





Inside Track

UN Creates New "Terror" Agency, Russian Agent in Charge

The United Nations General Assembly, dominated by unfree regimes and even mass-murdering dictators, voted June 15 to create a new UN "terrorism" agency to supposedly wage the emerging global terror war. The new UN outfit, known as the "United Nations Counter-Terrorism Office," will be led by a Russian terror czar and charged with leading the UN's terror efforts and coordinating national governments' implementation of global terrorism policies coming down from the international body.

Socialist UN Secretary-General António Guterres appointed a minion of Russian leader Vladimir Putin to lead the outfit — despite the Kremlin, along with other governments, being at the center of fomenting global terrorism for generations. Critics slammed and ridiculed the decision to install one of Putin's agents at the head of the agency, but in UN circles, the move was well received. Some analysts explained it as an effort to further empower the Kremlin within the UN, while further sidelining America — something that may actually be good news for the growing number of American activists and lawmakers hoping to get the United States to withdraw from the "dictators club" that is the UN.

The new UN terror office, approved by a consensus resolution by the UN's 193 member governments, will centralize various existing UN offices and schemes under a new bureaucracy run by a newly created "under secretary-general" post. In all, the UN reportedly operates 38 different terror-related entities, so the new bureaucracy will bring them all together under one roof — with the exception of the "Counter-Terrorism Committee" of the UN Security Council.

This may be yet another opportunity for patriotic Americans to advance the American Sovereignty Restoration Act (H.R. 193). The legislation, currently sitting in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, would see the U.S. government withdraw from the UN and all of its dangerous, totalitarian tentacles. It would also evict the UN's headquarters — infested with spies, tyrants, mass murderers, and communists — from U.S. soil. Concerned Americans should contact their elected representatives.

Computer Models Wrong, Skeptics Right on "Pause"

In a paper published in *Nature Geoscience* on June 19, Dr. Benjamin Santer, a top global-warming alarmist, led a team of activist authors (including Michael Mann and Al Gore of "Hockey Stick" infamy) who made the startling admission that alarmist computer model predictions greatly overestimated the actual observed global temperatures. That's what they are confessing, but they do so in a very convoluted manner designed to hide the confession. Here's the opening sentence of the abstract of their article: "In the early twenty-first century, satellite-derived tropospheric warming trends were generally smaller than trends estimated from a large multi-model ensemble." They go on to write: "Over most of the early twenty-first century, however, model tropospheric warming is substantially larger than observed.... We conclude that model overestimation of tropospheric warming in the early twenty-first century is partly due to systematic deficiencies in some of the post-2000 external forcings used in the model simulations." In other words, "garbage in, garbage out."

The ever-busy Santer co-authored a similar paper in *Nature* on May 24, 2017, with a different team of climate activists who attempted to spin the discrepancies between the raw data and the computer models in an AGW face-saving direction. The embarrassing discrepancies, said Team Santer, are "due







to the combined effects of multiple factors: the anomalous warmth at the beginning of the last 20 years (arising from a large El Niño event in 1997/98), the shift from a warm phase to a cold phase of the Interdecadal Pacific Oscillation in the late 1990s, changes in other modes of internal variability, a succession of moderate volcanic eruptions in the early 21st century, a long and low minimum in solar output during the last solar cycle, and an increase in anthropogenic sulphate pollution."

Of course, the mainstream media are AWOL on this issue, since they've been lap dogs for the anthropogenic (human-caused) global-warming consensus chorus for more than two decades.

Supreme Court Allows Most of Trump Travel Ban to Proceed

The U.S. Supreme Court, on the last day of the 2016-2017 term on June 26, granted most of the Trump administration's emergency request to put the president's March 6 travel ban executive order into place. That order places a 90-day suspension on entry into the United States on citizens of Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. The court will hear arguments related to the travel ban case during its next session, which will begin in October. The court also said it would partly allow a 120-day ban on all refugees entering the United States to go into effect.

The High Court, in an unsigned opinion, exempted one category of foreigners from the travel ban, those "with a credible claim of a bona fide relationship with a person or entity in the United States."

Having a bona fide relationship means that the individuals have family members who reside in or have business ties with the United States.

The case under consideration by the court on June 26 was *Trump v. International Refugee Assistance Project* — considering the administration's application for stay and appeal for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit — which was combined with *Trump v. Hawaii*, in which the administration sought a stay and appeal of a ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. (A writ of certiorari is a document that a losing party in a court decision files with the Supreme Court asking it to review the decision of a lower court.)

The Supreme Court wrote that these cases involve challenges to Executive Order No. 13780, Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States. The High Court wrote: "The Government filed separate petitions for certiorari, as well as applications to stay the preliminary injunctions entered by the lower courts. We grant the petitions for certiorari and grant the stay applications in part."

California's \$400-Billion Single-payer Bill Tabled for the Year

Californians have been spared the horrors of single-payer healthcare for a little longer, thanks to a June 23 decision by Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon to put a universal healthcare bill passed by the state Senate on hold for the remainder of the year.

Rendon, a Democrat who supports single-payer, said in a statement that he was keeping the bill in committee "until further notice" rather than bringing it to the floor for a vote. He called the bill, which would replace California's current public and private health-insurance systems with a single state-run program to cover virtually all healthcare expenses, "woefully incomplete."

"Even senators who voted for [the bill] noted there are potentially fatal flaws in the bill, including the fact it does not address many serious issues, such as financing, delivery of care, cost controls, or the







realities of needed action by the Trump Administration and voters to make [the bill] a genuine piece of legislation," Rendon added.

The cost of the measure is perhaps its biggest hurdle. The Democrat-controlled Senate Appropriations Committee estimated in May that the bill, sponsored by Senators Ricardo Lara and Toni Atkins, would cost the state \$400 billion a year, more than twice its existing annual budget. That would require a doubling of state taxes and also necessitate concessions from the federal government on Medicare, Medicaid, ObamaCare, and other programs. Despite this, the Senate passed the bill the following week.

Universal healthcare is thus on hold in the Golden State for the time being, but it is by no means gone forever. "The fight for single payer also is moving forward on other fronts," Rendon observed in his statement, pointing to a movement to "get a single payer initiative on the ballot." Californians who prefer to retain at least a semblance of individual liberty and free markets in healthcare — not to mention their current tax rates — will need to remain vigilant.

Award-winning Journalist Says Syria Did Not Use Chemical Weapons

According to Seymour Hersh, a journalist who has won the Pulitzer Prize, President Donald Trump ordered the bombing of Syria in April despite having no evidence that the Bashar al-Assad government had used chemical weapons in the Syrian Civil War. In fact, Hersh contends in a June 25 article entitled "Trump's Red Line," originally published in the German newspaper *Die Welt*, Trump ignored evidence to the contrary when he used 59 Tomahawk missiles to bomb Syria in retaliation against the Assad regime.

"None of this makes any sense," Hersh reported one U.S. officer saying upon hearing of the planned bombing raid on Syria. "We KNOW that there was no chemical attack ... claiming we have the real intel and know the truth.... I guess it didn't matter whether we elected Clinton or Trump," the officer lamented.

Hersh interviewed multiple U.S. advisors, examining the evidence that they provided, and concluded that the so-called chemical attack committed by the Syrian Air Force was really a non-chemical attack upon Khan Sheikhoun, targeting high-ranking jihadist leaders and using a 500-pound conventional bomb provided by the Russians. The place bombed was a two-story building that housed a grocery and other businesses on the ground floor. According to Hersh's sources, the basement stored rockets, weapons, and ammunition. In addition, medicines and chlorine-based decontaminants were also stored there. The chlorine was used to cleanse bodies of the dead before burial.

"The rebels control the population by controlling the distribution of goods that people need to live — food, water, cooking oil, propane gas, fertilizers for growing their crops, and insecticides to protect the crops," Hersh said he was told by a senior advisor in the American intelligence community. In other words, it was an obvious target for a conventional bomb. Use of sarin gas upon such a facility would be illogical.

Another advisor told Hersh, "This was not a chemical weapons strike. That's a fairy tale. If so, everyone involved in transferring, loading and arming the weapon — you've got to make it appear like a regular 500-pound conventional bomb — would be wearing Hazmat protective clothing in case of a leak. There would be little chance of survival without such gear. Military grade sarin includes additives designed to





Published in the July 24, 2017 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 33, No. 14

increase toxicity and lethality. Every batch that comes out is maximized for death. That is why it is made. It is odorless and invisible and death can come within a minute."

Victims at hospitals "smelled of bleach, suggesting that they had been exposed to chlorine," Hersh was told. He noted that there was evidence that there was more than one chemical responsible for the various symptoms observed, "which would not have been the case if the Syrian Air Force — as opposition activists insisted — had dropped a sarin bomb, which has no percussive or ignition power to trigger secondary explosions. The range of symptoms is, however, consistent with the release of a mixture of chemicals, including chlorine and the organophosphates used in many fertilizers, which can cause neurotoxic effects similar to those of sarin."

Hersh cited an advisor who said that blaming Assad, without any evidence, was illogical. "Russia's strategy against ISIS," the advisor told Hersh, "which involves getting American cooperation, would have been destroyed.... Bashar would do that? When he's on the verge of winning the war? Are you kidding me?"

Trump, however, apparently believed Assad did use sarin gas, against all logic, and with no evidence. "When you kill innocent children, innocent babies — babies, little babies — with a chemical gas that is so lethal … that crosses many, many lines, beyond a red line…. That attack on children yesterday had a big impact on me. Big impact…. It's very, very possible … that my attitude toward Syria and Assad had changed very much."

Trump's previous noninterventionist attitude, in general, and with the Syrian Civil War in specific, was likely one of the main reasons that he was able to win the Republican presidential nomination, and finally the general election. He rightly condemned President Barack Obama in 2013, Tweeting, "What will we get for bombing Syria besides more debt and a possible long-term conflict?"

During the recent presidential campaign, Trump rightly challenged the tendency of recent presidents to intervene in the internal affairs of other sovereign nations, particularly decrying the "regime change" agendas of Presidents Bush (both of them), Clinton, and Obama. Yet Trump seems to be going down the same path. Millions of Americans had hoped that Donald Trump would be different.







Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year
Optional Print Edition
Digital Edition Access
Exclusive Subscriber Content
Audio provided for all articles
Unlimited access to past issues
Coming Soon! Ad FREE
60-Day money back guarantee!
Cancel anytime.