

If She's a Native American, then I'm Chinese

It's not exactly breaking news that Donald Trump can be petty. That he can be needlessly vindictive. That he can sound like a kid in fifth grade when he puts down opponents with dopey, demeaning names like Crazy Bernie (Sanders) and Jeff Flakey and Psycho Joe (Scarborough) and Little Rocket Man. But I have to admit to a guilty pleasure: When he calls Elizabeth Warren Pocahontas, I laugh. Out loud.

If Elizabeth Warren, the progressive senator from Massachusetts, is an American Indian as she claims, then I'm Chinese. For the record, I'm not. Though I have eaten at Chinese restaurants a few times and visited Shanghai once.

But, of course, I could be wrong about the senator's claim. Maybe she's telling the truth. Politicians don't always make stuff up. So a cheap and easy DNA "spit in a tube" test would settle the matter once and for all. But she won't do it – because Ms. Warren has evidence proving her Native American heritage. What evidence? What she calls, her "family's stories."

"As a kid, I never asked my mom for documentation when she talked about our Native American heritage," she has said. "What kid would? But I knew my father's family didn't like that she was part Cherokee and part Delaware, so my parents had to elope."

A DNA test would be a lot more convincing than that "family story."

But her tale does get credence in some quarters. On CNN, Jim Acosta, a White House reporter who prides himself on his toughness and skepticism – at least when it comes to anything related to President Trump – asked the senator if the

Pocahontas jab annoys her. "Doesn't that bother you because of your family's heritage?"

Huh? What family heritage? The one she claims without any proof beyond "family stories"? Memo to Jim: You're a reporter. Try to act like one.

And then there's Harvard, where she taught at the Law School. Here's an excerpt from a CNN story:

"Harvard Law School in the 1990s touted Warren, then a professor in Cambridge, as being 'Native American.' They singled her out, Warren later acknowledged, because she had listed herself as a minority in an Association of American Law Schools directory. Critics note that she had not done that in her student applications and during her time as a teacher at the University of Texas.

"Warren maintains she never furthered her career by using her heritage to gain advantage."

Sure!

But wait, it gets better. Some scholars at the most prestigious school in the solar system reportedly said Elizabeth Warren was the Law School's "first woman of color."

Only at an elite progressive institution like Harvard could such nonsense pass as a serious observation. Besides, if she's a woman "of color" what color would that be?

The scholar, Victor Davis Hanson makes an interesting point about the progressive obsession with race and ethnicity. "But what if indeed the pink and blond Warren were found to have 1/32nd or even 1/16th Native American 'blood'?" he writes in National Review. "Why would that artifact magically make her 'Indian,' much less a victim of something or someone, or at least outfitted with a minority cachet?"

Think about it. In the bad old days of the Old South, anyone

with a drop of “black blood” was considered not white – and relegated to the second-class citizenship.

Now, one drop of “Indian blood” doesn’t get you a seat in the back of the bus, but in progressive circles it just might help you get a seat on the faculty of the Harvard Law School.

Senator Warren has been doing a lot of TV lately, and while that doesn’t automatically mean she’ll be running for president in 2020, it at least suggests she might be paving the way – even though she claims she’s not interested in the job.

Whether the senator is speaking with a forked tongue or not remains to be seen. Stay tuned.

President Trump’s Secret Weapon

He can’t go 10 minutes without saying something – let’s be diplomatic here and call it ... *provocative*.

He, of course, is President Trump, who has said some – more diplomacy – *interesting* things of late.

First, there’s Mr. Trump’s understanding of American history. He said he believes that President Andrew Jackson saw the Civil War coming and was angry about it.

Could be, but Andrew Jackson died 16 years *before* the war started.

Mr. Trump also said that Jackson “Would never have let it happen.”

Could be, again, but Andrew Jackson owned slaves in his native Tennessee and might very well have let it happen. And many historians believe the war was inevitable, given how long bad blood between the North and South had been simmering.

Then there's North Korea.

President Trump said he would be willing to meet with Kim Jong Un "under the right circumstances" to defuse tensions over North Korea's nuclear program. "If it would be appropriate for me to meet with him, I would absolutely, I would be honored to do it," Mr. Trump said.

A meeting is one thing – diplomacy is always a good place to start. But honored to do it?

Honored ... to meet with a despot who threatens the United States every chance he gets? *Honored* ... to meet with a tyrant who doesn't tolerate anything resembling dissent and isn't averse to murdering his opponents?

Maybe the president was just being polite. Or maybe he was just shooting from the lip, improvising foreign policy on the fly. Who knows?

So let's leave North Korea and go to the Philippines – and another authoritarian leader our president would like to sit down with (at the White House).

Maybe President Trump isn't aware that since Philippines President Rodrigo Duterte took office nearly a year ago, he has overseen a campaign of extrajudicial executions of suspected drug addicts and drug dealers that has claimed more than 7,000 lives.

So, is a sit-down with a despot like Duterte – at the White House no less – a meeting that would give him a patina of legitimacy, good policy? Off the top of my head, I'd say no.

Despite all the needless turmoil he stirs up, President Trump

has a secret weapon, unintended allies in unexpected places. They're the Trump-hating progressives on the loony left who are doing their best to make him look good.

If it isn't Stephen Colbert's vulgar rant on national television aimed at the president, or left-wing masked anarchists violently disrupting May Day rallies, or liberal thugs on college campuses shutting down conservative speakers they don't like – when they're not yelling about “inappropriate” Halloween costumes, then it's really important stuff – like accusing the president of bigotry because he calls their progressive heroine Senator Elizabeth Warren ... Pocahontas.

Note to the crazy left: As a general rule, unhinged doesn't play well among moderates who live between the coasts.

But now progressives have taken their anger to a whole new level: Some have actually cancelled their subscriptions to the newspaper they have long accepted as their progressive bible – the New York Times.

What ghastly sin did the Times commit? They hired former Wall Street Journal columnist Bret Stephens, a Pulitzer Prize-winning conservative and a member of the never-Trump club.

If only, in his first column for the Times, Stephens had stuck it to the *despised* Mr. Trump. But he didn't.

Instead, he had the gall to challenge the liberal party line on one of the left's holiest of sacred cows – global warming.

“While the modest (0.85 degrees Celsius, or about 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit) warming of the Northern Hemisphere since 1880 is indisputable,” Stephens wrote, “as is the human influence on that warming, much else that passes as accepted fact is really a matter of probabilities. That's especially true of the sophisticated but fallible models and simulations by which scientists attempt to peer into the climate future.”

In other words, we can be sure of what's happening now and what's already happened but we can't be certain of what's going to happen years and years into the future.

Because of his *blasphemy* many Times readers had a meltdown of nuclear proportions. Taking to Twitter they said:

"Bret Stephens first op-ed for the NYT is an abomination"

"It's really a shame what has happened to this once-great newspaper"

"Democracy dies in the darkness. So, too, the climate. Thanks, Times, for spreading fake opinion"

David French put it elegantly in National Review Online: "The only people who can't recognize that our nation has a 'smug liberal' problem are smug liberals."

But these smug liberals may wind up being Donald Trump's ace in the hole, because a lot of Americans – whether they like Donald Trump or not – find left wing smugness far more annoying than the president.

Crazy as it sounds, they may turn out to be Donald Trump's most potent political allies, as we get closer to 2018.

Stay tuned.