



At the end of the second biggest jag in that chart, World War II, the global Deep State decided to deep-six the religion of aggressive nationalism as practiced by the nation-state and rule without the consent of the nationalist mob. How is that working out, Deep-Staters?

Now, I was at the Seattle stop on the Jordan Peterson road show last week. What Peterson is saying is that none of us just views the world as facts. We all view the facts and interpret them through our values, our religion.

So all our lefty friends are doing is looking at, e.g., little children on the border or transgenders not in the military and deciding, through the lens of their values, that the facts require peaceful protest to bend the arc of history toward justice for these victims and refugees. And no dinner for Sarah Sanders!

They deny that there are other lenses and that other good people can have different values and see the facts through a different lens. If you know only one lens, then it is easy to give Clinton a pass and throw the book at Trump and throw people out of restaurants.

Not surprisingly, humans have developed maxims that address this hypocrisy. We all know them: physician, heal thyself. Judge not lest ye be judged. Clean your room. And then there is the long-form version:

“Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye.”

That was 2,000 years ago. What did they know of modern leftism? So here is a new one for the ages:

“Activist, protest thyself.”

—*American Thinker*, June 26, 2018

## Oh Canada

by Bob Kuhn

Canada legalized same-sex marriage in 2005, amid many promises that traditional religious believers would be protected. Those promises have proved empty. Earlier this month the Supreme Court of Canada told Trinity Western University, which I lead, that it could not open a law school. Accrediting a school that upholds traditional Christian teachings on marriage could send the wrong message to Canadians who disagree with Trinity’s beliefs, we were told.

This isn’t about the quality of our educational programs. Our researchers hold millions of dollars in grants. Many members of our faculty have been recognized as 3M Teaching Fellows, Canada’s most prestigious award for excellence in educational leadership. We are consistently ranked one of the best Canadian universities for educational experience, according to the National Survey of Student Engagement.

Trinity simply is being punished for asking its faculty and students to observe traditional Christian teachings on marriage through a community covenant. In 2001 the high court ruled decisively that this policy did not disqualify the university from training public-school teachers. It seemed as if the ruling gave Trinity a secure place as one of the few private faith-based schools in Canada.

But that was then. In 2012 Trinity decided to open a law school. It would have been the only private one in Canada and the only one to offer a specialty in charity law. It was an arduous task from the beginning. Three provincial law societies—similar to state bar associations in the US—said no in March 2014. Everyone agreed that Trinity’s program met all the requirements and would train competent lawyers. But law societies across the country held public meetings during which Trinity’s students and faculty were called bigots and worse.

The Law Society of Upper Canada, the nation’s oldest and largest, told the high court in Ottawa during oral arguments on Nov. 30, 2017, that accrediting any “distinctly religious” organization would violate the Canadian Charter, which is similar to the US Bill of Rights. It added that when the government licenses a private organization it adopts all its policies as its own. If these arguments had been accepted they would have spelled the end of Canada’s nonprofit sector. In their zeal to root out the supposed bigotry of traditional religious believers, these lawyers were prepared to dynamite Canada’s entire civil society.

Thankfully the court passed over some of our opponents’ more extreme arguments. Instead, on June 15 it ruled that making Trinity’s faith-based community standards mandatory could harm the dignity of members of the LGBT community who attend Trinity. The majority of the court concluded that this potential dignitary harm to future LGBT law students was “concrete,” while the infringement on Trinity’s religious liberty from refusing to accredit its qualified law program was “minimal.”

We respectfully disagree with the court. As the British Columbia Court of Appeal put it when it ruled in favor of Trinity’s law school in November 2016, a “society

that does not admit and accommodate difference is not a free and democratic society, one in which its citizens are free to think, to disagree, to debate and to challenge accepted norms without fear of reprisal.”

Despite this blow, Trinity will stand firm in its belief—which extend far beyond what the court ruled on. While all this controversy has swirled around us, Trinity alumni have continued their remarkable record of service. Two graduates, Richard Taylor and Jeffery Komant, opened a school in Rwanda, and another established an organization to rescue child prostitutes in India. A group of Trinity alumni successfully lobbied Parliament to allow Yazidi refugees to enter Canada more quickly. Current Trinity students have founded a campus support network for survivors of sexual assault and raised money to sponsor a refugee family from Congo.

We are disappointed but we are not deterred. We will continue to be a biblically based, mission-driven university committed to provide everyone an excellent education—regardless of race, sexuality, gender orientation, or religion. We will continue to teach our students the importance of using their skills to serve others. And above all, we will continue to stand firm, and be what we have always been—a “distinctly Christian” community.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, June 22, 2018, p. A13

## Thugs

by D.J. Sobieski

Someone is going to get killed. We have gone beyond the severed presidential head held by the unfunny and untalented Kathy Griffin to mob action, including the physical harassment of Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen who just days before was drummed out of a Mexican restaurant by left-wing activists protesting the separation of children from parents caught crossing the border illegally.

Nielsen was also targeted by a leftist mob at her home:

A cabal of protesters gathered outside Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen’s Virginia townhouse Friday morning, blasting audio of crying immigrant children and chanting “No justice, no sleep.”

The small crowd of about two dozen protesters was led by CREDO Action, a progressive grassroots organization. Video posted to social media

shows the protesters repeatedly yelling, “Shame!” as Nielsen leaves her home and enters a vehicle. “History will remember you!” shouted one protester with a British accent. “You belong in the Hague! You’re a modern-day Nazi!”

Well, we all know what happened to the Nazis. They were hunted down worldwide and executed. The left’s incitement of physical violence through rhetoric and mob action is excused or ignored by a leftist media who go into spasms of righteous indignation after every presidential tweet.

In the days of civil discourse, ideological opponents would target each other’s rhetoric, not each other. What you said was evil or inappropriate and must be denounced. Now, following Saul Alinsky’s playbook, it is not what conservatives stand for that is evil. Conservatives themselves are evil. They must be thrown out of restaurants, confronted at their homes and, yes, shot on baseball practice fields.

One wonders if it had been Peter Fonda instead of Sarah Huckabee Sanders who chose to dine at the Red Hen in Lexington, Virginia. Would restaurant co-owner Stephanie Wilkinson have asked the C-list actor, who suggested that President Trump’s son deserved an unspeakable fate while suggesting Trump supporters be hunted down and harassed, or worse, to leave because “the restaurant has certain standards”?

One wonders if those standards would have applied to Peter Fonda, who apparently has a movie coming out. Certainly the Roseanne Barr standard for indignant lefties does not apply to him:

Roseanne Barr literally had her career destroyed by the establishment media and Hollywood a few weeks ago over one racist Tweet. Peter Fonda, however, has been given a free pass by the establishment media and Hollywood’s #MeToo activists after tweeting out a call to have a child raped and a woman sexually abused and humiliated . . .

Never forget that Fonda sent out a call for mob violence, a call for a child (the 11-year-old son of President Trump) to be kidnapped from his mother and thrown in a cage with pedophiles. Peter Fonda sought to orchestrate mob action that would result in the gang-rape of an innocent child . . .

“WE SHOULD RIP BARRON TRUMP FROM HIS MOTHER’S ARMS AND PUT HIM IN A CAGE WITH PEDOPHILES,” Fonda’s Tuesday night tweet read.

But Fonda wasn’t done. He also called on his

mob to terrorize the children of ICE agents.

“[W]e only need to surround their schools and scare the sh\*t out of them and worry the f\*ck out of the agents fr[o]m CBE ICE & REGULAR BORDER PATROL AGENTS. WE NEED TO SCARE THE F\*CK OUT OF THEM! NEED TO MAKE THEIR CHILDREN WORRY NOW,” Fonda demanded.

Then Fonda turned his hate towards two women, Press Secretary Sarah Sanders, who he attacked with the sexist slur “gash,” and Kirstjen Nielsen, the Department of Homeland Security, who he wanted to see stripped naked and publicly whipped.

This incendiary rhetoric and physical confrontation is a reminder of the heated leftist rhetoric that preceded and inspired a gunman to hunt down and shoot Republican congressmen at a baseball practice field in Arlington, Virginia. Then, too, it was suggested by some that the targets of the gunman had it coming, as some say of the targets of current leftist thugs.

Typical was MSNBC’s Joy Ann Reid, who, in an appalling example of the left’s pathological hatred of anything and anyone conservative, said, in not so many words, that Rep. Steve Scalise kind of had it coming when a Bernie Sanders volunteer tried to assassinate him and his GOP colleagues as they practiced for the annual baseball game between Democrats and Republicans in Congress. As Fox News reported:

As Rep. Steve Scalise lay in his hospital bed recovering after he was shot by a maniac gunman who was hunting congressional Republicans, an MSNBC host asked whether the House Majority Whip’s life-threatening injuries meant Americans had to “ignore” his political positions.

Joy Ann Reid on Saturday cited Scalise’s positions on ObamaCare and gay marriage as among the concerning “moral” issues she felt couldn’t be overlooked despite his critical injury at the hands of a left-leaning lunatic who opened fire at a GOP baseball practice on June 14.

“There’s a whole country out there and a lot of people, at least in my Twitter timeline, and it’s a delicate thing, because everybody is wishing the congressman well and hoping that he recovers, but Steve Scalise has a history that we’ve all been forced to sort of ignore on race,” Reid said.

Joy Ann Reid’s litany of Scalise’s crimes against humanity for which he deserved being target for assassination reveal how skewed to left is the moral compass of

those on the left:

He did come to leadership after some controversy over attending a white nationalist event, which he says he didn’t know what it was.

He also co-sponsored a bill to amend the Constitution to define marriage as between a man and a woman. He voted for the House healthcare bill, which as you said would gut healthcare for millions of people including three million children and he cosponsored a bill to repeal the ban on semiautomatic weapons.

While Joy Ann Reid can be dismissed as a left-wing gadfly on a cable network, CBS’ Scott Pelley supposedly represented mainstream media and its professed objectivity and fairness. But there he was, blaming Scalise’s shooting on Scalise’s own rhetoric:

Thursday evening, CBS’s Scott Pelley, who officially ended his tenure as the network’s Evening News anchor the following evening, told viewers that “It’s time to ask whether the attack on the United States Congress Wednesday was foreseeable, predictable and, to some degree, self-inflicted.”

It’s clear from Pelley’s subsequent commentary that his answers to all three elements are “Yes.” It’s equally clear from the examples he supplied as support that he sees (or wants viewers to see) the problem as predominantly about the conduct of those on the right.

Self-inflicted? As has been noted on this site, the Alexandria shooter woke up one morning intent on killing Republicans, not because of anything they’ve said or done, but because Democratic leaders from Nancy Pelosi, to Bernie Sanders, to Jerry Brown to Maxine Waters, have said Republican policies, from healthcare to climate change, will kill people or are Nazi-inspired, keep setting off the leftist loons determined to save mankind.

Not surprisingly, Rep. Maxine Waters has embraced the civilized concept of mob rule:

On Saturday night, California Congresswoman Maxine Waters encouraged the type of recent protests against President Trump as seen in several Washington, DC and Virginia area restaurants, saying that she has “no sympathy” for those who serve in the administration and that the public should “turn on them” and “absolutely harass” White House officials while they are doing normal every day activities . . .

Rep. Waters then went further, adding that members of the Trump administration who con-

tinue to serve and defend the president should be harangued at gas stations, restaurants, and while shopping at department stores. “They know what they are doing is wrong,” said Rep. Waters. And for that, the public should ridicule and protest them every chance they get, according to the California congresswoman.

Just as in the case of Steve Scalise, those on the left are suggesting that Sarah Sanders, Kirstjen Nielsen, and even young Baron Trump, deserve the vitriol and confrontation directed at them. Their hateful end-justifies-the-means rhetoric will likely inspire someone like the loon who shot up an Alexandria baseball field to take similar action.

After all, if you believe in securing the border and enforcing the nation’s laws, you have it coming.

—*American Thinker*, June 25, 2018

## Global Warming

by Anthony Sadar

Weather observing 160 miles above the Arctic Circle leaves a lasting impression. In the beginning of my atmospheric science career, I observed weather for a season at an isolated military outpost on Alaska’s west coast. Although snow fell on July 5, the temperature in the summer of 1977 later reached 70 degrees Fahrenheit on two days. More typically, the Arctic air was quite cool and the sky cloudy. Rain and mist were frequent.

Since then, my decades of work in meteorology have been within the lower 48. But captivated by my inaugural experience, I am drawn to news of polar conditions, such as climate change in the Arctic. When I learned of substantial, documented Arctic warming referenced in climatologist Roy Spencer’s recent book, *An Inconvenient Deception*, I took notice.

It had been reported that “fishermen, seal hunters, and explorers who sail the seas about Spitzbergen and the eastern arctic, all point to a radical change in climatic conditions, and hither-to unheard of high temperatures in that part of the earth’s surface.” An expedition observed that ice conditions were exceptional. “In fact so little ice has never before been noted. The expedition all but established a record, sailing as far north as 81 degrees 29 minutes in ice free water. This is the farthest north ever reached with modern oceanographic apparatus.”

This account is remarkable, maybe even alarming.

Yet it was from “The Changing Arctic” by George Nicolas Ifft, published by the American Meteorological Society in *Monthly Weather Review*, November 1922.

The piece goes on to describe: In Arctic Norway, “[m]any old landmarks are so changed as to be unrecognizable. Where formerly great masses of ice were found, there are now often moraines, accumulations of earth and stones. At many points where glaciers formerly extended far into the sea they have entirely disappeared.”

But a couple of decades later, the Arctic ice was observed growing again.

It’s not likely that in 1922 anyone was seriously looking to blame the proliferation of the Model T for the disappearance of glaciers. But in the 1970s, people were looking to blame nuclear weapons testing and excessive particulate matter pollution from industry as the reason the next ice age seemed to have been imminent. As the back cover of the 1977 book *Our Changing Weather: Forecast of Disaster?* by Claude Rose, put it: “Northern hemisphere temperatures have been falling steadily since the 1940s. Glaciers are advancing once again. Scientists no longer debate the coming of a new ice age, the question now is when?” And *The Cooling* (1975), by Lowell Ponte, noted that “[a] handful of scientists denied evidence that Earth’s climate was cooling until the 1970s, when bizarre weather throughout the world forced them to reconsider their views.” Sound familiar? Back then, you were a “denier” if you weren’t in the global cooling camp.

Even a short book for youngsters by Henry Gilfond, *The New Ice Age* (1978), made the point with its dust jacket displaying six large thermometers in a row measuring ominously declining temperatures.

Other books and popular press like *Time*, *Newsweek* and *National Geographic* in the 1970s spread the fear. And a Christian tract by Walter Lang and Vic Lockman asked, “Need we fear another Ice Age?”

Of course, atmospheric science has advanced tremendously since the coming-Ice Age scare of the 1970s and long since the early 20th century when ice evaporated in the Arctic. Rather than sooty smokestacks coaxing a new Ice Age, we are now certain that increasing carbon dioxide will yield a melted ice cap and intolerable global temperatures by the end of the 21st century.

You can bet on it.

But I wouldn’t.

—*The Washington Times*, June 4, 2018, p.22

# Nuclear Summer—Nuclear Winter

by S. Fred Singer

Fear of a catastrophic nuclear winter gripped much of the media and political establishments, much the way fear of global warming/climate change does today.

If you are under fifty years of age, you probably never heard of Nuclear Winter. Even if you are older, you may not remember what it was all about. Popular issues go up to a peak suddenly and then just fade away slowly, according to a 1972 paradigm by Anthony Downs. Global warming/climate change may provide another good example: by 2100, people may wonder what all the fuss was about. The Paris Accord may be unfamiliar, and even the Kyoto Treaty will have been forgotten.

So for those who might not remember, here is a succinct summary of N.W. from Wikipedia:

Nuclear Winter is the severe and prolonged global climatic cooling effect hypothesized to occur after widespread firestorms following a nuclear war. The hypothesis is based on the fact that such fires can inject soot into the atmosphere, where it can block [some] direct sunlight from reaching the surface of the Earth. It is speculated that the resulting cooling would lead to widespread crop failure and famine. In developing computer models of nuclear-winter scenarios, researchers use the convention [of] the Hiroshima . . . firestorm in World War II as an example where soot might have been injected into the stratosphere, alongside modern observations of natural, large-area wildfire/firestorms.

Nuclear Winter burst on the academic scene in December 1983 with the publication of the hypothesis in the prestigious journal *Science*. It was accompanied by a study by Paul Ehrlich, et al. that hinted that it might cause the extinction of human life on the planet.

The five authors of the Nuclear Winter hypothesis were labeled TTAPS, using the initials of their family names (T stands for Owen Toon and P stands for Jim Polak, both Ph.D. students of Carl Sagan at Cornell Univer-

sity.) Carl Sagan himself was the main author and driving force.

Actually, Sagan had scooped the *Science* paper by publishing the gist of the hypothesis in *Parade* magazine, which claimed a readership of 50 million! Previously, Sagan had briefed people in public office and elsewhere, so they were all primed for the popular reaction, which was tremendous.

Many of today's readers may not remember Carl Sagan. He was a brilliant astrophysicist but also highly political. Imagine Al Gore, but with an excellent science background.

Sagan had developed and narrated a television series called *Cosmos* that popularized astrophysics and much else, including cosmology, the history of the universe. He even suggested the possible existence of extraterrestrial intelligence and started a listening project called SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence). SETI is still searching today and has not found any evidence so far. Sagan became a sort of icon; many people in the US and abroad knew his name and face.

Carl Sagan also had another passion: saving humanity from a general nuclear war, a laudable aim. He had been arguing vigorously and publicly for a "freeze" on the production of more nuclear weapons. President Ronald Reagan outdid him and negotiated a nuclear weapons reduction with the USSR.

In the meantime, much excitement was stirred up by Nuclear Winter. Study after study tried to confirm and expand the hypothesis, led by the Defense Department (DOD), which took the hypothesis seriously and spent millions of dollars on various reports that accepted Nuclear Winter rather uncritically.

The National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences published a report that put in more quantitative detail. It enabled critics of the hypothesis to find flaws—and many did. The names Russell Seitz, Dick Wilson (both of Cambridge, Mass.), Steve Schneider (Palo Alto, Calif.), and Bob Ehrlich (Fairfax, Va.) (no relation to Paul Ehrlich) come to mind. The hypothesis was really "politics disguised as science." The whole TTAPS scheme was contrived to deliver the desired consequence. It required the smoke layer to be of

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz (1913-2009) has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and Dr. Michael Bauman and is offered free of charge to anyone asking for it. The Crusade's address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is 719-685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (CACC is a 501C3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. You may also access earlier editions of *The Schwarz Report* and make donations at [www.schwarzreport.org](http://www.schwarzreport.org). Permission to reproduce materials from this Report is granted provided that the article and author are given along with our name and address. Our daily blog address is [www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com](http://www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com).

just the right thickness, covering the whole Earth, and lasting for many months.

The Kuwait oil fires in 1991 produced a lot of smoke, but it rained out after a few days. I had a mini-debate with Sagan on the TV program *Nightline* and published a more critical analysis of the whole hypothesis in the journal *Meteorology & Atmospheric Physics*. I don't know if Carl ever saw my paper. But I learned a lot from doing this analysis that was useful in later global warming research. For example, the initial nuclear bursts inject water vapor into the stratosphere, which turns into contrail-like cirrus clouds. That actually leads to a strong initial warming and a "nuclear summer."

In any case, Sagan forgave me for questioning the scientific underpinnings of his hypothesis. In 1996, I received a cordial letter from Carl just before he passed away—he was only 62 at the time. I wonder now if he might have reacted differently had he read my paper; I had chided him for misusing science to promote a political goal. RIP, old friend!

—*American Thinker*, June 27, 2018

## Russia, USA, and Israel

by Fay Voshell

Leftists had to have been astonished to hear President Putin's opening remarks at the Trump-Putin summit. Russia's president proclaimed, "The Cold War is a thing of the past[.] . . . The era of acute ideological confrontation of the two countries is a thing of the remote past—it's a vestige of the past."

No wonder the American and European left are screaming over the triple reference to the past. No wonder also that old Cold Warriors like John McCain are apoplectic. That is because Putin's words and the Trump-Putin summit possibly signaled the beginning of the end of the left-leaning ideological hegemony that has influenced American international policies for many years.

The fact is that Putin expressed hopes for rapprochement with the West after the fracturing of the Soviet Union, assuming that once the communist party was almost obliterated and a new religious-political paradigm began to take hold in Russia, the West, and Russia might have more in common. What Putin had not counted on, perhaps, was the rapid ascendancy of leftist ideology in powerful circles of academia, government, and even churches.

But there was a moment in which a new relationship

between the world's two most powerful nuclear powers might have seemed possible. In fact, according to Peter Conradi, author of *Who Lost Russia? How the World Entered a New Cold War*, there were some expectations that after the fall of the Soviet Union, a new "entente cordiale" might be established between Moscow and the Western nations the old Soviet Union had tried to destroy.

Conradi relates that "soon after Putin came to power in 2000, he asked George Robertson, then NATO Secretary-General, when Russia would be invited to join. When Robertson replied that Russia would have to apply to NATO, just like everyone else, Putin retorted: 'Russia is not going to stand in a queue with other countries that don't matter.' The subject has not been raised since."

It appears now that the prospect of Russia joining NATO is so fantastically remote as to scarcely enter Putin's mind, but he has indicated that some cooperation between the United States and Russia is quite possible under a Trump administration.

The idea of such cooperation is not just foreign to those of the American left, but absolutely repellent, especially since Russia has given every sign its people are imbibing what the left has always detested as "the opiate of the people"—namely, Christianity, as presently characterized by the revival of the Russian Orthodox Church. Putin's admiration and imitation of Russia's tsarist past is also regarded as favorably by modern progressives as garlic and a cross by vampires.

In repudiating the left's embrace of postmodern orthodoxy, both Putin and Trump have assured they will continue to be detested by the Western left ensconced in places of power both in Europe and America. For the postmodern political ideologue, both America and Russia (as well as Israel) are powers that deserve to be destroyed. That is because to be powerful in any way is seen as automatically ensuring oppression of those who are not powerful.

As Naya Lekht observes, Israel, though certainly not the only target of leftist ideologues, serves as a locus for their approbation. The return of the idea of the all-powerful Jewish cabal automatically oppressing disempowered peoples everywhere on the globe, and whose hidden hand is pulling the strings of Washington's puppets, owes much of its renewed impetus to the leftist postmodern interpretation of what entails oppression.

She writes:

And Israel, for all of its manifestations of the very best that a democratic Western country can offer . . . has been scorned to be the nadir of human

injustice.

Repackaged in the post-modern model of the powerful and the powerless, Jew-hatred has extended beyond academic institutions to movements such as ‘Black Lives Matter,’ which have become platforms for, among other things, virulent anti-Zionism. Anti-Semitism has not only successfully crept into progressive causes, but has been codified in the language used by the Left: words such as ‘social justice’ and ‘Intersectionality,’ which operate around the fundamental understanding of the ontology of power and privilege, have become code words for anti-Semitism, for within the hierarchy of power proffered by intersectionality, the post-1967 Jew does not only find himself at the very bottom, but is the culprit who abuses and exerts his power over the powerless. To boot, his very existence is loathsome.

Anti-Semites ensconced within places of power in academia, government, and many churches are appalled that the diminishment or even destruction of Israel the nation is postponed or will not happen, due at least in part to the Trump-Putin summit.

Caroline Glick explains, writing that before Trump and Putin met, the prospect of war between Israel and Iran or Hezb’allah was almost a certainty, as Iranian-backed forces tried to embed their presence in Syria near Israel’s border. Israel would have to go to war in order to protect herself. Though Glick does not add the following, the summit and the reduction of the Hezb’allah threat are probably among the reasons Israel launched an attack on Hamas in Gaza.

Glick notes, “In their remarks, both Putin and Trump said that they are committed to Israel’s security.” She writes that Trump and Putin have, each in his own way, announced support for Israel against Iranian-backed forces. Trump will fight such forces and Putin will not ally Russia with Iran should it remain in Syria and choose to fight Israel: “It is clear enough that the summit reduced the prospects of war in the immediate term. And again, if that was the only thing accomplished at the summit, its importance would be incontestable.”

But the accomplishments of the Trump-Putin summit go beyond the possibility of war between Israel and Iranian-backed forces to a possible realignment of global alliances. The rejection of the postmodern doctrine that the equitable thing to do is to disempower the powerful so equality may reign is replaced with the idea that alliances among and with powerful nations such as Russia may best serve American interests.

What this may mean in practice is that organizations such as the E.U., which is seen by Trump as exploitative economically, will be opposed as long as their present trade stances prevail. The E.U.’s idea that those in power are inherently racist or colonialist and must pay for sins by empowering formerly colonized minorities also is not one Trump seeks to imitate in his relationship with Mexico and other nation-states that consider themselves deserving of empowerment, or at the very least sanctuary.

It also means that the globalist view of the E.U. and other globalist-leaning organizations is unacceptable to Trump as well as Putin, both of whom do not believe that the destruction of nation-states in order to establish a one-world order is a way to world peace, but which actually would be a sure guarantee that World War III will happen, since a push for global governance will inevitably be resisted by powerful nations.

The idea behind rapprochement between powerful nations such as America and Russia is that each nation should be able to make alliances on certain levels without sacrificing either’s national identity or heritage. Alliances among nation-states rather than the pursuit of a new global order are considered more favorable ways to establish order.

In other words, it looks as if Putin and Trump consider it better to make a deal than to continue the Cold War both apparently want ended or at least mitigated. Both seem to be willing to make concessions to existing realities and to avoid more wars by fostering alliances rather than continuing adamant positions that offer no possibility of rapprochement at all. In the meantime, Trump should recognize that though a leopard may change his spots, nonetheless, a leopard remains a leopard.

While it is true that all summits come with Gordian knots and often with Scylla and Charybdis choices, ultimately, both Russia and America have legitimate reasons for discontinuing the Cold War and for rejecting post-modern political ideology—as well as for making deals that do not compromise either nation’s integrity.

—*American Thinker*, July 22, 2018



Don’t miss a minute of the news and analysis by David Noebel.

Check out our blog at:

[www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com](http://www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com)