

Newsbytes

The First Watch

December 4, 2019

No. 949

Since 2001

Newzbytes is a ministry of Calvary Chapel of Appleton

www.ccappleton.org

“Let us be alert to the season in which we are living. It is the season of the Blessed Hope, calling for us to cut our ties with the world and build ourselves on this One who will soon appear. He is our hope—a Blessed Hope enabling us to rise above our times and fix our gaze upon Him.” Tozer

China Adopts Malicious "Cybersecurity" Rules

by Gordon G. Chang November 30, 2019

President Trump should use his emergency powers to prohibit American companies from complying with the new rules or from storing data in China.

After all these "cybersecurity" rules are in place, no foreign company may encrypt data so that it cannot be read by the Chinese central government and the Communist Party of China. In other words, businesses will be required to turn over encryption keys.

Companies will also be prohibited from employing virtual private networks to keep data secret, and some believe they will no longer be allowed to use private servers.

Beijing's system, once implemented, will be so invasive that Chinese authorities will no longer need to ask foreign businesses to turn over data. Chinese officials will simply be able to take that data on their own.

"Once data crosses the Chinese border on a network," writes Steve Dickinson in the China Law Blog, "100 percent of that data will be 100 percent available to the Chinese government and the CCP." Beijing's complete visibility into the networks of foreign companies will have extremely disadvantageous consequences, Dickinson notes. First, Chinese officials will be permitted, under Chinese law, to share seized information with state enterprises. This means the enterprises will be able to use that information against their foreign competitors.

Second, China's new rules will almost certainly result in foreign companies losing trade secret protection around the world. A trade secret loses its status as such when it is widely disclosed. Once a company allows such a secret to be carried on its Chinese network, the company has to assume Beijing will know it. "Since no company can reasonably assume its trade secrets will remain secret once transmitted into China over a Chinese controlled network, they are at great risk of having their trade secret protections outside China evaporating as well," writes Dickinson.

Third, China's cybersecurity program exposes companies to penalties for violating U.S. tech-export legislation. Businesses have assumed that technology covered by U.S. export prohibitions is not "exported" if it is kept on a Chinese network protected by end-to-end encryption, in other words, not available to Chinese authorities. Because companies will no longer be permitted to encrypt data end-to-end, they will almost certainly be considered as violating U.S. rules for tech stored on a network

in China.

Not every analyst is alarmed by China's December 1 measures. James Andrew Lewis, for instance, maintains that Beijing's new rules are a "legitimate effort" to secure networks in China. Moreover, he argues the Chinese do not need the new MLPS 2.0 rules to grab information because they can just steal all they want with their advanced "APT" hacker groups. "Their intent is not to use it for malicious purposes," Lewis argues, referring to Chinese officials.

It is not clear how Lewis, a tech expert at the Washington, D.C.-based Center for Strategic and International Studies, can know the intent of China's officials. Furthermore, portraying that intent as benign seems naive—laughable even—while their country is stealing hundreds of billions of dollars of American intellectual property each year and while Chinese ruler Xi Jinping continues his determined attacks on foreign business. In these circumstances, we have to assume Chinese officials are acting with malign intent.

Lewis also downplays the basic point that China's cyber spies, once they have the encryption keys and access to the China network of a foreign firm, will be in a better position to penetrate the networks of that firm outside China. Therefore, it will only be a matter of time before Beijing steals data and puts companies out of business or ruins them to the point where Chinese entities can swoop in and buy them up cheap. Many allege that China stole data from Canada's Nortel Networks and thereby bankrupted it almost a decade ago. The company was, according to the Financial Post, "hacked to pieces."

Finally, CSIS's Lewis fails to recognize that Beijing's December 1 rules generally legitimize China's regulation and information-custody role—in other words, China's theft.

Senator Josh Hawley is rightly more suspicious of Beijing's intentions. In November, the Missouri Republican introduced a bill, the National Security and Data Protection Act of 2019, prohibiting American companies from storing user data or encryption keys in China. Of course, this bill faces opposition from tech companies doing business in that country.

Yet, there is someone who can, with the stroke of a pen, effectively implement Hawley's bill. President Donald John Trump can use his broad powers under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act of 1977 to prohibit companies from complying with the pernicious new rules or from storing data in China.

The rationale for such a sweeping presidential order is that the American people have an interest in China not taking control of American companies with operations in China—a probable consequence of the application of the December 1 and January 1 measures.

Such an emergency order would effectively force American companies out of China, so this step would be drastic. Yet it is China, with its incredibly ambitious grab of data, that is forcing the issue. The American people have a vital interest in the protection of American data. Trump should issue such an order immediately.

Gordon G. Chang is the author of [The Coming Collapse of China](#) and a Gatestone Institute Distinguished Senior Fellow. Follow him on Twitter @GordonGChang.

Iranian general: Our missiles are aimed at 21 US bases in the region

Allahnoor Noorollahi declares the Islamic Republic prepared to fight its 'greatest enemy,' recalls Khamenei's vow to 'raze' Tel Aviv

Times of Israel

December 2

An Iranian general has warned that Iran's missile arsenals are aimed at 21 American military bases in the Middle East and the country is prepared for "the greatest war against the greatest enemy."

In a November 29 speech, at an event in the southern city of Bushehr commemorating 40 years since the establishment of the Basij paramilitary force, Gen. Allahnoor Noorollahi also said that Iran had the ability to raze Haifa and Tel Aviv to the ground.

Noorollahi serves as a top adviser to the commander of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Officers College. His speech was broadcast on Bushehr TV, and was reported on and translated by the Middle East Media Research Institute.

"Iran is the world's fourth [strongest] missile power after the US, Russia, and China," he boasted in his comments, which were translated Sunday by the MEMRI watchdog group.

Noorollahi claimed the NATO military alliance had purportedly warned that Iran could launch as many as 20,000 missiles per day, but that the number could actually be higher in a future conflict with the United States.

"Unfortunately, some Gulf countries have become a military camp for our enemy. I must say this, 21 of their bases constitute targets for our missiles. NATO itself announced that Iran's 110 missile bases and launching sites are capable of launching 20,000 missiles per day. This is what the enemy says. They only acknowledge part [of our capability]. When a country reveals not only its underground missile bases but also its missile 'cities' to the enemy – this reflects readiness and capabilities.

"It means that we have capability to confront the greatest enemy," he added, a reference to the US, which the regime has long characterized as its arch-foe and calls the "Great Satan."

He said America's regional allies were not Iran's enemies, and reiterated the claim by the regime's Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei that the Islamic Republic was capable of "razing" Tel Aviv and Haifa to the ground.

"Saudi Arabia and the region's countries are neither on our level nor are they our enemies. Our enemy is the [country] that came to Kuwait and built six large bases there. This enemy knows that if it transgresses... We do not want to cause harm to our neighbors unless we are forced to," he said.

Noorollahi's comments came just days after the Revolutionary Guard's top commander, Gen. Hossein Salami, threatened to destroy Israel, the US and other countries, as he addressed a pro-government demonstration denouncing last month's violent protests over a fuel price hike.

Salami accused the US, Britain, Israel and Saudi Arabia of stoking the unrest.

"If you cross our red line, we will destroy you," he said. "We will not leave any move unanswered."

"We have shown restraint ... we have shown patience towards the hostile moves of America, the Zionist regime (Israel), and Saudi Arabia against the Islamic Republic of Iran," Salami added, according to

Reuters.

In this undated photo released by Sepahnews, the website of the Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, Gen. Hossein Salami speaks in a meeting in Tehran, Iran. (Sepahnews via AP) He said if Iran decides to respond, "the enemy will not have security anywhere," adding that "our patience has a limit."

Iran has accused the US, Israel and Saudi Arabia of engineering large protests sparked by a 200 percent jump in the price of gasoline.

Officials said the demonstrations turned violent because of the intervention of "thugs," backed by royalists and Iran's arch-enemies.

At a pro-government rally last Monday, which state TV referred to as the "Rise of the people of Tehran against riots," protesters carried signs bearing traditional anti-US slogans.

But speakers also criticized President Hassan Rouhani's administration for the way the fuel price hike was implemented, even as they called for capital punishment for rioters and further restrictions on social media platforms.

During the violence, dozens of banks, gas pumps and police stations were torched across the Islamic Republic. The United Nations said it feared that dozens died, while Amnesty International said more than 100 were believed to have been killed.

Iran has been gripped by an economic crisis since the US restored painful sanctions after withdrawing from the 2015 nuclear deal.

At a meeting Monday with family members of a security officer who was killed in the violence, Salami vowed that Iran will "take revenge for the security defenders on the US, the UK, Israel and their mercenaries inside Iran," the official IRNA news agency reported.

Transgenderism Is Just The Start: Racial Self-Identification Is Next

By Jonathon Van Maren/Bridgehead.ca December 02, 2019

We all knew it was coming, and here it is - according to The Telegraph, one major lecturer's union has declared that people "should be allowed to identify as black no matter what color they are born."

After all, if your genitalia doesn't tell us anything about your sex, your skin color obviously tells us nothing about your race. I'm a bit surprised it took so long for this to take off:

The University and College Union (UCU), which represents more than 100,000 university lecturers and staff, set out its position on whether people should be able to self-identify as different races or genders.

In the paper "UCU Position on Trans Inclusion", it stated: "The UCU has a long history of enabling members to self-identify, whether that is being black, disabled, LGBT or women."

The union's stance was criticized by some of its own members as "nonsensical". Kathleen Stock, a professor of philosophy at the University of Sussex, wrote on Twitter: "I'm still a member of UCU but... they make it hard when they publish this nonsensical, anti-intellectual propaganda."

The debate over racial self-identification has become heated in recent years. Last November, Anthony Lennon, a white theater director who describes himself as an "African born again", drew criticism for securing public funding intended to help ethnic minorities develop their stage careers.

Mr Lennon, 53, who was born in London and whose parents are Irish, won a place on a two-year Arts Council-funded scheme, after a leading black theater company accepted his claim to be of "mixed heritage".

Trevor Phillips, the former chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, said allowing people to self-identify their race meant members of ethnic minority communities "lost out".

The UCU's paper also reaffirmed that it supported a "social, rather than medical, model of gender recognition".

A spokesman for the UCU said: "Self-identification is a standard practice in many organisations and the Office for National Statistics says 'there is no consensus on what constitutes an ethnic group and membership is something that is selfdefined'."

The interesting thing about our new era of radical autonomy and forced social acceptance of any self-identification, no matter how ludicrous, is that it is displacing and replacing groups that previously had to fight for decades to achieve their rights--rights that are now simply being "named and claimed" by whoever happens to identify with that group.

Women fought for private, female-only spaces--and now biological males claiming to be females are forcing their way in, many of them still packing their functioning male genitals.

Feminists who protest this and try to tell the press that this is a new manifestation of the patriarchy are shouted down and told they are transphobes and bigots.

And now you have white people claiming to be black people and taking things designated for black people. Since we've done away with standards of objectivity, anything is up for grabs, and some people are getting very grabby.

I'm sure the Democrats will do precisely what the radical Left tells them to when trans-racialism or whatever they're going to call it becomes the next big thing, and that's when we'll find out just how much of this progressive nonsense the African-American community is willing to put up with.

Iran, Russia, China to Hold Joint Wargames in 'Message to the World'

November 27 The Washington Free Beacon

Iran, China, and Russia will hold in the coming weeks their first-ever joint war drills, which leaders say are meant to send a "message to the world" about increased military cooperation between the rogue countries.

The commander of Iran's navy, Rear Admiral Hossein Khanzadi, said Wednesday that the Islamic Republic will team up with Moscow and Beijing within the next month to hold the mass war drills.

"When we talk about joint wargames, we are talking about two or more countries with a high level of relations in various political, economic and social fields, which culminate in cooperation in the military

sector, with wargames usually being the highest level of such cooperation," Khazdadi was quoted as saying in remarks to Iran's state-controlled press.

David Rutz breaks down the most important news about the enemies of freedom, here and around the world, in this comprehensive morning newsletter.

"A joint wargame between several countries, whether on land, at sea, or in the air, indicates a remarkable expansion of cooperation among them," the military leader said.

The joint war drills will be aimed at sending a message to the world, particularly Western nations, like the United States, that have sought to constrain Iran's expanding military ambitions.

"The joint wargame between Iran, Russia, and China, which will hopefully be conducted next month, carries the same message to the world, that these three countries have reached a meaningful strategic point in their relations, with regard to their shared and non-shared interests, and by non-shared I mean the respect we have for one another's national interests," Khazdadi was quoted as saying.

The Iranian military leader emphasized the importance of performing military drills in the sea, where the Islamic Republic has been particularly troublesome for Western nations. Iranian naval vessels routinely harass American military ships and have played a role in various sabotage efforts aimed at disrupting international shipping lanes.

"The wargame seeks to deliver this message to the world that any kind of security at sea must include the interests of all concerned countries. We do not condone the kind of security that only caters to the benefits of one specific country at a specific time and which disregards the security of others," Khazdadi said. "Seas, which are used as a platform for conducting global commerce, cannot be exclusively beneficial to certain powers.