

Eye on the World

Nov. 12, 2016

This compilation of material for "Eye on the World" is presented as a service to the Churches of God. The views stated in the material are those of the writers or sources quoted by the writers, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Church of God Big Sandy. The following articles were posted at churchofgodbigandy.com for the weekend of Nov. 12, 2016.

Compiled by Dave Havir

Luke 21:34-36—"But take heed to yourselves, lest your souls be weighed down with self-indulgence, and drunkenness, or the anxieties of this life, and that day come on you suddenly, like a falling trap; for it will come on all dwellers on the face of the whole earth. But beware of slumbering; and every moment pray that you may be fully strengthened to escape from all these coming evils, and to take your stand in the presence of the Son of Man" (Weymouth New Testament).



A Reuters article titled "Saudi Oil Shipments to Egypt Halted Indefinitely, Egyptian Officials Say" was posted at reuters.com on Nov. 7, 2016. Following is the article.

Saudi Arabia has informed Egypt that shipments of oil products expected under a \$23 billion aid deal have been halted indefinitely, suggesting a deepening rift between the Arab world's richest country and its most populous.

Saudi Arabia has been a major donor to Egypt since President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi seized power in mid-2013 but Riyadh has become frustrated with Sisi's lack of economic reforms and his reluctance to be drawn into the conflict in Yemen.

During a visit by Saudi King Salman in April, Saudi Arabia agreed to provide Egypt with 700,000 tonnes of refined oil products per month for five years but the cargoes stopped arriving in early October as festering political tensions burst into the open.

Egyptian officials have said since that the contract with Saudi Arabia's state oil firm Aramco remains valid and had appeared to expect that oil would start flowing again soon.

On Monday, however, Egyptian Oil Minister Tarek El Molla confirmed it had stopped shipments indefinitely. Aramco has not commented on the halt and did not respond to calls on Monday.

“They did not give us a reason,” an oil ministry official told Reuters. “They only informed the authority about halting shipments of petroleum products until further notice.”

The move comes as a source in Molla’s delegation said late on Sunday evening that he would visit Iran, Saudi Arabia’s main political rival, to try to strike new oil deals.

Egypt and Iran’s diplomatic relations have been strained since the 1970s. An Egyptian official visiting Iran would cement a break in its alliance with Saudi Arabia and mark a seismic shift in the regional political order.

Speaking to reporters in Abu Dhabi, Molla said he was not going to Iran. An Iranian oil official later said that a report by the semi-official Mehr news agency suggesting Molla would meet his Iranian counterpart in Tehran on Monday was “incorrect.”

Egyptian Prime Minister Sherif Ismail also said Molla was not visiting Iran and Egypt was not negotiating with Tehran over importing oil products, state newspaper al-Ahram reported.

But two security sources and the source in Molla’s delegation said the minister had been scheduled to go, and the low-key visit was now delayed after the news became public.

Gulf Arab countries, led by Saudi Arabia, have pumped billions of dollars into Egypt’s flagging economy since former general Sisi took over after a year of divisive rule by the Muslim Brotherhood.

But with the Brotherhood threat diminished, Gulf rulers have grown disillusioned at what they consider Sisi’s inability to reform an economy that has become a black hole for aid, and his reluctance to back them on the regional stage.

Egypt has been reluctant to provide military backing for Riyadh’s war against the Iranian-backed Houthi group in Yemen.

In Syria, where Saudi Arabia is a leading backer of rebels fighting against Iranian-backed Bashar al-Assad, Sisi has supported Russia’s decision to bomb in support of the president.

A deal to hand over two Red Sea islands to Saudi Arabia, made at the same time as the oil aid agreement, has faced legal challenges and is now bogged down in an Egyptian court.



An article by James Phillips titled “Wrong, Iran: Trump Can Absolutely Overturn Obama’s Iranian Nuke Deal” was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 10, 2016. Following is the article.

Donald Trump's election as president has discomfited many foreign leaders, especially in Iran.

Iranian President Hassan Rouhani claimed Wednesday that there is "no possibility" for the Obama administration's nuclear deal with Iran to be overturned by Trump, despite Trump's threat to do so.

This is an outright lie. President Barack Obama purposely structured the deal as an executive agreement to make an end-run around Congress, which he knew would oppose the flawed and risky deal.

After his inauguration, Trump would have the authority to revoke the executive agreement. Trump has called the deal "disastrous" and said his "No. 1 priority" would be to dismantle it.

Iran's state television channel reported that Rouhani told his Cabinet that Tehran's "understanding in the nuclear deal was that the accord was not concluded with one country or government but was approved by a resolution of the U.N. Security Council and there is no possibility that it can be changed by a single government."

Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif chimed in to urge Trump to accept the agreement: "Every U.S. president has to understand the realities of today's world. The most important thing is that the future U.S. president stick to agreements, to engagements undertaken."

That is laughable advice, coming from the hypocritical leaders of a country that regularly violates international law by sponsoring terrorism, taking hostages, harassing shipping in international waters—not to mention violating U.N. Security Council resolutions by exporting arms to Palestinian terrorist groups, Hezbollah terrorists, Syrian militias, and Yemeni rebels.

Iran has also been caught trying to covertly buy illicit dual-use nuclear technology in Germany. This violates its commitments under the nuclear agreement to obtain international approval for all nuclear purchases.

The new administration could use these or other violations as a justification for doing away with the nuclear deal.

Trump has promised to enforce the nuclear deal so strictly that it will be patently clear that Iran is responsible for the deal's demise. During the presidential campaign he said:

"You know, I've taken over some bad contracts. I buy contracts where people screwed up and they have bad contracts. But I'm really good at looking at a contract and finding things within a contract that, even if they're bad, I would police that contract so tough that they don't have a chance. As bad as the contract is, I will be so tough on that contract."

Iran's dictators have had an easy time out-negotiating and out-maneuvering the Obama administration, which eagerly sought to clinch a deal. The administration made huge concessions that allowed Iran to dismantle international sanctions without dismantling key elements of its nuclear program, which continues to advance.

It looks like the Trump administration will take a much harder line on the Iran nuclear issue, which will be one of the earliest foreign policy issues it must address.



An article by Katie Pavlich titled "After Trump Victory, Pressure Builds to Officially Name Jerusalem Capital of Israel" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 10, 2016. Following is the article.

Before Donald Trump won the presidency on Tuesday night, he campaigned on a promise to officially name Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and said he would order the relocation of the U.S. embassy in Tel Aviv to the Holy City.

Now that Trump's victory is secure, pressure is already building for those promises to be fulfilled.

Jerusalem Mayor Nir Barkat cheered "Mazel tov, Mr. President!" to the winning candidate and then reminded Trump that he had promised to move the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Israel's declared capital, Jerusalem. The United States does not recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital, awaiting instead a final negotiated settlement between Israel and the Palestinians.

Deputy Foreign Minister Tzipi Hotovely—Israel's top diplomat—chimed in that she wanted Trump to fulfill his campaign vow to recognize Jerusalem. "That would be an important historic move," she said.

"This will symbolize the close relationship and courageous friendship between the two nations," said Israeli Justice Minister Ayelet Shaked.

The leader of Israel's Jewish Home party, Education Minister Naftali Bennett, called Trump's win "a tremendous opportunity for Israel to immediately announce its intention to renege on the idea of establishing Palestine in the heart of the country—a direct blow to our security and the justice of our cause."

Yesterday Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu congratulated President-elect Donald Trump on his victory, calling him a great friend of the Jewish state.

"President-elect Trump, my friend, congratulations on being elected President of the United States of America. You are a great friend of Israel," Netanyahu said "The bond between the US and Israel is based on shared values, shared interests and a shared future. I am sure that President-elect Trump and I will continue to strengthen the special alliance between Israel and the US and we will bring them to new heights."

In return, Trump invited Netanyahu to visit the United States for a meeting. The two met at Trump Tower earlier this year.



An article by Bill Gertz titled "Nuclear Modernization, Cyber Security Top Trump Defense Priorities" was posted at freebeacon.com on Nov. 10, 2016. Following is the article.

President-elect Donald Trump's national security priorities are modernizing the aging U.S. nuclear arsenal and securing critical infrastructure from cyber attacks.

According to Greatagain.gov, the presidential transition website opened Thursday, Trump also appears to have shifted rhetoric on terrorism. During the campaign, Trump loudly proclaimed radical Islam to be the key driver of terrorism. The transition website, however, refers only to "radical ideologies" as the inspiration behind the long-term threat of terrorism.

Trump criticized the Obama administration during the campaign for its failure to use the term radical Islam in countering Muslim terrorism by the Islamic State and other groups.

"America's stature in the world is determined by its values, prosperity and might," the national security section of the website states, in the first public preview of Trump administration policies.

"Donald Trump understands how a strong, prosperous economy underwrites military might, and how a strong, robust military secures our way of life and the fruits of our economy."

Security threats cannot be resolved "unless we define the problem in a way that American resources and instruments of power can be applied against them," the website says.

Trump was elected Tuesday in a stunning upset victory over former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. On Thursday, he met at the White House with President Obama. Both men have been highly critical of each other during the campaign.

The New York real estate developer and business mogul has little foreign policy experience. His foreign policy views were outlined as a variation of isolationist "America First" policies.

Trump advisers also have stated that Trump plans to rebuild the U.S. military under Reagan-style policies known as "peace through strength."

On nuclear arms, the new website states that the Trump administration "recognizes the uniquely catastrophic threats posed by nuclear weapons and cyber attacks."

"Mr. Trump will ensure our strategic nuclear triad is modernized to ensure it continues to be an effective deterrent, and his administration will review and minimize our nation's infrastructure vulnerabilities to cyber threats," the website states.

Russia and China are aggressively building up their nuclear arsenals with new weapons and delivery system.

By contrast, the U.S. nuclear arsenal has been sharply reduced under Obama administration arms control policies. Aging weapons, missiles, submarines, and bombers also are in need of modernization to maintain nuclear deterrence against foreign strategic threats.

Cyber attacks were a major issue during the campaign, with intelligence and security leaders issuing statements blaming Russian government hackers for intrusions into the emails of political figures and institutions. The anti-secrecy website WikiLeaks and the website DCLeaks.com were identified as conduits for information stolen by Russian hackers.

Disclosures from the hacked email account of Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta produced numerous news stories, many of them critical of Clinton and her aides.

China was blamed for the massive theft of U.S. government records from the Office of Personnel Management, including 22 million records of government workers.

The Obama administration took no action in response to either the Chinese or Russian cyber attacks.

The Trump transition website stated that the use of military force would be more closely linked to American national interests.

"Mr. Trump will be a strong commander-in-chief befitting our American men and women in uniform, and ensure their sacrifices will only be made in operations that safeguard the interests of the American people and our allies, and that their service will be honored as they enter the ranks of veterans," the website said.

The White House earlier this week would not comment on Obama's past statement that Trump was unfit to be president and should not have control over U.S. nuclear forces.

One of the first tasks of incoming presidents is to take control of U.S. nuclear commands, carried wherever the president travels in a portable communications system known as the nuclear "football."

The transition team, currently headed by New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie, currently is operating in two floors of an office building on Pennsylvania Avenue close to the White House.

Sources close to the transition team say political battles have broken out between conservative and moderates over key presidential appointments.

Candidates for key posts include former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations John Bolton and Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Sen. Bob Corker (R., Tenn.) for secretary of state. Sen. Jeff Sessions (R., Ala.) and former Bush administration security adviser Stephen Hadley are said to be in the running for the post of secretary of defense. Retired Lt. Gen. Michael

Flynn is said to be a candidate for director of national intelligence. Former New York Mayor Rudy Guiliani could be picked for attorney general.

Domestically, Trump priorities outlined by the transition team include building a wall on the southern U.S. border and ending "catch-and-release" policies toward illegal immigrants.

Funding for cities that do not enforce federal immigration laws will be cut and "unconstitutional" executive orders will be rescinded, according to a 10-point plan.

Another priority for the new administration will be to work with Congress to repeal the Obama administration's Affordable Care Act health care program.

"It is clear to any objective observer that the Affordable Care Act (ACA), which has resulted in rapidly rising premiums and deductibles, narrow networks, and health insurance, has not been a success," the transition team site says.



An article by Lloyd Marcus titled "Lloyd Marcus's Final Thoughts: Election Day 2016" was posted at americanthinker.com on Nov. 8, 2016. Following is the article.

Well, folks, this is it: Election Day 2016. Similar to the words of Bette Davis, it has been a very bumpy, grueling, and emotional ride. Mary and I have been on the road for over a year, living in hotel rooms and out of suitcases, with occasional pit stops back home in Florida to pet Sammy, our greyhound. Mary loves on her seven cockatiels, three parakeets, and three cats.

First we campaigned for Cruz. Cruz was not selected, so we moved on, going all out for Trump. Why? Because Hillary is the devil. Period. I need not explain further, because we all know of Hillary's multiple crimes, lies, evil actions, and repulsive self-aggrandizement.

As I sit with my lovely wife in a west-coast hotel room, my thoughts are all over the place. "Let's do a last-minute music video of my 'Trump Train' song using pictures from Trump rallies."

I did an internet search for pictures from Trump rallies. Man, was I blown away. The crowds were jaw-dropping. How on Earth is it possible for this man not to win the presidency? The excitement of the crowds, the passionate emotion on their faces!

I thought about my black relatives who rejected me explaining to them countless times how the Democrats have been screwing blacks for decades and how voting for Hillary equals more of the same. And yet my relatives remain embarrassed and angered by me. While working out at the gym, it hit me to simply shake their dust off my shoes and move on. That is what Jesus's disciples were instructed to do when people rejected the Gospel.

I thought about Republican John Kasich. I try not to beat up on people who are supposedly on our side, but this guy should be done politically. With us on the brink of losing our country, Hillary putting a hardcore lib on the Supreme Court, etc., Kasich ran to the airways to proudly proclaim that he voted for John McCain instead of Trump. Clearly, Kasich's politics is all about him. Disgusting. We the People are so through with Kasich and his ilk.

I thought about mega-rich black celebs selling out fellow blacks by deceiving them into voting for Hillary. These black betrayers are reaping the rewards of following the standard American success formula of education, hard work, and right choices. And yet they sell blacks the Democrats' lies that blacks cannot make it in extremely racist America, where blacks risk being murdered by cops every time they step outside their homes.

The Democrats' lie that America is a hellhole for blacks is so freaking stupid. It defies logic and what we see before our very eyes. And yet my black relatives have swallowed their Democrat plantation overseers' lies hook, line, and sinker.

Blacks are only 12% of the U.S. population. Therefore, white America elected Obama for two undeserved terms. And yet idiots in my family still parrot the Democrats' absurd lie that the majority of white America did everything in their power to block Obama from becoming president and have fought him implementing his wonderful agenda for the past eight years. If I sound frustrated and annoyed, it is because I am.

Black betrayer and actor Samuel L. Jackson says America is extremely racist. Oh, really? White America has made Jackson worth \$170 million.

Black betrayer Oprah, who says America is as racist as it was back in the days of Selma, is worth \$2.8 billion.

Half-black betrayer and pro football player Colin Kaepernick says he will not stand for our National Anthem until blacks are treated fairly in America. Kaepernick is worth \$22 million. These ungrateful racial hate-generating black celebs are spitting in the face of millions of white Americans whose support has made them wealthy beyond their wildest dreams. There are simply not enough blacks in the U.S. to generate such wealth for these anti-America blacks.

Numerous wealthy blacks are out there betraying everyday blacks by feeding them from the Democrats' bucket of victim crap. They should be mentoring black youths to stop murdering each other, stop dropping out of school, stop having babies out of wedlock, and start making moral choices. Young blacks should also be taught to stop surrendering their power by blaming their woes on someone other than themselves.

Jackson, Oprah, Beyoncé, and other wealthy black Democratic Party operatives are excellent at what they do. Why not encourage black youths to follow their path of striving for excellence rather than telling blacks that the deck is stacked against them?

Shamefully, these black betrayers tell their black fans to vote for Democrats (Hillary) who treat blacks like inferiors, bought off with free phones and free diapers for baby mamas.

What truly sucks is that these powerful celeb black betrayers could do so much to end the racial hostility in this country created by the Democrats over the past eight years. Democrats have despicably used Obama's race as a bludgeon to beat into submission all who oppose them implementing their socialist-progressive agenda.

Anyway, these are my final thoughts before the most crucial election in U.S. history.

A Christian sister emailed me saying that whoever wins this election, she will trust God. I say, "Amen, sister!" Still, I believe that Trump will win.



An article by Alex Griswold titled "Ana Navarro: Democrats Nominated 'The Only Person Who Could Lose to Donald Trump' " was posted at mediate.com on Nov. 9, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

#NeverTrump conservative pundit and former Bush advisor Ana Navarro diagnosed how exactly Donald Trump managed to win the 2016 election, saying that in the end, Hillary Clinton was just a terrible candidate.

Navarro, who was harshly critical of Trump and voted for Clinton, was conciliatory on CNN Wednesday morning. "Look, we are all Americans. At this point he is President-elect Trump. I don't like Donald Trump, I respect the office of the presidency," she said.

"I would say, we all own what happened last night. You know, Democrats probably nominated the only person who could lose to Donald Trump. And she did," Navarro said.

"I think she ran a pretty good campaign, but at the end of the day it comes down to the candidate," she concluded, "And there were things that the Clintons did in the last eight years that I think raised a lot of questions for a lot of Americans, and they turned that into a benefit of the doubt vote for the outsider."



Looking back to April, here are excerpts of an article by Kristine Marsh titled "Katie Pavlich Explains the Reasons Why No One Trusts the Media Anymore" that was posted at newsbusters.org on April 18, 2016.

A new poll revealing that Americans overwhelming distrust the mainstream media was unveiled Monday, confirming the biased reporting over at the big three networks has become appallingly apparent to most people. Fox News

contributor and Townhall editor Katie Pavlich was a guest along with Juan Williams on The O'Reilly Factor, where she explained how the media's "agenda" on issues like Ferguson and the Clintons has played a huge part in why the public doesn't trust the media anymore.

KATIE PAVLICH: Well there's a lot of things driving it but first I would point out. People go to the media for factual information and a lot of the time the media gets it wrong. Especially in cases where the media is doing it with malice because they have an agenda to push. Ferguson is an example of that. They lose trust in the media and the other thing too, Bill is that we see anchors not disclosing their conflicts of interest, for example, George Stephanopoulos over the weekend interviewed Hillary Clinton with no mention that he worked in the Clinton white house. He is friends with the Clintons and that he happened to donate money to the Clinton Foundation. So, when people find that out, and believe they're being spoken to in an objective way and find out there's something else going on. They lose trust. This has been going on for many, many years. I think now with social media, people can see that.

O'Reilly then argued that social media was part of the problem, but Pavlich had a different take, pointing out that "new media" has helped expose stories the networks refused to cover.

PAVLICH: I think the establishment media for decades had a monopoly on the types of information that people were allowed to do receive. And I think new media has actually been very helpful in calling them out for their bias and covering stories that no one else has been covering especially under the Obama administration.



Looking back to September, here is an article by Kurt Schlichter titled "We're Laughing at the Self-Destruction of Media Gatekeepers" that was posted at townhall.com on Sept. 22, 2016.

The media meltdown we are gobbling popcorn to right now is the result of two key phenomena—we normals have grown tired of the media elite's lies, and today's technology allows us to ignore the people who would presume to tell us what we can and cannot know.

As the walls collapse around the few remaining information gates and we barbarians bypass them, gatekeeper gigs are becoming as rare as jobs for millennials with masters degrees in Feminist Interpretive Dance.

Now you media creeps are finding yourself ignored and irrelevant as America proceeds to do whatever the hell it pleases whether you like it or not. We don't need you; we can and will get our information by ourselves.

How I yearn to fill a hot tub with the salty, sweet tears of a thousand so-called journalists who decided to put their money down on progressive ideology

instead on objectivity and public service. You just crapped out. That's what you get when you always bet on hack.

Let's savor their pain. Imagine yourself coming out of some university where you were reliably liberal and sucked-up to your pinko professors. You nodded eagerly whenever anyone said "global warming," and you shook your head in horror whenever someone said "Men can't have babies."

You got a job at some prominent newspaper or mainstream network, dutifully parroting the party line with perfect precision, awaiting the day when you would finally reach a level of power where you could not merely lie about and distort the news, but to actually control the news.

Then, just when you thought you were going to become a Lord of the Fourth Estate, you idiots completely overplayed your hand right when technology gave people an alternative to your old school media monopoly. You pushed us past the point of toleration just as the web created other places for us to go. And now, look at you. You're nothing. Just a bunch of pompous, boring, nobodies without reputations, without respect, without futures.

We're laughing at you.

Then Donald Trump comes along and outrages you, but not for what he says or does. Hell, you haven't seen so many eyeballs turned your way since that unpleasantness with the pumpkin-infused craft ale and trans lifestyle editor at last year's winter solstice office party. No, Trump outrages you because he thinks you're a clod and a joke and he mocks you, and no matter what you say, no matter what you do, no matter how much futile fussiness you manage to muster in that concave chest of yours, you can't dent his popularity.

You've dumped everything you have on Donald Trump and he's still tied with your ancient, crusty crone candidate Hillary. And you realize that you don't have the power you were promised. You don't have the influence you sought. You have nothing.

No one cares anymore.

No one listens to you anymore.

We're laughing at you.

So of course you double down. Now, back in the day, long ago, before I could ignore you by going on Twitter and getting my news unfiltered, you had some pretensions of being worthy of respect.

You were journalists, the guardians of public integrity, afflicting the comfortable and comforting the afflicted. Except you sold out, and now you comfort the comfortable—"Gosh, Ms. Clinton, your energy and robust health are an inspiration to women everywhere. Does your courage make it hard to be the example of feminine perfection you indisputably are, except to racists?"

And you afflict the afflicted, bullying and slandering good people whose unforgiveable sins include believing in God, loving our country, and not having wasted \$400,000 of Daddy's hedge fund loot partying at some Ivy League resort with thousands of other layabout parasites who despise the better men who built the country your presence degrades.

You've tossed away your pretense of objectivity because Donald Trump is different. Yeah, now it's hard to be objective, because you really, really, really want Youthfulia McVigor to be president, so you openly dispensed with objectivity.

Apparently, objectivity was only a thing when it is easy, when you didn't actually have to risk your preferred outcome by giving the complete and balanced story without putting your puny thumb on the scale. Yeah, you've moved beyond the "he said/she said" model which tragically prevented you from overtly packing the story with your preferences and prejudices—oh, we know you always slipped in your biases, but now you don't even pretend. You're all in, charter members of the Democrats' Team Take-A-Memo.

If you ever had a shred of credibility, it's long gone, like your monopoly on the free flow of information. Technology made you superfluous. Hey, I'm right here in my pad writing a column just like you, with three key differences: I'm not pretending to be unbiased, I don't have to wear pants, and this time next year I'm not going to be looking for a new job at some place where the term "Frappuccino®" is a thing.

Gatekeepers are falling everywhere, not just in the news game. Look at publishing. My last book was traditional. I had to get someone's approval to put it out, then I had to wait for the publisher to publish it. But I put out my new book *People's Republic* this week and within 72 hours it was in the Amazon Top 500 and ahead of a whole bunch of traditionally published books. Keep manning those gates, chumps—we're going around the collapsing walls that you once used to control the narrative.

We don't need you.

We don't want you.

And we're laughing at you.



Looking back to early October, here is an article titled "Donald Trump Makes History With Zero Major Newspaper Endorsements" that was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 6, 2016.

With just a little over a month until election day, Donald Trump has racked up zero major newspaper endorsements, a first for any major party nominee in American history.

While newspaper endorsements don't necessarily change voters' minds, this year's barrage of anti-Trump endorsements could actually move the needle come November, experts say.

"It's significant," Jack Pitney, professor of government at California's Claremont McKenna College, told *TheWrap*. "The cumulative effect of all these defections could have an impact on moderate Republicans."

Some conservative papers, which have endorsed Republicans for decades, are now breaking with tradition to endorse Hillary Clinton or, at the very least, urge their readers not to vote for Trump.

Several have taken a stand even at the expense of losing subscribers at a time when newspapers are barely staying afloat. Some papers have received death threats.

But for a growing number of newspaper editorial boards, staying on the sidelines is no longer an option.

The *Dallas Morning News*, which has endorsed every Republican nominee since 1940, was so appalled by the idea of a President Trump that it introduced its Clinton endorsement with this caveat: "We don't come to this decision easily. This newspaper has not recommended a Democrat for the nation's highest office since before World War II—if you're counting, that's more than 75 years and nearly 20 elections."

The *Cincinnati Enquirer's* editorial board broke from a nearly century-long tradition of backing Republicans to support Hillary Clinton, telling its readers: "This is not a traditional race, and these are not traditional times."

The *Arizona Republic* also endorsed Clinton, the first time the paper backed a Democrat since its founding in 1890. Same for the *San Diego Union-Tribune*, which hadn't endorsed a Democratic nominee in its 148-year history.

After the *Houston Chronicle* endorsed Clinton, the *Texas Monthly* asked, "Will Any Major Newspapers in Texas Endorse Donald Trump?"

But why limit that question to Texas?

The *Chicago Sun-Times* reversed a 2012 decision to stop making presidential endorsements, explaining to its readers that "the best way to avert a train wreck is to wave a warning flag as soon as possible."

USA Today, which had never endorsed a presidential candidate, did not actually endorse anyone this year either, but did publishing a non-endorsement: "Resist the siren song of a dangerous demagogue. By all means vote, just not for Donald Trump," the paper urged its readers.

And on Wednesday *The Atlantic* endorsed Clinton, marking just the third time in the magazine's 160-year history that it has made a presidential endorsement.

The last time *The Atlantic* took sides in a presidential election was in 1964, when it endorsed Lyndon Baines Johnson for fear of a Barry Goldwater presidency. The other endorsement was 104 years earlier, when it backed Abraham Lincoln.

And it's not just the papers but also writers who are taking a stand. Last month, a member of *The Wall Street Journal's* traditionally conservative editorial board endorsed Clinton, calling Trump the candidate of "white supremacists and swastika devotees."

Trump did receive four endorsements during the primary, including one from the *New York Observer*, which is owned by his son-in-law Jared Kushner and the *National Enquirer*.

But so far Trump has gotten no general election endorsements, a stunning development considering even Libertarian presidential candidate Gary Johnson, known best for his head-scratching "Aleppo moment," has scored a few.

The fact that so many conservative bastions are willing to go out on a limb, experts say, could eventually convince moderate Republicans to break from their own traditions of voting for the GOP.

"Even Michael Chertoff, the man who led the Whitewater investigation against Clinton has endorsed her," Pitney said. "That should tell you something. This is the first election where I'm not voting Republican."



Looking back to mid-October, here are excerpts of an article by Jordan Chariton titled "WikiLeaks Exposes a Corporate Media As Out-Of-Touch As Politicians" that was posted at mediate.com on Oct. 17, 2016.

Hillary Clinton was "playing to the paying crowd" in her private Wall Street speeches. Some people are looking at this as a "yawn." There's no "smoking gun" here.

These are just a few versions of the "nothing to see here" rallying cry that's permeated corporate media over the last week in regards to the thousands of emails WikiLeaks obtained from the account of Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta.

When TV news took a break from wall-to-wall Trump coverage (CBS, ABC, and NBC's morning and evening shows spent 4 hours and 13 minutes on Trump's sexual assault allegations vs. 36 minutes on the WikiLeaks emails between Oct. 7th and 13th), they widely viewed the revelations through a tone-deaf prism.

The verdict: emails showing the behind-the-scenes machinations of the Clinton campaign changing her positions in real-time, coordinating with the Obama

administration, crossing ethical lines with the Clinton Foundation, doing favors for donors, and more were irrelevant because there were “no bombshells.”

Take, for example, what Clinton told Goldman Sachs bankers at a behind-closed-door speech on regulation.

“There’s nothing magic about regulations, too much is bad, too little is bad. How do you get to the golden key, how do we figure out what works? And the people that know the industry better than anybody are the people who work in the industry.”

CNN’s Don Lemon was on the case recently, speaking with William Cohen, a contributing editor to *Vanity Fair*. What ensued was a tug-of-war of ignorance.

“She also insisted that these bankers needed to take control of their own regulation,” Cohen said. “In other words, if they didn’t self regulate, if they didn’t change the way they do business, then big-time Washington regulators will step in and do it for them.”

Like so many journalists who haven’t done their homework and taken the time to dig through these emails—I’ve reported on hundreds at this point for TYT Politics—Lemon let Cohen’s preposterous, borderline-calculated interpretation of what Clinton told Wall Street stand.

But, for anyone living outside the NY-DC media-political bubble, what Clinton actually told Goldman was politicians can’t just go on and regulate you all without getting your input on best practices and conditions for success.

Of course . . . let’s ask the bank robbers what tools they need to break open the front door!

Glenn Greenwald nailed this thought in a recent piece at *The Intercept*.

“Many longtime journalists or political junkies already know that politicians are typically disingenuous, dishonest, and manipulate public opinion, and this jaded perspective causes them to react with boredom toward stories that reveal this. But journalism isn’t about entertaining veterans of political journalism or feeding them new tidbits that they did not already know. It’s about providing the public with information that they can use to better understand the world and, in particular, what those who wield the greatest power are doing. Just because a political journalist thinks he already knows something doesn’t mean that the general public already knows it, or doesn’t want to learn more about it.”

Here’s some news for the “journalists” foaming at the mouth on Donald Trump’s treachery 24/7 and calling the WikiLeaks revelations nothing but goose eggs.

For the millions of people whose savings and retirement accounts were decimated thanks to Wall Street fraud, Hillary Clinton fluffing bankers’ pillows behind-closed-doors, telling them their advice on regulation is needed, *is a bombshell*.

To the millions of Americans who collectively distrust the media in record numbers, reporters from the most prestigious newspaper in the world reading stories to presidential campaigns before publishing them is big news, worthy of more information and analysis.

In the end, corporate journalists receiving checks from multi-billion dollar conglomerates have become just as out-of-touch as politicians receiving hundreds of millions from billionaire plutocrats.

And that may be one of the most important revelations WikiLeaks has exposed yet.



An editorial by Will Rahn titled "The Unbearable Smugness of the Press" was posted at cbsnews.com on Nov. 10, 2016. Following is the article.

The mood in the Washington press corps is bleak, and deservedly so.

It shouldn't come as a surprise to anyone that, with a few exceptions, we were all tacitly or explicitly #WithHer, which has led to a certain anguish in the face of Donald Trump's victory. More than that and more importantly, we also missed the story, after having spent months mocking the people who had a better sense of what was going on.

This is all symptomatic of modern journalism's great moral and intellectual failing: its unbearable smugness. Had Hillary Clinton won, there's be a winking "we did it" feeling in the press, a sense that we were brave and called Trump a liar and saved the republic.

So much for that. The audience for our glib analysis and contempt for much of the electorate, it turned out, was rather limited. This was particularly true when it came to voters, the ones who turned out by the millions to deliver not only a rebuke to the political system but also the people who cover it. Trump knew what he was doing when he invited his crowds to jeer and hiss the reporters covering him. They hate us, and have for some time.

And can you blame them? Journalists love mocking Trump supporters. We insult their appearances. We dismiss them as racists and sexists. We emote on Twitter about how this or that comment or policy makes us feel one way or the other, and yet we reject their feelings as invalid.

It's a profound failure of empathy in the service of endless posturing. There's been some sympathy from the press, sure: the dispatches from "heroin country" that read like reports from colonial administrators checking in on the natives.

But much of that starts from the assumption that Trump voters are backward, and that it's our duty to catalogue and ultimately reverse that backwardness. What can we do to get these people to stop worshiping their false god and accept our gospel?

We diagnose them as racists in the way Dark Age clerics confused medical problems with demonic possession. Journalists, at our worst, see ourselves as a priestly caste. We believe we not only have access to the indisputable facts, but also a greater truth, a system of beliefs divined from an advanced understanding of justice.

You'd think that Trump's victory—the one we all discounted too far in advance—would lead to a certain newfound humility in the political press. But of course that's not how it works. To us, speaking broadly, our diagnosis was still basically correct. The demons were just stronger than we realized.

This is all a "whitelash," you see. Trump voters are racist and sexist, so there must be more racists and sexists than we realized. Tuesday night's outcome was not a logic-driven rejection of a deeply flawed candidate named Clinton; no, it was a primal scream against fairness, equality, and progress. Let the new tantrums commence!

That's the fantasy, the idea that if we mock them enough, call them racist enough, they'll eventually shut up and get in line. It's similar to how media Twitter works, a system where people who dissent from the proper framing of a story are attacked by mobs of smugly incredulous pundits. Journalists exist primarily in a world where people can get shouted down and disappear, which informs our attitudes toward all disagreement.

Journalists increasingly don't even believe in the possibility of reasoned disagreement, and as such ascribe cynical motives to those who think about things a different way. We see this in the ongoing veneration of "facts," the ones peddled by explainer websites and data journalists who believe themselves to be curiously post-ideological.

That the explainers and data journalists so frequently get things hilariously wrong never invites the soul-searching you'd think it would. Instead, it all just somehow leads us to more smugness, more meanness, more certainty from the reporters and pundits. Faced with defeat, we retreat further into our bubble, assumptions left unchecked. No, it's the voters who are wrong.

As a direct result, we get it wrong with greater frequency. Out on the road, we forget to ask the right questions. We can't even imagine the right question. We go into assignments too certain that what we find will serve to justify our biases. The public's estimation of the press declines even further—fewer than one-in-three Americans trust the press, per Gallup—which starts the cycle anew.

There's a place for opinionated journalism; in fact, it's vital. But our causal, profession-wide smugness and protestations of superiority are making us unable to do it well.

Our theme now should be humility. We must become more impartial, not less so. We have to abandon our easy culture of tantrums and recrimination. We have to stop writing these know-it-all, 140-character sermons on social media and admit that, as a class, journalists have a shamefully limited understanding of the country we cover.

What's worse, we don't make much of an effort to really understand, and with too few exceptions, treat the economic grievances of Middle America like they're some sort of punchline. Sometimes quite literally so, such as when reporters tweet out a photo of racist-looking Trump supporters and jokingly suggest that they must be upset about free trade or low wages.

We have to fix this, and the broken reasoning behind it. There's a fleeting fun to gang-ups and groupthink. But it's not worth what we are losing in the process.



Isaiah 55:6-11—"Seek you the LORD while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; let him return to the LORD, and He will have mercy on him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon. 'For My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways My ways,' says the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain comes down, and the snow from heaven, and do not return there, but water the earth, and make it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall My word be that goes forth from My mouth; it shall not return to Me void, but it shall accomplish what I please, and it shall prosper in the thing for which I sent it."