overall system as "white supremacy." Noah Rothman and David French have tracked Democrats' radicalism on this front, and even some liberal writers have raised a few red flags about the consequences of this profound ideological drift. We're now at a point where the leading Democrat on Capitol Hill has rejected outright an offer from the Trump administration that was so accommodating that it seriously rankled immigration hardliners on the Right.

A near-immediate amnesty (with a path to citizenship) for up to 1.8 illegal immigrant DREAMers (far more than the number who signed up for Obama's non-permanent deferral program) in exchange for (a) funding for a border wall, (b) additional beefed up security and enforcement measures, and (c) a phased-in shift away from chain migration to a more merit-based overall approach to America's legal immigration policies (which would move the US closer to other Western nations' regimes, like those in Canada and the UK, which are popular with Americans). All in all, remarkably generous—*too* generous for many conservatives' tastes, in fact.

But Chuck Schumer said no dice—and Allahpundit is right that preening anti-Trump petulance for the consumption of his base is only part of the explanation for why he said 'no,' so loudly and so quickly:

"The 'problem' with Trump's offer yesterday wasn't the wall component, it was the rollback of chain migration, which is an absolute dealbreaker for the left. Legalizing upwards of two million illegals who are already here is nice but there's a much larger universe of foreigners out there for them to import. They're not going to trade 10 million would-be constituents in the future for two million illegals who are destined to be legalized sooner or later anyway given the breadth of popular support for doing so . . . what incentive does Schumer have to do a deal that involves any meaningful concession by the left? He has

a short-term problem in that his base expects him to shut down the government to force a deal on DACA, but Trump has a short-term problem too in deciding what to do about his deadline to end DACA in March. He's probably going to cave and keep the program going and Schumer knows it, which will soften the disappointment to left-wing amnesty shills if there's no DACA deal in February. And then Schumer will remind them that, as angry as they are, the way to force Trump to bend a knee and agree to a DACA amnesty on even more favorable terms to the left is to hand Democrats more congressional seats in November."

Read AP's Eeyore-ish, but not necessarily inaccurate, assessment of why Democrats believe the political dynamics of this work in their favor. That may be true, *unless* they really believe Trump is willing to let DACA just run out, and to allow very unpopular deportations to commence.

Either way, I can see why Democrats would strongly oppose any significant change to US legal immigration policies under a DACA compromise; they want to keep some topics totally off the table until the next inevitable round of "comprehensive" reform talks. Maybe the White House's final offer should focus more on the wall and border security—and perhaps ramped up e-verify.

"Cracking down on illegal hiring" was a step that Bill Clinton touted, after all, and e-verify was an element of the Gang of Eight compromise we've mentioned before in this context.

And if Democrats keep playing hardball, Trump can threaten to walk away from the wider 1.8 million number and focus on the DREAMers who actually signed up for DACA. Democrats must be forced to make some real concessions on enforcement because let's face it: They'll never do so unless they're dragged into it.



An article by Craig Bannister titled "Bozell: Media's 'Liberal Bias was on Full Display Tuesday Night' As Media Slammed SOTU" was posted at cnsnews.com on Jan. 31, 2018. Following is the article.

Media Research Center President Brent Bozell blasted the media's overwhelmingly negative coverage of President Trump's first State of the Union address.

According to a CBS/YouGov poll conducted Tuesday evening, three in four Americans approved of the President's speech. But, as reported by NewsBusters, broadcast news networks including ABC, NBC, CNN and MSNBC were widely critical in their coverage following the State of the Union.

This shows just how blatantly bias and out-of-touch media have become, Bozell said in statement issued Wednesday: "The media's overwrought, liberal bias was on full display Tuesday night in their reaction to President Trump's State of the Union address. The President delivered a promising, powerful speech that resonated with most of America."

"75% of Americans approved of his address yet ABC, NBC, CNN and MSNBC's coverage was overwhelming critical. This is more evidence of how out of touch the media have become.

"These 'journalists' live in their own elitist bubble and the public sees right through it."

Reports by Newsbusters highlighting the liberal media's hostility towards Trump's popular State of the Union speech include:

- CNN: Melania Wearing White to Protest Her Husband
- ABCNEWS: 'Divisive . . . Gloomy . . . Sad . . .'
- State of Union Mind Meld: CNNMSNBC Push Trump as Nixon in '74 Talking Point . . .
- Mika Brzezinski Defends Dems Not Clapping for 'Great Dictator' Trump
- CNN Discredits Own Poll Showing Overwhelming Positive Reaction to SOTU



An article by Katie Pavlich titled "MSNBC Host: Church, Military and National Anthem are Part of the 'Bygone' Era" was posted at townhall.com on Jan. 31, 2018. Following is the article.

MSNBC host Joy Reid is known for her outlandish and ugly statements full of factual errors, but last night during the State of the Union she took things to another level.

During President Trump's speech, Reid said American institutions like church, police, the military and the National Anthem are all from a bygone era that should be forgotten.

Church, family, police, military and the National Anthem are hardly part of a bygone era, but instead represent the best of what America has to offer. In fact, we saw examples last night during President Trump's address.

- First, Trump told the story of 27-year-old police officer Albuquerque Police Officer Ryan Holets and his wife Rebecca.

"Last year, Ryan was on duty when he saw a pregnant, homeless woman preparing to inject heroin. When Ryan told her she was going to harm her unborn child, she began to weep. She told him she did not know where to turn, but badly wanted a safe home for her baby," Trump said. "In that moment, Ryan said he felt God speak to him: 'You will do it—because you can.' He took out a picture of his wife and their four kids. Then, he went home to tell his wife Rebecca. In an instant, she agreed to adopt. The Holets named their new daughter Hope."

■ Next, he honored Army Staff Sergeant Justin Peck and Chief Petty Officer Kenton Stacy for their service overseas.

"Near Raqqa last November, Justin and his comrade, Chief Petty Officer Kenton Stacy, were on a mission to clear buildings that ISIS had rigged with explosives so that civilians could return to the city," Trump said. "Clearing the second floor of a vital hospital, Kenton Stacy was severely wounded by an explosion. Immediately, Justin bounded into the booby-trapped building and found Kenton in bad shape. He applied pressure to the wound and inserted a tube to reopen an airway. He then performed CPR for 20 straight minutes during the ground transport and maintained artificial respiration through 2 hours of emergency surgery."

"Kenton Stacy would have died if not for Justin's selfless love for a fellow warrior. Tonight, Kenton is recovering in Texas. Raqqa is liberated. And Justin is wearing his new Bronze Star, with a 'V' for 'Valor,' " Trump continued.

These are the kinds of stories members of the left, including Joy Reid, believe are part of a "bygone era." The reality is, men and women like Ran and Rebecca Holets, and veterans Peck and Stacy, are the American heroes of today.



An article by Rich Noyes titled "2017: The Year the News Media Went to War Against a President" was posted at newsbusters.org on Jan. 16, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

The first year of the Trump administration was as turbulent for the news media as it was for politics, with many journalists dropping any pretense of professionalism to become strident opponents of the President. As a proxy for the larger establishment media, the Media Research Center analyzed every moment of coverage of President Trump last year on the ABC, CBS and NBC evening newscasts, usually seen by more than 25 million people each night.

The major findings:

The Trump presidency was the biggest story of the year, accounting for one out of every three minutes of evening news airtime—nearly 100 hours in total.

The tone of coverage has been incessantly hostile, especially for a new President in his honeymoon year: 90% negative, vs. just 10% positive (These percentages do not include neutral statements).

More than two-fifths of evening news coverage of the President (43%) focused on controversies, not policies, with the Russia investigation alone accounting for one-fifth of all Trump coverage (1,234 minutes).

Despite their massive coverage of Russia, the networks had almost no airtime for questions about how the investigation began, or whether special counsel Robert Mueller's current investigation is biased.

Now the details of our year-long study:

The Trump Presidency Was by Far the Biggest Story of 2017: From Inauguration Day (January 20) through the end of 2017 (December 31), the three evening newscasts aired 3,430 stories that talked about either President Trump or his administration, totaling 99 hours, 3 minutes of airtime. This amounts to approximately 34 percent of all evening news airtime (excluding commercials), meaning that one out of every three minutes of broadcast evening news coverage was devoted to the Trump story last year.

In contrast, MRC analysis of these same newscasts in 2015 and 2016 found that airtime devoted to President Obama and his administration amounted to approximately ten percent of overall evening news coverage in those years, or less than one-third the level of Trump's coverage.

Coverage of Trump Has Been Incessantly Negative: Reviewing all of this coverage, our analysts catalogued 5,883 evaluative statements about the President or his administration from either reporters, anchors or non-partisan sources such as experts or voters. Only about 10 percent of those comments (617) were positive, compared with 5,266 (90%) which were negative—an unparalleled level of media hostility for a President in his first year in office.

There were only three months in 2017 when Trump's level of good press rose above 10 percent on the evening news: January, when TV coverage of his inauguration included a few stories about the positive reaction among Trump voters; April, when the network coverage mentioned supportive reaction to the cruise missile strikes against Syria; and in December, when Congress finally passed a major tax reform package, a Trump legislative success. Even in those months, however, the balance of TV's coverage of Trump was still hugely negative—85 percent negative in January, 82 percent in April, and 85 percent in December.

The media's negative approach has been essentially consistent regardless of which issues or controversies were prevalent in the news. For example, network TV coverage was no more hostile in August (91% negative), when Trump came under intense criticism for his reaction to the violence in Charlottesville, Virginia, related to a white supremacist march, than it was in most other months.

Rather, the evening newscasts have provided extremely heavy coverage of some stories (Russia, the travel ban, and myriad personal controversies) where they evidently believed heavy criticism is justified, while they barely mention other topics where the administration has a positive story to tell. (Tomorrow, we will report on six of Trump's accomplishments that were essentially ignored by the networks. UPDATE: Now posted.)

A Huge Percentage of Network News Coverage Focused on Controversies, Not Policy: More than two-fifths of evening news coverage of the Trump administration (43%, or 42 hours, 37 minutes) centered on various controversies associated with the President and his top aides. The Russia investigation was the networks' favorite topic, with an astonishing 20 hours, 34 minutes of coverage, or more than one-fifth of all Trump coverage last year.

Discussion of all public policy issues combined amounted to 46 hours, 58 minutes of coverage, or roughly 47 percent of all Trump coverage.

The five most-frequently covered policy issues were the following.

- Effort to repeal and replace ObamaCare—475 minutes
- Nuclear showdown with North Korea—364 minutes
- Immigration policy, including ramped-up deportations and a potential border wall—258 minutes
- Temporary travel ban and the ensuing court fight—251 minutes
- Ultimately successful push for comprehensive tax reform—222 minutes

Besides Russia, the networks spent more than 100 minutes on two other controversies.

- The President's reaction to the white supremacist violence in Charlottesville.
- The furor over his allegation in a tweet that President Obama had wire-tapped Trump Tower.

No other controversy achieved that much airtime; our analysts found that the networks typically obsessed about one controversy at a time, and then dropped it when a new one became available.

- Investigation into Russia "collusion"—1,234 minutes
- Response to Charlottesville violence—104 minutes
- Claims Obama wiretapped Trump Tower—100 minutes
- Criticizing the News Media—76 minutes
- Private business dealings—59 minutes
- Feuds with GOP senators—51 minutes
- Criticism of NFL players over kneeling—48 minutes
- Furor over condolence call to Army widow—40 minutes
- Accusations of sexism/sexual misconduct—32 minutes
- Endorsing Roy Moore despite charges—29 minutes

The media reaction to Trump's first year has been so extreme, the public itself has become polarized over the coverage. In September, Gallup discovered that record numbers of Democrats are reporting "trust and confidence in the mass media to report the news 'fully, accurately and fairly,'" with 72 percent of Democrats saying they trusted the press in 2017, compared to just 51 percent who said that a year ago.

A month later, a *Politico*/Morning Consult poll found that “more than three-quarters of Republican voters, 76 percent, think the news media invent stories about Trump and his administration.” That number swells to 85 percent when just Trump supporters are asked the question.

What seems to be happening is that many in the media, including the broadcast networks, have chosen to morph into anti-Trump activists. As a result, they provide massive attention to stories that they think make him look bad, give little airtime to more positive aspects of his administration, and punish him with massively negative spin.

The polls suggest anti-Trump Democrats love that kind of news, pro-Trump Republicans hate it—while the national media are cementing their reputation as biased partisans. Their hostility against the White House is now so obvious, nobody could possibly take them seriously if they ever again claim to be fair and non-partisan professionals.



An article by Laura Hollis titled “The Media’s Role in the Ongoing Scandals” was posted at townhall.com on Jan. 25, 2018. Following is the article.

While the general public awaits the declassification and release of the now-infamous four-page memo written by House Intelligence Committee Chair Devin Nunes, R-Calif., those who have read it are remarking with astonishment at the depths to which our federal government (including and especially persons in law enforcement and national security) has sunk.

Politicians and pundits alike are saying that this is “bigger than Watergate.” And plenty of people are talking about the roles played in the emerging scandal by FBI agents Peter Strzok and Lisa Page, Independent Counsel (and former FBI firector) Robert Mueller, Deputy FBI Director Andrew McCabe, former FBI Director James Comey, former MI6 spy Christopher Steele (author of the “Trump dossier”) and the FISA court, just to name a few key players and institutions. But this is only the latest in a long line of scandals on the Democratic side of the political aisle (and they seem to get progressively worse as time goes on). What far fewer people are discussing is the role that the media has played in bringing us to this point.

Like Donald Trump or hate him, among the feats he has accomplished is exposing the fraud of the U.S. media. We’ve all known about the pervasive left-wing bias among the national media. What was less well-known, but is becoming increasingly apparent, is the extent to which the media has actually facilitated misconduct by the government, as well as political campaigns and candidates.

Think back over the past few years: Barack Obama lied his way through much of his eight years as president of the United States. He lied over and over again about his “signature achievement,” the passage of the Affordable Care Act. The American public would not be able to “keep their doctors” or their insurance plans. There would be no savings of thousands of dollars. To the

contrary, millions of people lost their health care providers and their insurance, and discovered that their new plans would cost thousands more a year.

The media's reaction? Meh.

Obama's first attorney general, Eric Holder, was held in contempt of Congress. The media's reaction? Yawn.

The Obama administration lied through their teeth about the Sept. 11, 2012 attack on our diplomatic compound in Benghazi, Libya. We were told that the attack was a spontaneous demonstration in response to a video. This was a lie—and emails later discovered which were written by then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton proved that it was a lie.

The media's reaction? No big deal. And how dare you politicize a tragedy!

Obama lied to the American public about the Iran deal. Former Deputy National Security Advisor Ben Rhodes bragged about how he could put out whatever talking points the White House wanted, and the press would dutifully publish them.

The media's reaction? Crickets.

When then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch met with Bill Clinton in his private jet—while his wife, Hillary, was under investigation by the FBI—the media didn't blink an eye when we were told that they just discussed "golf, grandchildren and yoga." Days later, Hillary is magically exonerated by then-FBI Director James Comey.

The media's reaction: Hooray!

And it's almost impossible to keep up with Hillary Clinton's lies: Yes, she used multiple devices. Yes, she did know that the emails were classified. Yes, she did try to hide and destroy evidence while under investigation. Yes, national security was likely compromised.

The media's reaction as each lie, one by one, was exposed? Nothing to see here, folks. Move along.

Debbie Wasserman Schultz rigged the 2016 Democratic primaries? No big deal.

Donna Brazile revealed debate questions to candidate Hillary Clinton? Whatever.

Now we're supposed to believe that a federal law enforcement agency charged with aggregating and keeping information has magically lost five months' worth of texts. I'm sorry, but I don't believe that for a moment. In fact, I think it is a lie of a shockingly brazen nature.

If the Clintons, President Obama, Susan Rice, Debbie Wasserman Schultz and other members of the DNC, the former attorneys general of the United States—and now, certain actors in the FBI—have been able to lie with impunity, it is at least in part because they were secure in their knowledge that a compliant—if not complicit—press would look the other way, deflect atten-

tion by demonizing anyone who dared to inquire or accuse, and even spew the perfunctory talking points in the face of overwhelming evidence.

It is clear at this point that the media's role in Democratic scandals goes back years—perhaps decades. It is also safe to assume that much of what we needed to know, we have not been told—and that much of what we have been told was a lie.

The American public should be as outraged with our press as they are about sexual predators in Hollywood—and just as determined to weed out wrongdoers.

The revolution is just beginning.



“Eye on the World” comment: While it is true that this publication mentions much of the unprofessional practices of members of the mainstream media, we present the next article to show how a liberal cable network (MSNBC) handled an appearance of Michael Wolff on one of their shows.



A video and an article by Joe Cunningham titled “ ‘Morning Joe’ Kicks Michael Wolff Off the Show Over Nikki Haley Rumors” were posted at redstate.com on Feb. 1, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

It's gotta be said: Go, Mika.

Michael Wolff, the author of the poorly-written and hardly-truthful *Fire and Fury*, was on the show this morning, and the primary topic of conversation was centered on the rumors Wolff keeps fueling about Nikki Haley sleeping her way to the top.

Haley, who is rightfully outraged at the rumors, has denied them, and Wolff sputtered about how he never actually accused Haley of anything. That's when it got good.

Mika kicked him off. When the show returned, his seat was empty.

Wolff is a gossip-monger, and he has made his living off spreading these rumors and calling it writing. His utter stupidity is righteously smacked down by Mika, who is totally in the right here.

Meanwhile, showing his usual grace and class, Wolff took to Twitter to gripe about being kicked off the show.

But THIS right here is the money tweet.

He wrote: “My bad, the President is right about Mika.”

Wolff is . . . very Trumpian here, no? He has no problems attacking women who insult his integrity. It's really pathetic. I hope the rest of the media follows suit and stops giving airtime to this clown.



An article by Wayne Allyn Root titled "FBI Went to Great Lengths to Plot Against Donald Trump" was posted at reviewjournal.com (Las Vegas) on Jan. 27, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

I'd like to write more about the booming Trump economy. About bonuses for 2 million workers and bigger paychecks for 90 percent of taxpayers thanks to the Trump tax cuts. And about Trump's triumphant appearance at Davos—telling the entire world that America is now open for business.

But there is much more important news involving the exploding FBI/Department of Justice scandal and the shocking, about-to-be-world-famous FISA memo.

Many in the FBI/DOJ leadership will be fired or forced to resign. Many others may wind up serving prison time.

The scandal involving texts from FBI investigator Peter Strzok and his lover, FBI attorney Lisa Page, is so deadly, it goes far beyond the wildest imagination of anything in a Hollywood movie.

FBI agents openly texted about how Hillary was about to win the presidency—and no one wanted to be on her bad side. Page texted to the lead Hillary investigator (her lover): "She might be our next president. The last thing you need us going in there loaded for bear. You think she's going to remember or care that it was more DOJ than FBI?"

So the intimidated FBI agents rigged the investigation, asked her softball questions, didn't record her interview, didn't put her under oath and then changed the wording of the conclusion from "grossly negligent" to "extremely careless."

Here's how bad the story gets. Even the crooked FBI agents out to fix the investigation against Hillary believed and recommended that FBI Deputy Director Andrew McCabe could not possibly be in charge of the probe after his wife took a \$700,000 donation from Terri McAuliffe, the Clinton's great friend and financial bagman for decades.

It's clear top FBI leadership hated Donald Trump, used fraudulent pretenses (a fake dossier paid for by Hillary and her campaign) to get FISA warrants against Trump and were out to stop Trump at all costs. As I've warned from Day One, the main purpose of obtaining illegal wiretaps to spy on the Trump campaign was to pass along his campaign plans to Hillary and her team. This was how the FBI leadership tried to guarantee an election victory for Hillary.

It's also clear top FBI brass formed a "secret society" with the sole goal of destroying the newly elected Trump. A congressman has spilled the beans that this "secret society" didn't include just FBI agents. It included federal judges, federal prosecutors and at least one attorney general of a large state.

It's clear this "secret society" met off-site to plot against the president of the United States. These rogue plotters used "burner phones" because they were so afraid their plot could be uncovered. Burner phones? Is this the FBI or the Colombian cocaine cartel?

We have no idea how bad this gets. The FBI suddenly claimed 50,000 texts from Strzok and Page were gone, missing, disappeared. Two days later the DOJ inspector general announced he found them. Of course, he did. FBI forensic experts find missing texts from bad guys every day. That means the FBI was purposely trying to hide these 50,000 texts. Can you imagine what's in them?

Folks, this is called a coup. This is supposed to happen only in a banana republic. But that's exactly what America became under Barack Obama—a cesspool of crime, corruption, conspiracy and media/big government collusion.



An article by Matt Vespa titled "ABC News: Were the Secret Society FBI Texts Made in Jest?" was posted at townhall.com on Jan. 25, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Palace intrigue abounds. The FBI remains in the spotlight as new texts reveal a possible anti-Trump secret society that's meeting offsite. What is this? At the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, there's Dumbledore's Army, a group of disgruntled staffers resisting the new leadership of Office of Budget and Management Director Mick Mulvaney; they reportedly communicate through encrypted devices.

So, ABC News got their hands on the secret meeting texts and wondered if this was made in jest.

■ Lawmakers have refused to publicly release the full text message, sent the day after Trump won the 2016 presidential election. But ABC News has obtained a copy of the one message that Republicans appear to be citing, and it's unclear if the message's reference to a "secret society" may have been made in jest.

A top counterintelligence agent and bureau lawyer shouldn't be making these jokes, especially since they're involved in highly sensitive investigations, like the Russia probe headed by Special Counsel Robert Mueller. How serious? Well, when the first batch of texts between these two—Strzok was having an extramarital affair with Page, by the way—stretching from August 2015 to December 2016, became known to Mueller, he removed Strzok from the Russia probe; Page's business with the investigation had already concluded.

Yet, what's odd about that development is that we, and by that I mean Congress and the public, found out about Strzok's removal four months after it happened. Well, maybe that's because the texts are explicitly pro-Hillary, anti-Trump. They make a reference to an "insurance policy" in an August 15, 2016 text, which some have alleged could be a reference to the Trump

dossier—an opposition research document compiled by research firm Fusion GPS through an ex-MI6 operation that was funded by the Hillary campaign.

It's also been speculated that it's been used to secure FISA warrants against Carter Page, a foreign policy adviser to Trump, and other individuals on the campaign and during the transition. In all, it's all very embarrassing, which is probably why the FBI tried to keep this secret, despite zero national security risks.

So, let's say they were joking—we still don't know—it doesn't absolve top officials at the FBI for being grossly unprofessional, unethical, and neither does it absolve Strzok and Page from their antics with these texts that number in the tens of thousands.

Attorney General Jeff Sessions said the two sent at least 50,000 total texts. You have anti-Trump texts, riddled with references to secret society meetings and an "insurance policy," and the latter was about a meeting these two just had with Deputy Director Andrew McCabe.

Joking or not, it's still bad. It seems to show a level of bias that should be disconcerting to all, especially since the FBI is our preeminent domestic intelligence agency, along with their role in federal law enforcement.



Isaiah 55:6-11—"Seek the LORD while He may be found, Call upon Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; Let him return to the LORD, and He will have mercy on him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon. For My thoughts are not your thoughts, Nor are your ways My ways,' says the LORD. 'For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain comes down, and the snow from heaven, and do not return there, but water the earth, and make it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall My word be that goes forth from My mouth; it shall not return to Me void, but it shall accomplish what I please, and it shall prosper in the thing for which I sent it.' "