

Eye on the World

Nov. 26, 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. 26, 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 by Ivan Castro titled "Hurricane Otto Hits Nicaragua, Costa Rica As Quake Shakes Region" was posted at reuters.com on Nov. 25, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Tropical storm Otto moved out to sea on Friday after battering Nicaragua and Costa Rica with hurricane-force winds and torrential rains, killing at least three people and forcing thousands to evacuate.

Otto landed as a hurricane but weakened rapidly after hitting the southeastern coast of Nicaragua and became a tropical storm by early Friday, the U.S. National Hurricane Center said, as dangerous flooding thrashed both countries.

In Costa Rica, President Luis Guillermo Solis said on Twitter that at least 3 people had died and some 2,500 people had been evacuated. He said rescue efforts continued.

Otto, the seventh Atlantic hurricane of the season, landed north of the town of San Juan de Nicaragua as a Category 2 storm on the five-rating Saffir-Simpson scale of intensity, the Miami-based hurricane center said.

By Friday morning the storm was heading out to the Pacific Ocean with top sustained winds of 60 mph (95 kph) and located about 115 miles (190 km) west southwest of Santa Elena, Costa Rica.

Soon after the storm had landed on Thursday, a 7.0 magnitude quake struck 93 miles (149 km) southwest of Puerto Triunfo, El Salvador, at a depth of 6.4 miles (10.3 km), the U.S. Geological Survey said.

There were no reports of major damage from the quake, but local emergency services ordered the coastal population to withdraw up to 0.6 mile (1 km) from the shore.

Nicaraguan civil protection officials said the hurricane, which was moving west at 14 mph (22 kph), damaged homes and telephone lines but had not claimed any victims as of early Friday morning.

In Bluefields, a city in Nicaragua's southeastern Mosquito Coast, rainfall began early in the morning. Hundreds had moved to storm shelters by Thursday evening.

Bluefields, once an infamous pirate haunt, was smashed by Hurricane Joan in 1988, a devastating Category 4 storm that destroyed many of the town's 19th century wooden houses.

On the Corn Islands, which face Bluefields and are popular with tourists, 1,400 people were evacuated to shelters, emergency services officials said. Another 1,000 people more moved from Punta Gorda, which lies south along the coast from Bluefields.

Government officials said people along the country's southeast coast had refused to evacuate but declined to say how many.

The storm dumped about 6 inches to 12 inches (15 to 30 cm) of rain, with isolated amounts of 15 inches to 20 inches (38 to 50 cm).



An article titled "60,000 Flee Massive Fires Raging Haifa; Arson Suspected" was posted at timesofisrael.com on Nov. 24, 2016. Following is the article.

Some sixty thousand people were evacuated from their homes in Haifa Thursday as a wave of wildfires threatened the bay metropolis, bolstered by high winds and dry conditions that have contributed to a spate of blazes across the country this week.

Residents of a total of 11 neighborhoods in the city were told to leave their homes, as fires in at least five locations consumed homes and businesses. By late afternoon, more than 100 people in the Haifa area had been treated for fire-related injuries, mostly smoke inhalation.

Israel Police chief Roni Alsheich said some of the fires were set by arsonists, "presumably with nationalist motives," but most were not. He said some suspects were in custody. Top Arab MK Ayman Odeh called the arsonists "enemies of us all."

Greece, Russia, Cyprus and Turkey were among the nations that sent fire-fighting planes and other equipment to help fight the fires.

During the afternoon another brush fire broke out in the Horeshim Forest in the Sharon region. The nearby community of Nirit was evacuated.

A fire that started at the Sha'ar Hagai Junction, on the outskirts of Jerusalem, was reportedly sweeping toward a gas station in the area, and Modiin's two train stations were closed due to a blaze in the central-region city. Earlier, police had briefly closed Route 443, the main approach road to Modiin, due to a fire in the area.

"The fire is not under control; residents should quickly evacuate," the Haifa fire chief said, as eyewitnesses described firefighters having little success in checking the onslaught of the flames.

Firefighting planes from several countries were being brought in and the army's Home Front Command called in soldiers and rescuers to aid with the effort.

In the Haifa's Romema neighborhood, a large apartment tower was seen going up in flames.

Houses and a kindergarten in Haifa's Ramot Sapir neighborhood were evacuated, police said, as the city's entire fire service tried to control a blaze threatening to spread from the surrounding forests into the suburb.

Israeli TV broadcast pictures of paramedics frantically moving elderly people out of a nursing home in the Romema neighborhood of Haifa as black smoke billowed overhead.

Firefighters also worked to try and keep flames from nearing a gas station close to the city's Paz bridge. Route 22 running through the area was closed.

The Magen David Adom rescue service said 36 people had been treated for injuries by early afternoon, a number that continued to rise through the day; 35 of those were lightly hurt and one was hospitalized in moderate condition.

"We're in a state of war," Haifa fire service spokesman Uri Chibutro told Channel 2 news.

Major traffic jams were reported as residents in affected neighborhoods attempted to move to safer ground.

Earlier, an Israel fire service spokesman told The Times of Israel arson was suspected in Haifa based on circumstantial evidence, but nothing had been confirmed.

Firefighters have been struggling since Tuesday to keep pace with a spate of brush fires that have popped up around the country, several of which have damaged homes and put people in the hospital for smoke inhalation.



A Reuters article by Ben Blanchard titled "At Least 67 Killed in China Power Plant Mishap" was posted at reuters.com on Nov. 24, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

A platform under construction at a power plant in eastern China collapsed early on Thursday, killing 67 people and injuring two, while rescuers pulled one worker from the debris, state media said.

Deadly accidents are relatively common at industrial sites in China, where anger over lax standards is growing. Three decades of swift economic growth have been marred by incidents ranging from mining disasters to factory fires.

Two injured workers were taken to hospital soon after the 7 a.m. accident in Fengcheng in Jiangxi province, during work on a cooling tower for the coal-fired power plant.

The company building the plant, Jiangxi Ganneng Co (000899.SZ), confirmed the toll of 67 dead. In a stock exchange filing, it said it was cooperating with authorities.

Shares of Jiangxi Ganneng fell 3.7 percent on Thursday before trading was suspended. Shares will resume trading on Friday, the company said in its statement.

One trapped worker was rescued from the rubble, China News Service reported.

Chinese Premier Li Keqiang has ordered an investigation, demanding that those responsible for the accident should be held accountable, the central government said.

“Strengthen supervision and preventive measures, prevent such a major accident from happening again,” it cited Li as saying in a statement on its website.

Third-phase construction at the coal-powered Fengcheng plant started earlier this year, state media said.

China has vowed to improve safety at such facilities. President Xi Jinping has said authorities would learn the lessons paid for with blood after chemical blasts in the port city of Tianjin killed more than 170 people last year.



An article by Laretta Brown titled “French TV Bans Smiling Down Syndrome Children—Might ‘Disturb’ Post-Abortive Women” was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 22, 2016. Following is the article.

France’s Conseil d’État (State Council) banned the award-winning “Dear Future Mom” video from airing on French television due to concerns that the expressions of happy children with Down syndrome in the video were “inappropriate” because they were “likely to disturb the conscience of women who had lawfully made different personal life choices.”

The Council rejected the Jerome Lejeune Foundation’s request last week to lift the ban.

"Dear Future Mom" was produced by the Italian Down Syndrome Advocacy organization CoorDown for World Down Syndrome Day in 2014. The video features smiling children and young adults with Down syndrome from different countries reassuring a worried pregnant woman that her child can be happy.

The Global Alliance for Disability in Media and Entertainment has started a petition on Change.org, saying, "The Global Alliance for Disability in Media and Entertainment (GADIM) as an international disability and media organization acting within a framework of human rights and with the support of the video's creators CoorDown (Italy), respectfully asks the French government intervene to lift the ban."

"No other country has taken the position of France," the petition pointed out, "and in fact the video has received acceptance and acclaim worldwide, has attracted significant media coverage and an outstanding 7.2 million views on youtube alone and has received multiple international awards including 6 Cannes Lions at the prestigious Cannes Festival of Creativity in France."

They add that "the discriminatory ban of the video sends the message that people with Down syndrome are unwelcome in society and has impacted the Down syndrome community around the world who have seen it as a rejection of the effort to challenge negative stereotypes and societal prejudices and to assert the equal and inherent value of the lives of people with Down syndrome."

Renate Lindeman, a mother of two children with Down syndrome and a disability rights advocate with Downpride, wrote that the problem she has with the French video ban "is that I have three kids; two happen to have Down syndrome. What's next? Will kids with Down syndrome be banned from school? Will they be segregated from society and placed in institutions like in the old days, because their presence upsets post-abortion parents?"

"See this ban is akin to putting people with Down syndrome away because their presence 'confronts' society with the reality of their systematic eradication," she added. "Eradication not to 'prevent suffering,' but because authorities have decided that their differences place a burden on our lives and societies. A burden that we refuse to carry collectively.

"I have a much better idea," she concluded, "let's not ban the video but make it compulsory for every couple considering a selective abortion for Down syndrome. Let's show them the truth that families with Down syndrome have an enormous good quality of life."



An article by Laura Hughes titled "Brexit Can Be Stopped, Insists Tony Blair As He Rules Out Return to Frontline Politics" was posted at telegraph.co.uk on Nov. 24, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Britain's exit from the EU could be blocked, Tony Blair has said, as he ruled out a return to frontline politics because there is "too much hostility" towards him.

The former Labour prime minister said he had been accused of “treason” for suggesting that Britain keep its “options open” over Brexit.

But he insisted that voters had a right to decide they want to stay in the EU after “scrutinising” Theresa May’s final deal with European leaders.

Last month Mr Blair told Remain voters “we’re the insurgents now” and said Britain should keep its “options open” over holding a second referendum.

He compared June’s referendum result to agreeing to a house swap “without having seen the other house” and insisted that Brexit could be stopped once voters are able to evaluate its “consequences”.

He said: “It can be stopped if the British people decide that, having seen what it means, the pain-gain cost-benefit analysis doesn’t stack up.

“And that can happen in one of two ways. I’m not saying it will [be stopped], by the way, but it could. I’m just saying: until you see what it means, how do you know?”

“But this is what I keep saying to people. This is like agreeing to a house swap without having seen the other house . . . You’ve got to understand, this has been driven essentially ideologically.

“I’m not saying it will (be stopped), by the way, but it could. I’m just saying: until you see what it means, how do you know?”

“Why wouldn’t you keep your options open? Why wouldn’t you say, ‘We took this decision, we took it before we saw what its consequences are; now we see its consequences, we’re not so sure?’”



An article by Paul Bedard titled “9/11 Mastermind: Al Qaeda Favors ‘Immigration’ to Defeat USA” was posted at washingtonexaminer.com on Nov. 23, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

The jailed architect of 9/11 revealed that al Qaeda’s plan to kill the United States was not through military attacks but immigration and “outbreeding nonmuslims” who would use the legal system to install Sharia law, according to a blockbuster new book.

Khalid Sheikh Mohammed [KSM] also predicted that intelligence officials using so-called “enhanced interrogation” techniques such as the waterboarding he experienced would eventually come under attack from weak-kneed U.S. politicians and media.

In *Enhanced Interrogation*, CIA contractor James Mitchell tells for the first time about his role interrogating al Qaeda principals, many like KSM still jailed at Guantanamo Bay. He details accounts of waterboarding and other interrogation sessions of the nation’s most notorious enemies.

None more so than Mohammed. Among the most fascinating aspects of the book are chatty discussions between KSM and Mitchell long after the waterboarding and before he was delivered to the prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, where he clammed—and lawyered—up.

In his book, Mitchell is not pushing for a return to waterboarding, especially for run-of-the-mill battlefield prisoners. He does, however, back aggressive interrogation for the worst terrorists trained or willed to not cough up any secrets because he said it worked.

He quotes another terrorist, Abu Zubaydah, who said waterboarding was effective. In the book:

■ “While we were waiting, Bruce and I talked with Abu Zubaydah about waterboarding. By then he had been cooperating for several months, and even though I hadn’t seen him for a couple of weeks, I was confident he would help if he could. I thought he was the best source available to help us fully understand how Islamic terrorists were likely to respond to the waterboard and how we could avoid using it, if possible. We told him that we didn’t like doing it. We asked him to help us come up with some way to get the brothers to provide information we could use to stop attacks, information they were trying to protect, without the use of waterboarding or other harsh interrogation techniques.”

■ “No, no,” Abu Zubaydah said adamantly. “You must do this for all the brothers. If you don’t and he talks, the brother has sinned. Allah will punish him.”

■ “I’m not following,” I said, thinking I had misheard him. “You think we should use harsh techniques more often?”

■ “No,” he said. “Not more often; only enough. Allah does not expect more of a man than he is capable,” Abu Zubaydah explained.

Snippets obtained by Secrets from the book set for release next Tuesday from Crown Forum show that Muslim terror groups had a much bigger plan to crush America than just through attacks like 9/11.

Instead, the plan is to fill the country with like-minded Muslims through the country’s easy immigration laws and by having babies, and then using the U.S. legal and welfare system to turn the country into a system like Iran.

Consider this passage in the book, *Enhanced Interrogation* where KSM reveals the plan to Mitchell:

■ “It would be nice,” he said, if al Qaeda or like-minded Islamists could bring America to its knees with catastrophic attacks, but that was unlikely to happen; “not practical” is the wording he used. From his perspective, the long war for Islamic domination wasn’t going to be won in the streets with bombs and bullets and bloodshed. No, it would be won in the minds of the American people.

■ He said the terror attacks were good, but the “practical” way to defeat America was through immigration and by outbreeding non-Muslims. He said jihadi-minded brothers would immigrate into the United States, taking advantage of the wel-

fare system to support themselves while they spread their jihadi message. They will wrap themselves in America's rights and laws for protection, ratchet up acceptance of Sharia law, and then, only when they were strong enough, rise up and violently impose Sharia from within. He said the brothers would relentlessly continue their attacks and the American people eventually would become so tired, so frightened, and so weary of war that they would just want it to end.

■ "Eventually," KSM said, "America will expose her neck to us for slaughter."

Since the attacks, and during President Obama's two terms, Muslims from several countries that harbor terrorists have flooded into the U.S. And Obama has promised to open the borders for Syrian refugees whose backgrounds are difficult to investigate. President-elect Trump has vowed to reverse Obama's plans.

In talks with the terrorist, Mitchell said that KSM discussed waterboarding and other interrogation techniques and said that if the tables were turned, "he would do the same thing to protect his way of life."

He also predicted the downfall of the techniques and persecution of those involved. From the book:

■ KSM wagged his finger professorially at us and warned, "Soon they will turn on you." He prophetically predicted that the press and some members of my own government would turn on me and Bruce and others like us who took aggressive action to prevent the next 9/11 attack and save American lives.

■ Warming to the topic, KSM smiled and said the media, either on purpose or without realizing it, would promote Islam's cause and champion tearing down the measures put in place to protect the American people after 9/11. He said the media would promote al-Qaeda's cause by framing the war against Islam (his characterization, not mine) as morally wrong, impossible to win, and fraught with unacceptable losses. He said the media's response was one of Allah's "gifts," one of the ways Allah preordained for Americans to set aside those things which kept us safe and prevented attacks in the immediate aftermath of 9/11.

■ KSM said, "Your own government will turn on you. Your leaders will turn on you. They will turn on you to save themselves. It will play out in the media and strengthen the hearts of the brothers. It will recruit more to Allah's cause because the press coverage will make the U.S. look weak and divided."



An article by Olivia Solon titled "Barack Obama on Fake News: 'We Have Problems' If We Can't Tell the Difference" was posted at theguardian.com on Nov. 17, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

President Barack Obama has spoken out about fake news on Facebook and other media platforms, suggesting that it helped undermine the US political process.

"If we are not serious about facts and what's true and what's not, if we can't discriminate between serious arguments and propaganda, then we have problems," he said during a press conference in Germany.

Since the surprise election of Donald Trump as president-elect, Facebook has battled accusations that it has failed to stem the flow of misinformation on its network and that its business model leads to users becoming divided into polarized political echo chambers.

Obama said that we live in an age with “so much active misinformation” that is “packaged very well” and looks the same whether it’s on Facebook or on TV.

“If everything seems to be the same and no distinctions are made, then we won’t know what to protect. We won’t know what to fight for. And we can lose so much of what we’ve gained in terms of the kind of democratic freedoms and market-based economies and prosperity that we’ve come to take for granted,” he said.

These comments come after Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg rejected the “crazy idea” that fake news on the social network swayed voters in the US presidential election.



“Eye on the World” comment: While fake news stories on social media are certainly a problem, lies espoused by politicians in the mainstream media are a larger problem.



Looking back to 2013, here are excerpts of an article titled “Obama: ‘If You Like Your Health Care Plan, You’ll Be Able to Keep Your Health Care Plan’ ” that was posted at politifact.com on Dec. 12, 2013.

It was a catchy political pitch and a chance to calm nerves about his dramatic and complicated plan to bring historic change to America’s health insurance system.

“If you like your health care plan, you can keep it,” President Barack Obama said—many times—of his landmark new law.

But the promise was impossible to keep.

So this fall, as cancellation letters were going out to approximately 4 million Americans, the public realized Obama’s breezy assurances were wrong.

Boiling down the complicated health care law to a soundbite proved treacherous, even for its promoter-in-chief. Obama and his team made matters worse, suggesting they had been misunderstood all along.

For all of these reasons, PolitiFact has named “If you like your health care plan, you can keep it,” the Lie of the Year for 2013.



An article by Tim Jones titled “Who Gets the Credit for Trump’s Victory? The Tea Party” was posted at americanthinker.com on Nov. 22, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

There have been many excellent post-election analyses since Trump's improbable win, most of which have identified the disaffected working class and the failure of the Democrats' politically correct identity politics as the driving factors.

But one thing that seems to be overlooked is the Tea Party, the reasons for its beginnings, and its underlying anti-establishmentarianism in this election.

- It was not just the failure of the Democrats' urban-centric political focus on minorities, women, and income inequality that deep-sixed Hillary Clinton's campaign.

- Walking it back, what has outraged so many grassroots conservatives was the phony conservatism under George W. Bush, culminating in the financial crisis of 2008. It pushed them overboard to no longer get fooled by the Republican establishment that had been basically a milder form of the big-government progressivism that had taken over the Democratic Party following the loss of Hubert Humphrey in 1968 to Richard Nixon. It was that crushing loss that sent Democrats on a far-left trajectory for decades to come.

Bush did nothing to cut back the size and growth of government. Instead, he actually expanded it through his unfunded Medicare Part D prescription drug program and the "No Child Left Behind" federally mandated education program. There were no efforts at all to rein in spending and the size of the federal government. And the war with Iraq added untold billions to the ever expanding annual federal deficits.

Bush's "compassionate conservatism" was liberalism in disguise.

From "Decision Time for the GOP Elite" at [americanthinker](#): "Remember that the Republicans controlled both houses of Congress during the presidency of George W. Bush and yet nothing was done to control the size, scope, or cost of the federal government."

When the economy began melting down in 2007, culminating in the financial crisis of 2008, McCain was not offering any real solutions or differentiating himself from the "Democrat Lite" policies of both Bush presidencies. The result was an inexperienced but highly articulate and educated, attractive and charismatic man who would become the country's first black president.

The bipartisan \$700-billion Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) and the \$830-billion economic stimulus (where shovel-ready jobs were nowhere to be found) were the last straws. The grassroots had had enough, and the Tea Party was born to take on and push back the political elites driving the country into the financial ditch.

- It's common knowledge now that the 2010 and 2014 midterms were essentially driven by the Tea Party influence on the electorate, especially after the passage of Obamacare put the federal government on ever more powerful steroids in growing its size, spending, and intrusion on individual life.

Kimberly Strassel writes at [The Wall Street Journal](#): "What Democrats should realize, because everyone else does, is that voters rejected both their policies (which have undermined middle- and low-income families) and their governance (which has fueled rage at a power-hungry federal government)."

The Tea Party's influence on the grassroots and especially the blue-collar working class culminated in the election of Trump. Right now they're not getting the credit they deserve, but when the history books are written about this election, the Tea Party movement should be getting most if not all of the credit for setting in motion the biggest presidential upset in history. It's the Tea Party that ushered in a complete outsider with zero political experience to upend the existing political order.



An editorial by Dick Morris titled "Focus on Swing States Caused Discrepancy Between Popular and Electoral Votes" was posted at dickmorris.com on Nov. 21, 2016. Following is the article.

It now appears that Hillary Clinton defeated Donald Trump in the popular vote by more than 1.5 million ballots. And, with almost 3 million left to be counted—largely in liberal California—her margin may swell further. No matter how high it goes, it will have no effect, of course, on the election results. Trump's lead in the Electoral College is safe.

But we have never had this wide a disparity between the electoral and the popular vote. In 2000, Gore got one-half of one percent more votes than Bush nationally but lost the Electoral College. But this outcome is dwarfed by Hillary's current lead of more than one percentage point, a lead that is likely to expand.

Why has the Electoral College stopped mirroring the popular vote all of a sudden?

Prior to the 2000 presidential race, campaign strategists kept their focus largely on the national campaign, paying only secondary attention to the specific swing states. Most paid advertising was bought on national shows and network programming that reached all U.S. households.

But the 2000 results, in which everything hinged on Florida, led to an obsessive concentration on a handful of swing states that absorbed most of the paid advertising and field operations, leaving the rest of the country out in the cold.

This focus on swing states has created a virtual blackout in the non-swing states that means that voters there are not subject to the same influences as those who live in swing states. Hence the dichotomy.

(In fact, it now appears that the national polls were right, after all, and that Hillary did, indeed, win the popular vote by between one and two percent, about what the RealClearPolitics.com average of major polls predicted she'd do).

Of course, had the election been determined by popular vote, not by the Electoral College, political strategists on both sides would have adjusted. As it was, Republicans saw no point in maximizing their turnout in red states and Democrats did not focus much on major cities like New York because they were located in states whose outcome was clear. Only if the major cities were in swing states, did they receive much attention.

We have politically become two nations: The privileged swing states that elect the president and the other forty or so states that are disenfranchised by their own predictability.



An editorial by Erick Erickson titled "California Should Try to Secede" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 25, 2016. Following is the article.

Left-wing activists in California want Californians to secede from the Union. They point to Scotland, Brexit, Catalonia and other modern secession movements as proof that the Civil War precedent is no longer binding. That precedent, like a roach motel, is that once a state is in the union it can never leave.

California should try. I do not wish California success in the effort, but the attempt is worth it to demonstrate to Californians that conservatives have been right all along. Washington is far too powerful and does far too much.

The founders of this nation never intended for a one size fits all national government. But in the past eight years of Barack Obama, progressive activists oblivious to both history and constitutional law have advanced the notion that states are now irrelevant.

In fact, just a few weeks ago in the Washington Post, a writer named Lawrence R. Samuel argued that "states are a relic of the past." He made the argument because Hillary Clinton won the popular vote and therefore should be president, despite the small matter of our constitutional processes that include an electoral college.

Samuel argued that "our states are no longer culturally diverse regions with their own respective identities; rather, they are artificially constructed geographic entities."

That single sentence has almost as many fallacies as it has words.

After then noting "Americans share a remarkably similar way of thinking and acting," he goes on to completely contradict his entire thesis by noting "the legal system would have to be overhauled. (Probably a good thing in itself given the vast inconsistencies in laws across state lines.)" In one parenthetical he undermines his entire argument.

The truth is we have 50 states that have ceded only limited authority to the District of Columbia. But over the past 100 years, progressives and both political parties in the constant quest for power have made Washington too powerful.

From the amount of water your toilet can flush to the light bulbs you use to whether men can use your daughter's bathroom, progressives have not only demanded a unitary, large national government, but they have also demanded one size fits all, secular amorality.

■ Our founders were far wiser than us and had a far better understanding of humanity.

- Having survived a war for independence, they knew that men covet power, and direct democracy is a terrible thing that leads to mob rule.
- They structured our constitution to limit the power of men, the power of institutions and the power of states against each other and the federal government against the states.

Gridlock is a feature, not a bug, of the system. But over the last 100 years, more and more people have looked to Washington for salvation.

Washington was never supposed to be so consequential. The fight for control over the Supreme Court was never supposed to exist. Both the Court and Washington were supposed to be ancillary to the daily lives of the citizens of the several states. A California secession movement would remind people of that.

If California wants gay marriage and abortion, let them have it. If Georgia wants traditional marriage and no abortion, let them have it. If California wants to demand one size fits all, secular amorality, transgender bathrooms, and taxes on plastic grocery bags, let them. California should be able to do whatever it wants as long as its legislature votes for it.

But California should not be able to impose its morality, laws, and taxes on other states.

Direct democracy is a terrible thing and the near bankrupt state of California proves it.

As British Prime Minister Clement Attlee noted in 1945, "I could not consent to the introduction into our national life of a device so alien to all our traditions as the referendum, which has only too often been the instrument of Nazism and fascism." California has suffered under the whims of direct democracy and mob rule. It should be allowed to continue that.

In the process of California divesting itself from Washington, perhaps progressives will finally see why conservatives, for so long, have argued the states, not Washington, should reign supreme in our system.



An editorial by John Stonestreet titled "Americans Are Losing Touch With Reality: Feelings Have Replaced Facts" was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 23, 2016. Following is the article.

Is our culture losing touch with reality? The folks who pick the official "word of the year" think so.

The Christian satire website, Babylon Bee, has had a lot of great headlines. One of my favorites so far: "Progressive Evangelical Leaders Meet to Affirm Doctrine of 'Sola Feels.'" Adherents to this imaginary creed believe that "things that make us feel bad . . . are wrong. The things that give us all the happy feels . . . are true, right, and good." Now of course, the scary part about satire is how closely it often mirrors reality.

On a related note, Oxford Dictionaries has released its 2016 word of the year: "Post-truth," which they define as "relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief."

I can hardly think of a better description of where we are right now as a culture. In fact, for those of us who've spent years calling out what Pope Benedict called "the dictatorship of relativism," it's tempting to say, "welcome to the party, guys!"

But the concept of "post-truth" is a bit different from garden variety relativism. It doesn't discount the existence of truth. Rather, a post-truth society is one in which truth takes a back seat to emotion—where feelings effectively replace facts. And that's exactly what we've seen over the course of this year's election.

For example, the melt-down among what many are calling the "snowflakes" on college campuses over President-elect Trump is the most obvious example. Despite exit polls showing that a huge percentage of eligible millennial voters stayed home on Election Day, many of these students just can't handle the outcome. Their schools are sending letters of condolences, canceling exams, even offering hot chocolate and hugs from administrators. Faced with a reality that contradicts what they feel should have happened, many just can't cope.

A post-truth culture also leads us to equate disagreement with hatred. Loving me means agreeing with me. And as many conservative speakers who've been chased from university campuses by angry students can tell you, when feelings are equated with a person's identity and even reality, contradicting those feelings is the same as attacking the person.

The post-truth culture can also lead us to ignore reality altogether. I've made it clear on BreakPoint that I find some of our next president's past words, especially about racial minorities and women, troubling, to say the least. But in this post-truth, post-fact, post-reality environment, many have hijacked legitimate concerns in order to play the victim. Just look at the panicked reaction from gay and lesbian activists, who are behaving as if Donald Trump plans to persecute their community.

But there are no facts to support this hysteria. If anything, our next president has been far friendlier to the LGBT agenda than I'm comfortable with, even calling the Supreme Court's Obergefell ruling "settled law." Trump hasn't committed to protecting the bakers, florists, photographers, and others who've been hounded for not participating in same-sex weddings. But all these facts don't matter when so many feel that the president-elect threatens their way of life.

And of course, post-truth culture dominates Facebook and Twitter feeds. Just look at the epidemic of fake news that marred this election. Even Christians too often fall for completely fabricated headlines and hoaxes, largely because they validate our feelings.

So where does all this leave us? Well, the Bible has plenty to say on the subject of truth. In fact, we follow the One Who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, Who

came into the world to testify to the truth, a truth which—He told His disciples—would set them free. Truth must govern our emotions, not the other way around.

The 2016 word of the year doesn't bode well for our culture. We must insist on prioritizing facts before emotions.

The "doctrine" of "sola feels" is supposed to be a joke. So let's make sure it stays that way.



An article by Jordan Crucchiola titled "Michael Shannon Tells Trump Supporters It's Their Time to Die Now" was posted at yahoo.com on Nov. 17, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Michael Shannon may be on a press tour promoting his new movie *Nocturnal Animals*, but he's also on the warpath, spewing harsh words at President-elect Donald Trump and any of the 60.9 million Americans who voted for him in the presidential election. And his feedback is getting pretty intense.

Earlier this week he suggested that people supporting "the Orange Man" form their own country called "the United States of Moronic F**king A**holes," and in a new interview with *Metro News*, he's sounding off again.

After suggesting that a civil war would be the only way to prevent Trump from assuming the highest office in the land, Shannon asserts that if you feel okay about supporting his presidency, it's probably time for you to just die already.

"There's a lot of old people who need to realize they've had a nice life, and it's time for them to move on," Shannon said. "Because they're the ones who go out and vote for these a**holes. If you look at the young people, between 18 and 25, if it was up to them, Hillary would have been president. No offense to the seniors out there. My mom's a senior citizen. But if you're voting for Trump, it's time for the urn."

And if your parents voted for Trump? "F**k 'em. You're an orphan now. Don't go home. Don't go home for Thanksgiving or Christmas. Don't talk to them at all. Silence speaks volumes."



A video and an article titled "Kellyanne Conway: Stop Treating Millennials Like 'Precious Snowflakes' " were posted at marketwatch.com on Nov. 18, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Last week, Columbia University sent a note to its faculty about how the school community has been "deeply affected" by the election, and that students finding it difficult to get their work done may need special treatment.

"We ask that you consider the extenuating circumstances when considering such requests and that you offer as much flexibility as possible in accommodating students in distress," the email read.

It's not limited to that one Ivy League institution, either. Several universities across the U.S. adopted similar stances on how to cope with the Donald Trump victory.

"Because I know this process has been difficult for many of you (emotionally and mentally), I wanted to let you know that I'm not taking roll in class tomorrow," a professor at UConn wrote in an email that was cited by Fox News.

Kellyanne Conway, Trump's campaign manager, had this to say about all that when she spoke to Sean Hannity of Fox News on Wednesday night: "We're treating these adolescents and these millennials like precious snowflakes."

She went on to ask, "What's the worst that could happen [to these kids]? That Trump will make good on his promise to create 25 million new jobs? That he'll unleash energy investment? That he'll get rid of the Obamacare penalty on Day 1?"

It's probably safe to say that millennials have a different concept of "the worst that could happen" under a Trump presidency.



An editorial by Dennis Prager titled "Feminism Makes Weak Women" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 22, 2016. Following is the article.

Feminism claims to stand for two things above all: women's equality and enabling women to be strong.

Regarding the first aim, no decent man or woman opposes the concept of equality of the sexes. But people who do not call themselves feminists have a problem with the feminist notion of equality: Most feminists have conflated equality and sameness. And that's a huge mistake; the sexes are equal, but they are different.

A second major problem regarding the feminist claim of aspiring to women's equality is that feminists frequently provide false evidence to prove that women are not treated as equals.

The best-known example is the false statistic that American women earn about 25 percent less than men when they do the same work for the same amount of time.

Another example was relentlessly expressed during Hillary Clinton's campaign for the presidency, and has been especially expressed since her defeat: the assertion that she was the victim of misogynistic comments and that she lost because she was a woman. None of it is true. But it keeps feminists thinking of women as victims—and people who think of themselves as victims are rendered weak.

That brings us to the second goal of feminism: enabling women to be strong and making women strong.

In one of modern life's bigger ironies, feminism has actually achieved the very opposite. In America today (as opposed to, let us say, Saudi Arabia, where it does take strength to be a feminist), the more stridently a woman identifies as a feminist, the less strong she is. Feminism has created what is undoubtedly the weakest generation of women in American history. My grandmother, who never heard the word "feminist" and never graduated high school, was incomparably stronger than almost any college-educated feminist I have ever encountered, or the many I have listened to and read.

My grandmother (and I suspect yours) would never have felt the need to retreat to a "safe space" when encountering an idea with which she differed. Yet we have a generation of young feminist women that is so weak that even if a woman comes to the women's campus to argue, for example, that when all relevant factors are taken into account there is no gender wage gap, they seek the comfort of stuffed animals, balloons and Play-Doh in "safe spaces." They also need "trigger warnings" alerting them that they may read something that disturbs them.

I first suspected that feminism was a cover for weakness when, as a young man, I engaged in a public dialogue with the mother of modern feminism, Betty Friedan. At one point I said something with which she disagreed, and after calling me a "male chauvinist piglet" she stood up and walked off the stage. No man I have ever argued with has done that—and, believe me, I've said far tougher things to many men than I did to Ms. Friedan. (For the record, she voluntarily returned to the stage after I neither apologized nor asked her to return.)

Nothing has changed since that evening (which was some time around 1980). Feminists still find intolerable words that men routinely use when addressing other men with whom they differ.

During one of their presidential debates, Donald Trump called Clinton a "nasty woman" in response to an attack on him. His remark was universally condemned as sexist by feminists—both male and female. But didn't Trump mock Sen. Marco Rubio's height, label Sen. Ted Cruz "Lyn' Ted" and offer other similarly negative descriptions of male competitors? (And by the way, tens of millions of American women also find Clinton to be nasty.)

Modern feminists are afraid of life. They are afraid of differences of opinion. And they're especially afraid of men.

As one example, *The Boston Globe* reported in 2014, "A realistic-looking statue of a man sleepwalking in his underwear near the center of (the all-female) Wellesley College . . . has caused outrage among some students in just one day after its Feb. 3 installation."

(I admit that I, too, was outraged about that statue—outraged that an idiotic sculpture of a man sleepwalking in his underpants is considered art, and that it was placed there by the college's Davis Museum.)

A petition signed by hundreds of Wellesley students said, "It has already become a source of undue stress for many Wellesley College students."

Clearly, hundreds of Wellesley College students are very weak.

Feminists are *outraged* and *unduly stressed* by much of life itself, particularly by all but the most feminized men.

Nearly every time the words "misogyny" and "sexist" are used, they are untrue and only reinforce the conviction that feminists are weak.

When Donald Trump used the moniker "Miss Piggy" in speaking to the Miss Universe who gained nearly 60 pounds within months of winning her beauty title, that was neither sexist nor misogynistic. It was insulting.

And when Donald Trump privately boasted to another man that he was so famous that women would allow him to "grab them by the p—," that, too, was neither sexist nor misogynistic. It was juvenile.

The male desire to touch the bodies of just about every woman they are attracted to is—trigger warning—normal. It has nothing to do with hatred of women or viewing women as unequal. Gay men want to touch the bodies of just about every man they find attractive, and they don't hate men or consider them unequal. Such is male sexual nature. Strong women know this. Weak women, aka feminists, and their fellow male feminists (who are just as weak) deny it. It's too painful for them to deal with.

You want to know what women are strong?

Here's an example: any young woman who announced in a college class that as much as she may want a career, she is more interested in finding a good man to marry. In other words, any young woman who announced that she isn't a feminist.



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."