**The China Syndrome**

Meddling in our elections is a problems we have had with foreign countries for nearly 30 years. Remember when the Clintons gave missile technology to China for cash to buy the presidency? This is the process continuing, and President Trump shuts off one source of cash after another. The close relationship of Boeing (whose former [employee Patrick Shanahan](https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2018-12-23/angry-trump-forces-mattis-out-early-names-former-boeing-exec-acting-secdef)is now the acting Pentagon chief) with a Chinese government-backed satellite start up company has been the target of an SEC and Commerce Department investigation, according to the [Wall Street Journal](https://www.wsj.com/articles/u-s-probes-failed-boeing-satellite-deal-backed-by-china-11547248296).

Global IP, based in Los Angeles, reportedly received a letter by the SEC requesting that the company retain all of its documents related to its work with Boeing as well as other entities, including China Orient Asset Management Company, a state owned Chinese lender. The letter says that the SEC believes that the company has "documents and data that are relevant to a matter under investigation". The letter was disclosed in a court filing on January 4 by one of Global IP's founders, Umar Javed. That filing was part of litigation against a group of defendants that includes a unit of China Orient.

China Orient was said to be providing financing to Global IP for the purchase of a satellite from Boeing. This is problematic because due to recent diplomatic... tensions shall we say, American companies are "effectively barred" from selling satellites to China.
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The Commerce Department is also said to be looking at Global IP's Chinese financing. The Commerce Department is in charge of issuing export licenses from CFIUS, which is tasked with reviewing foreign deals for national security concerns.

**The two co-founders of Global IP are suing because they allege that a unit of China Orient secretly took control of the company after it accepted $200 million in financing from the firm.**The founders stated they had been upfront in disclosing to Boeing where their funding was coming from to begin with.

In a separate article, Global IP had denied to the Wall Street Journal that it was controlled by China Orient, at odds with what this lawsuit states. Javed said he obtained the SEC’s letter because he was a minority shareholder in the company, but he claims he’s no longer involved in day-to-day operations.

Using their financing from China Orient, **Global IP contracted Boeing to build a satellite that would beam internet coverage to sub-Saharan Africa.**National security experts were said to be concerned that the satellite could then be repurposed for military activities. In a previous Wall Street Journal article, lawmakers and government officials said that they were surprised Boeing would work with Global IP if it knowingly understood China's involvement.

The SEC investigation is said to still be at a preliminary stage and is not a guarantee that the agency will bring a complaint.

**Rashida is an F-Bomber**

A serious threat has finally made it through our security protocols and into Congress. She has openly attacked our President and threatens the foundations of the Republic. She has 63 million American enemies, but another enemy has entered the fray. Truth is often stranger than fiction, and yes, this really just happened. Al Arabiya, a pro-government, Saudi-owned pan-Arab news outlet, just [lambasted](https://english.alarabiya.net/en/features/2018/12/08/Details-of-calls-by-US-Muslim-Sisters-of-Muslim-Brotherhood-to-attack-Trump-.html) Somali American Ilhan Omar (D-MN) and Palestinian American Rashida Tlaib (D-MI) for their ties with Linda Sarsour, U.S. [Muslim Brotherhood](https://clarionproject.org/glossary/muslim-brotherhood/)-linked groups and a plethora of other individuals who share the Brotherhood’s Islamist political project.

Al Arabiya makes its case by showing how the Democratic party’s quest to wrest control of Congress “led to an alliance with political Islamist movements … pushing Muslim candidates and women activists of immigrant minorities onto the electoral scene.”

The Saudi’s mortal enemy is Iran. There is no love lost in the kingdom for former President Obama and his Democratic cohorts for pushing Congress out of the way to make room for the controversial Iran nuclear deal, which deposited billions of dollars into the hands of the ayatollahs and helped foster their nefarious plans for regional hegemony in the Middle East.

The Saudis are equally threatened by the Muslim Brotherhood, whose quest for power over Middle East governments was beginning to be realized in the Arab Spring. The Brotherhood also enjoyed large support by the [Obama administration](https://clarionproject.org/obama-invites-brotherhoods-morsi-white-house-25/), both in Egypt and by US-linked Brotherhood groups which were considered by the White House as their [“top” outreach partners](https://clarionproject.org/white-house-isna-top-outreach-partner/).

As the Saudi news outlet noted, “The common ground between Congresswomen Omar and Tlaib is that both are anti-Trump … especially his foreign policy starting from the sanctions on Iran to the isolation of the Muslim Brotherhood and all movements of [political Islam](https://clarionproject.org/glossary/political-islam/).”

Al Arabiya considers the sponsorship and support received by the two Muslim candidates as a tactic employed by Islamists to infiltrate Congress through the immigrant and Black communities as well as through women’s groups, as represented by their prominent Islamist spokesperson, Linda Sarsour.

Al Arabiya calls Sarsour a “Palestinian American activist … with roots in Muslim Brotherhood and a member of the Council on American-Islamic Relations [CAIR].” The piece documents at length Sarsour’s ties to these and other Islamist and terrorists groups and causes.

Of course, the irony of the piece is ever present to those of us in the West who would first and foremost want to say to say to the Saudis: Get your own house in order first.

The [sharia](https://clarionproject.org/glossary/sharia/) principles that rule the kingdom – which make women second class citizens and human rights non-existent, not to mention the lack of a democratic system of government — are, of course, not too different than the theocratic rule in Iran or the Muslim Brotherhood’s goal of establishing a worldwide [caliphate](https://clarionproject.org/glossary/caliphate/).

**Green is the New Red**

Green New Deal legislation enjoys a number of enthusiastic, high-profile supporters. This stems in large part from no such bill existing.

Forty-five House Democrats [support](https://www.sunrisemovement.org/gnd/) the Green New Deal. So does New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman. An Outside magazine headline [proclaims](https://www.outsideonline.com/2376841/green-new-deal-best-deal-outdoors), “The Green New Deal Is a Great Deal for the Outdoors.”

But what, exactly, is the Green New Deal?

It is a slogan in search of a statute — proposed, passed, or otherwise. The amorphous concept nevertheless convinces politicians to attach their names to it, whatever it is. Not only does its formless ethereal form allow diverse individuals to project very specific fantasies on it, it allows well-wishers to imagine successful outcomes based on the imagined policies. Like Al Capone’s vault, we do not know what the Green New Deal contains. And we nevertheless harbor great expectations.

Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez released a draft that at least put ideas to paper. But in relying on such phrases as “social, economic, racial, regional and gender-based justice,” the Green New Deal draft means many things to many people.

The one specific and clear goal involves the elimination of greenhouse gases, which, we should remember, include water vapor and flatulence. The elimination of the latter seems a worthy if utopian goal; the elimination of the former, suicidal. The existence of other greenhouse gases involves a weighing of pros and cons; one senses the backers of the Green New Deal see more cons than pros in something as essential to the lives of Americans as the automobile. (Must we all drive Flintstones-style cars in the backward future?) The tin-eared response to coal country supporting Donald Trump in 2016 involves this proposal to eliminate coal.

The document declares war upon greenhouse gases — in fact, a world war. The plan articulates “the aim of becoming the undisputed international leader in helping other countries transition to completely greenhouse gas neutral economies and bringing about a global Green New Deal.” As ambitious as the original New Deal was, at least its authors felt bounded by the borders of the United States.

Much of the rest laid out by the freshman congressman appears as a non sequitur, unrelated in any sense, tangential or direct, to the environment.

The draft labels the Green New Deal “a historic opportunity to virtually eliminate poverty in the United States and to make prosperity, wealth and economic security available to everyone participating in the transformation.” It calls for it to be “responsive to, and in accordance with, the goals and guidelines relating to social, economic, racial, regional and gender-based justice and equality.” Other policies namedropped in the brief draft include “basic income programs,” “universal health care programs,” and “cooperative and public ownership.”

A Rorschach test quality colors the “solutions” to global warming. They all invariably involve ideas advanced by the Left for decades without previous reference to the environment. What does universal healthcare or increased foreign aid or guaranteed income have to do with shortening that red line on our thermometers?

If Republicans countered with their solution to global warming as a plan that included the prohibition of abortion, a reduction in income tax rates, and the construction of a border wall, then those on the other side of the aisle would immediately recognize it as a Trojan Horse to exploit a scare to smuggle their favored ideas into the legal code. Strangely, the 45 Democrats seconding a litany of policies extraneous to global warming as its solution do not recognize, or perhaps care, how comically counterfeit the Green New Deal strikes, particularly those legitimately concerned about the environment (but not enamored with socialism).

The Communist Party of the USA’s [program](https://www.cpusa.org/party_info/party-program/) on its website includes “the guaranteed right to a job,” “public ownership,” and “universal health care” — the same calls found in the Green New Deal. People, hopefully ones degreed in science, can debate the degree to which man influences degrees. Rejecting socialism as a solution requires no such sheepskin, and does not make one an enemy of clean air and water.

Green is the new red.