

Eye on the World

Oct. 29, 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 Oct. 29, 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).



An article by James Griffiths, Joshua Berlinger and Ben Westcott titled "Typhoon Haima: Philippines Hit by Second Storm in a Week" was posted at cnn.com on Oct. 20, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Heavy damage to infrastructure and agriculture is expected in northeast Philippines, officials said Thursday [Oct. 20], as the cleanup began in the wake of Typhoon Haima.

Haima was the second typhoon to hit Philippines in less than a week, lashing the country with torrential rain and raging winds.

It made landfall on the northeastern end of the archipelago about 11 p.m. (11 a.m. ET) Wednesday. The Joint Typhoon Warning Center downgraded it from a super typhoon before it hit land.

Winds of 220 kilometers per hour (137 mph) prior to arrival put it on par with a Category 4 hurricane, the center said. It's expected to affect as many as 2.7 million people in seven provinces before veering northwest toward the Chinese coast by Friday.

Crops and infrastructure are expected to be worst hit in areas close to the typhoon's path, a spokesperson for the Philippines' National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council said.

Haima is now heading towards China, where work teams have already been deployed to Guangdong province in anticipation of its arrival, according to Xinhua.

More than 60,000 people have already been affected by the typhoon, as it traveled across the Philippines, according to the Department of Social Welfare and Development, with almost 15,000 people in evacuation centers.

Hundreds of thousands of food packs were ready to be deployed by the government early on Thursday morning.

At its peak, Haima packed winds of up to 315 kilometers per hour (195 mph), the equivalent of a Category 5 hurricane on the Saffir-Simpson Hurricane Wind Scale.

It is the third-strongest typhoon of the season, behind Nepartak and Meranti, both of which lashed Taiwan and China.



An article by Pete Burn and Laura Smith-Spark titled "Saudi Arabia Executes Member of Royal Family" was posted at cnn.com on Oct. 20, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Saudi Arabia has taken the rare step of executing a member of its royal family after he was found guilty of murder, the Saudi Interior Ministry said in a statement.

Prince Turki bin Saud bin Turki bin Saud Al-Kabeer was convicted in the shooting death of a man during a "group quarrel," the statement said Tuesday, according to the state-run Saudi Press Agency.

The execution took place Tuesday [Oct. 18]. The statement did not include any details about the method of execution. In other cases in Saudi Arabia the death sentence has been carried out by beheading.

The guilty verdict was supported by an appeals court and later sanctioned by the Supreme Court of Saudi Arabia. A royal order was then issued to execute the courts' ruling, the press agency reported.

'Blood money' refused

The Saudi Gazette, an English-language newspaper based in Jeddah, said the victim's family had refused offers of "blood money" and demanded justice be carried out.

It is extremely uncommon for a member of the Saudi royal family to be put to death in Saudi Arabia. In 1975, Prince Faisal bin Musaid was beheaded for assassinating King Faisal.

"The government . . . is keen to keep order, stabilize security and bring about justice through implementing the rules prescribed by Allah . . . on whoever violates the sanctity of civilians," the Interior Ministry said.

King as 'enforcer'

The execution was "very rare," said Bruce Riedel, a senior fellow in the Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution.

Saudi King Salman ascended to the throne in January 2015.

"This execution has been widely praised in the kingdom for establishing that the rule of law applies to everyone including royals," he told CNN.

"The King has been the enforcer of the royal family since his days as governor of Riyadh province where most royals live. He served in that position for a half century before becoming crown prince."

Many in the kingdom have taken to social media to commend King Salman for allowing the execution to go ahead despite the man being a member of the Saudi royal family. Numerous posts have praised the Saudi King for enforcing the law equally.

So fervent was discussion about the execution that a hashtag, which translates from Arabic to "Salman the divisive order the punishing of a prince," began trending on social media.

King Salman ascended to the throne in January 2015 following the death of his brother King Abdullah.

According to the rights group Amnesty International, at least 158 people were executed in Saudi Arabia in 2015, the highest recorded figure in the country since 1995. As of late May, at least 94 people had already been put to death this year, the group said.



An article by Herb Keinon titled "Israel and Turkey Reconciliation Postponed Again" was posted at jpost.com on Oct. 25, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

The full normalization of Israeli-Turkish ties that will be marked when the countries exchange ambassadors was delayed yet again on Tuesday.

A Foreign Ministry source said the ministry's appointment committee, which was to meet on Thursday to name Israel's nominee for this sensitive position, was postponed.

The source said the postponement is connected to the sudden resignation earlier this month of Dore Gold as the ministry's director-general and the appointment of Yuval Rotem in his stead.

Turkey and Israel are expected to name their ambassadors on the same day, and this was originally to have been done already in July.

The Foreign Ministry's director-general heads the ministry's appointment committee. Rotem still needs the final approval from the government before formally taking over as director-general, and the appointments committee will not meet until that time.

The delay comes as Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas is in Turkey for a three-day visit. He met with Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan on Tuesday. Erdogan is a key supporter of Hamas, the arch rivals of Abbas's Fatah faction.

Since the reconciliation agreement was announced in June, Erdogan has sought to reassure the Palestinians on a number of occasions that a normalization of ties with Israel will not come at their expense, and that in fact it will benefit Gaza.



An Associated Press article (with video) titled "Pope Gives Marching Orders to Jesuits and New Superior" was posted at abcnews.com on Oct. 24, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Pope Francis is giving marching orders to members of his Jesuit order and their new superior. He wants them to go to the "peripheries" to serve freely and obediently.

Francis slipped out of the Vatican Monday to address the assembly of Jesuits who on Oct. 14 elected their first-ever Latin American superior, the Rev. Arturo Sosa of Venezuela.

The Society of Jesus, as the Jesuits are formally known, is the largest religious order of priests and brothers in the Catholic Church.

In his remarks, Francis urged the priests to "walk together, freely and obediently, going to the peripheries where the others don't arrive."

In addition to the usual vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, Jesuits take a fourth vow of obedience to the pope regarding their mission.



An article by Laretta Brown titled "WikiLeaks Email Suggests Obama Knew About Clinton's Private Email While Claiming He Found Out About It on the News" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 25, 2016. Following is the article.

An email released by Wikileaks Tuesday shows an exchange between Clinton spokesman Josh Schwerin and Clinton's former State Department chief of staff Cheryl Mills discussing President Obama's claim that he found out about Clinton's

personal email use when he saw it in the news. Mills warned Schwerin that “we need to clean this up. He has emails from her—they do not say state.gov.”

“You probably have more on this, but it looks like POTUS just said he found out HRC was using her personal email when he saw it in the news,” Schwerin wrote.

“We need to clean this up,” she replied. “He has emails from her—they do not say state.gov.”

The same day of that March 7th email exchange, Obama told CBS News correspondent Bill Plante in a March 2015 interview that he found out about Clinton’s private email system “the same time everybody else learned it, through news reports.”

Schwerin’s email includes a link to a tweet by BuzzFeed’s Katherine Miller saying she has “some questions” about the president’s response.



An article titled “ABC Ignores Revelation That Obama Knew About Clinton’s Private Server” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 25, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

WikiLeaks, Tuesday, exposed a massive lie President Barack Obama told to the American people following the first reports of Hillary Clinton’s private e-mail server.

In March of 2015 Obama told CBS News’ Bill Plante that he learned about the server, “The same time everybody else learned it through news reports.” According to the newly leaked e-mails, that is not true because he had received e-mails from Clinton’s account.

But ABC News didn’t think such a deception to the public warranted anytime at all, instead touting his appearance on Jimmy Kimmel Live.

■ ABC’s Cecilia Vega started out her report on World News Tonight flaunting how confident Clinton was with just two weeks to go until the election. She then went on to hype Clinton’s endorsement from former Secretary of State Colin Powell, although the ABC reporter did mention Powell’s previous criticisms of her. From there she praised Obama for tearing into Donald Trump, “The president taking his own shots at Trump, playing along with Jimmy Kimmel’s mean tweets.”

■ Even though NBC did mention the WikiLeaks e-mail exposing Obama’s knowledge of the server on NBC Nightly News, Clinton fangirl Andrea Mitchell downplayed it as just a “nagging problem” for Clinton.

■ With their other competitors paying it little mind, it was left up to CBS Evening News to do the grownup reporting since it was their reporter Obama had lied to. Reporter Nancy Cordes noted that, “Within minutes of the interview, Clinton’s former chief of staff, Cheryl Mills told campaign aides, “We need to clean this up. He has e-mails from her. They do not say state.gov.”

Cordes also reported that Trump was using the revelation to slam both the president and Clinton.



An article by Scott Whitlock titled "CBS Finally Discovers Obamacare Price Spike, Baffled As to Plan's Problems" was posted at newsbusters.org on Oct. 25, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

The baffled journalists at CBS finally discovered what should be a massive story: ObamaCare premiums will skyrocket in 2017 by 25 percent.

■ Yet, after ignoring the story on Monday, CBS This Morning allowed a scant 88 seconds on Tuesday. This is despite the fact that co-host Norah O'Donnell called the development a "big story" and "really interesting." NBC, which also initially skipped the report, managed to cover it on Tuesday.

On CBS, Gayle King explained that "millions of Americans face a huge increase in ObamaCare premiums and fewer insurance choices." She oddly stated that "about one in five consumers will be able to choose from only one provider." (If you have only one option, it's not a "choice.") After O'Donnell's 32 second news brief, O'Donnell, without any irony, marveled, "That's a big story."

In the 8AM hour, the show's hosts came back to the story, but only for another 56 seconds. After explaining that consumers in 39 states will be hit by this price hike, O'Donnell marveled, "We need a bigger understanding of why this is happening." As though the problems with ObamaCare were completely foreign, she sputtered:

NORAH O'DONNELL: Because the idea was not only to spread coverage around, but that by spreading the coverage around, not only help people get more preventative care. But then it would ultimately bring costs down. And instead, the premiums are skyrocketing!

CHARLIE ROSE: And so the question is, what happened?

O'DONNELL: Yeah. And who's profiting on this?

She closed the brief segment by reiterating, "It's a really interesting story." Of course, considering that the CBS program allowed less than a minute and a half total, it can't be that "big" or interesting."

■ NBC censored the health care news on Monday night, but mentioned it in on NBC's Today for a mere 58 seconds (in a news brief and as part of a separate story). Matt Lauer used the same contradictory language, saying, "Many consumers will only have one insurer to choose from." Reporter Hallie Jackson included the President's spin, promoting, "The administration argues things are better now than before the law was passed."

■ ABC covered the price increase on World News Tonight, Monday, but only in a brief. On Good Morning America, Amy Robach allowed 13 seconds:

AMY ROBACH: Well, get ready for sticker shock if you're looking into the price of ObamaCare plans. The average premiums are expected to rise by 25 percent next year. Many consumers will also be limited to choosing plans from just one provider.

Notice that she, too, used the language of one option being a "choice."

The totals for Tuesday: CBS allowed 88 seconds. NBC managed 58 seconds and ABC just 13 seconds. Perhaps the networks just aren't interested in talking about an issue that could be very unpopular for Hillary Clinton.



An Associated Press article by Ricardo Alonso-Zaldivar titled "Obama Administration Confirms Double-Digit Premium Hikes" was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 24, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Premiums will go up sharply next year under President Barack Obama's health care law, and many consumers will be down to just one insurer, the administration confirmed Monday. That's sure to stoke another "Obamacare" controversy days before a presidential election.

Before taxpayer-provided subsidies, premiums for a midlevel benchmark plan will increase an average of 25 percent across the 39 states served by the federally run online market, according to a report from the Department of Health and Human Services. Some states will see much bigger jumps, others less.

Moreover, about 1 in 5 consumers will only have plans from a single insurer to pick from, after major national carriers such as UnitedHealth Group, Humana and Aetna scaled back their roles.

"Consumers will be faced this year with not only big premium increases but also with a declining number of insurers participating, and that will lead to a tumultuous open enrollment period," said Larry Levitt, who tracks the health care law for the nonpartisan Kaiser Family Foundation.

Republicans pounced on the numbers as a warning that insurance markets created by the 2010 health overhaul are teetering toward a "death spiral." Sign-up season starts Nov. 1, about a week before national elections in which the GOP remains committed to a full repeal.

"It's over for Obamacare," Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump said at a campaign rally Monday evening in Tampa, Florida.

Trump said his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, "wants to double down and make it more expensive and it's not gonna work . . . Our country can't afford

it, you can't afford it." He promised his own plan would deliver "great health care at a fraction of the cost."



An article by Katie Pavlich titled "Flashback: Obama Says Obamacare Will Decrease Premiums by 3000 Percent" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 26, 2016. Following is the article.

As everyday Americans grapple with healthcare premium increases of 116 percent on top of losing their primary care doctors and networks, the White House and Democrats are attempting to do damage control.

During a speech last week in Miami, President Obama said rate increases have nothing to do with him. Just Today, Democrat presidential nominee Hillary Clinton argued she'll "fix" the imploding program.

Obama's claim of non-responsibility particular draws a lot of critical attention considering the great promises he made to the American people in order to pass the "Affordable" Care Act without a single Republican vote in the dead of night.

In 2010, he said Obamacare would decrease employer offered healthcare premiums by 3000 percent. Today employers are dumping healthcare coverage for employees in droves.

Obama also repeatedly said families would see their premiums decrease by \$2500.

Considering Hillary Clinton essentially wrote Obamacare in the 1990s with Hillarycare and that Obama is actively campaigning on her behalf, she owns this. Trump would do well to stay on message about the ever cascading broken promises and destruction of healthcare the vast majority of Americans used to enjoy.



An article by Amy Furr and Michael Morris titled "Levin: Obamacare Isn't About Serving You; 'You Exist to Fund Government' " was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 27, 2016. Following is the article.

On his show Wednesday, nationally syndicated radio talk show host Mark Levin railed against Obama and his health care law for failing to deliver on the promise of more affordable health care saying, "This isn't about you, it's about the government. You exist to fund the government."

"Remember what I just said about the administrative state? This isn't about you, it's about the government. You exist to fund the government. You exist to comply with the government, and if you don't you will be punished."

Below is a transcript of Levin's comments:

"But Obama is cockier than ever. He's cockier than ever. He has destroyed the health care your family receives. And he brags about increasing the number of people who are covered.

"Hillary Clinton thinks this is a great law, and she would build on it.

"And I know for many of you it is literally destroying your budgets, wiping out your savings, and you can't even get to see the doctors you need to see in a timely basis, and the doctors you've had in many cases you don't have anymore.

"As I pointed out the other day, when you go to a doctor visit, first thing they're doing is they're sitting there with a little laptop—aren't they, Mr. Producer?—typing stuff in because they're required to do that by law.

"Remember what I just said about the administrative state? This isn't about you, it's about the government. You exist to fund the government. You exist to comply with the government, and if you don't you will be punished.

"And here we are in America, in 2016, where your government can now force you to purchase health care you may not want or need, or that might actually be too expensive, and not have options because the government requires a certain laundry list of requirements.

"And if you don't purchase it, whether you like it or not, with your own money, then the Internal Revenue Service will punish you. It will fine you. And people are now making decisions about whether or not to break their budget purchasing healthcare under the Affordable Care Act or paying a fine to the Internal Revenue Service, money which will go into the general treasury and be spent on somebody else.

"This is what elections like this are about.

"You exist to support Obamacare. You exist to support a massive bureaucracy. The Supreme Court defied the Constitution, the president of the United States defied the Constitution, the Democrat Congress defied the Constitution. They all knew exactly what they were doing. You weren't even allowed to read the law before they passed it. Some representative republic, huh?

"And even if you had wanted to read the law, you would have had to hire a lawyer to read it for you, given its length, its intricacies and all the rest. Exactly what a law is not supposed to be."



An article by Evan Gahr titled "No Consequences From Media Peers for Reporters Caught Colluding With Hillary" was posted at observer.com on Oct. 24, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

Decades before social media and email, a remarkable but unsung Bronx housewife named Ruth Goldstock told her grandson, “Never put anything in writing that you wouldn’t want on the front page of The New York Times.”

These days, that wise advice applies to private communications by everybody in the entire country except elite journalists and news executives.

Elsewhere in America, when emails that the author assumed would never see the light of day became public he suffers some form of consequences—you know, stuff like plummeting poll numbers, possible jail time or forced resignation. This goes for everybody from Hillary Clinton and the former head of Sony Pictures on down.

But if you’re a Politico or New York Times scribe or CNBC anchor John Harwood and hacked emails emerge that reveal you outright colluding with Hillary Clinton campaign—by giving advice or providing the communications director “veto” power over what to include from your interview with the candidate or allowing campaign chair John Podesta veto power over your stories—that is another matter.

Your media friends will not censure you or even scold you—in fact, they don’t bother to contact you directly. Instead, you can hide behind a crafty spokesman who won’t even answer specific questions but acts like he’s the publicist for some elusive Hollywood star and that a journalist determined to ask standard pointed questions is actually pining to profile him for Vanity Fair.



An editorial by Cal Thomas titled “Dirty Tricks: Then and Now” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 25, 2016. Following is the article.

Students of the Watergate era (or those old enough to have lived through it) will recall the “dirty tricks” played by Richard Nixon’s henchmen, most notably Donald Segretti. Segretti, who was hired by Nixon’s deputy assistant, Dwight Chapin, was tasked with smearing Democrats, including senator and 1972 presidential candidate, Edmund Muskie of Maine. Among several “tricks,” Segretti composed a fake letter on Muskie’s letterhead falsely alleging that Sen. Henry “Scoop” Jackson (D-WA) had fathered a child with a 17-year-old girl.

In 1974, Segretti pleaded guilty to three misdemeanor counts of distributing illegal, even forged, campaign literature and served four months of a six-month prison sentence.

I mention this sordid history because some Democrats are playing similar “dirty tricks” on Donald Trump.

Videographer James O’Keefe and his Project Veritas and National Review columnist Stanley Kurtz have exposed Democratic dirty tricks in this presidential campaign.

O'Keefe's videos purport to show Democratic activists, allegedly hired by the party, describing tactics they use to deceive the public. The most notable comes in a clip in which Scott Foval, national director at Americans United for Change, tells of hiring people to demonstrate and even start fights at Donald Trump rallies.

The objective was to encourage the media to treat the disturbances as spontaneous responses to Trump's rally rhetoric, which some lefties called "hate speech." Predictably, the media, especially CNN, which gave the disturbances nonstop and repetitive coverage, bought this narrative and willingly spread it without investigating the background of the disruptors. That's probably because the resultant free-for-all fits the left-leaning media's narrative about Trump.

The equally predictable response from the left was that the videos must have been edited. Democratic Party operatives and Hillary Clinton deny any knowledge of such tactics. Do you really expect them to admit it?

In an Oct. 20 column for National Review, Kurtz reminds us that these tactics are straight from the mind of the late "Rules for Radicals" author and community organizer, Saul Alinsky, a Hillary Clinton pen pal.

Another of O'Keefe's videos is of Robert Creamer, an Alinskyite from Chicago, an experienced community organizer and a man who, according to Breitbart News, visited the White House 340 times and on 42 of those occasions met with President Obama. Creamer admits to being the brains behind hiring and paying for Trump disruptors. He was also sentenced to five months in prison for bank fraud and a tax violation.

While in prison, Kurtz writes, Creamer authored a book titled "Stand Up Straight! How Progressives Can Win."

In it, he instructs his fellow lefties how to handle conservatives: "In general our strategic goal with people who have become conservative activists is not to convert them—that isn't going to happen. It is to demoralize them—to 'deactivate' them. We need to deflate their enthusiasm, to make them lose their ardor and above all their self-confidence . . . [A] way to demoralize conservative activists is to surround them with the echo chamber of our positions and assumptions. We need to make them feel that they are not mainstream, to make them feel isolated . . . We must isolate them ideologically . . . [and] use the progressive echo chamber . . . By defeating them and isolating them ideologically, we demoralize conservative activists directly. Then they begin to quarrel among themselves or blame each other for defeat in isolation, and that demoralizes them further."

Creamer is not alone. George Soros has long funded various groups who engage in similar tactics of disinformation, even violent behavior.

Neither the mainstream media, nor Republicans, have sufficiently exposed these dirty tricks and their intent to swing elections toward the Democratic candidate. Federal authorities—from the compromised FBI, to higher ups in the Justice Department—won't do anything about it either, mostly because they back Hillary Clinton's presidential candidacy.

And somewhere Richard Nixon is shaking his head.



An editorial by Thomas Sowell titled "The Left and the Masses" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 19, 2016. Following is the article.

The greatest moral claim of the political left is that they are for the masses in general and the poor in particular. That is also their greatest fraud. It even fools many leftists themselves.

One of the most recent efforts of the left is the spread of laws and policies that forbid employers from asking job applicants whether they have been arrested or imprisoned. This is said to be to help ex-cons get a job after they have served their time, and ex-cons are often either poor or black, or both.

First of all, many of the left's policies to help blacks are disproportionately aimed at helping those blacks who have done the wrong thing—and whose victims are disproportionately those blacks who have been trying to do the right thing. In the case of this ban on asking job applicants whether they have criminal backgrounds, the only criterion seems to be whether it sounds good or makes the left feel good about themselves.

Hard evidence as to what actual consequences to expect beforehand, or hard evidence as to its actual consequences afterwards, seems to have had very little role in this political crusade.

An empirical study some years ago examined the hiring practices of companies that did a background check on all the employees they hired. It found that such companies hired more blacks than companies which did not follow that unusual practice.

Why? This goes back to decision-making by human beings in general, with many kinds of decisions in general. Since we seldom have all the facts, we are often forced to rely on generalizing when making our decisions.

Many employers, aware of higher rates of imprisonment among blacks, are less likely to hire blacks whose individual backgrounds are unknown to them. But those particular employers who investigate everyone's background before hiring them do not have to rely on such generalizations.

The fact that these latter kinds of employers hired more blacks suggests that racial animosity is not the key factor, since blacks are still blacks, whether they have a criminal past or not. But the political left is so heavily invested in blaming racism that mere facts are unlikely to change their minds.

Just as those on the left were not moved by hard evidence before they promoted laws and policies that forbade employers to ask about job applicants' criminal records, so they have remained unmoved by more recent studies showing that the hiring of blacks has been reduced in the wake of such laws and policies.

Moreover, the left is so invested in the idea that they are helping the disadvantaged that they seldom bother to check the actual consequences of what they are doing, whether that is something as specific as banning questions about criminal behavior or something as general as promoting the welfare state.

In the vision of the left, the welfare state is supposed to be a step forward, in the direction of "social justice." Tons of painful evidence, from both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, that the welfare state has in fact been a step backward toward barbarism—among low-income whites in England and ghetto blacks in the United States—does not make a dent in the beliefs of the left.

The left's infatuation with minimum wage laws has likewise been impervious to factual evidence that the spread and escalation of minimum wages have been followed by far higher rates of unemployment among young blacks, to levels some multiple of what they were before—and to a racial gap in unemployment among the young that is likewise some multiple of what it was before.

Those who doubt this need only turn to the data on page 42 of "Race and Economics" by Walter Williams, or to the diagram on page 98 of "The Unheavenly City," written by Edward Banfield back in 1968. The facts have been available for a long time.

Surely the intelligentsia of the left have access to empirical evidence and the wit to understand such evidence. But the real question is whether they have the stomach to face the prospect that their crusades have hurt the very people they claim to be helping.

Examining hard evidence would mean gambling a whole vision of the world—and of their own role in that world—on a single throw of the dice, which is what looking at hard evidence amounts to. The path of least resistance is to continue going through life feeling good about themselves, while leaving havoc in their wake.



An editorial by Thomas Sowell titled "The Left and the Masses: Part II" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 20, 2016. Following is the article.

It is never easy to tell what people's motives are. But, when the political left proclaims their devotion to improving the lives of others in general, and of the poor in particular, we can at least get some clues from the way they go about it.

One of the first things the left does is take away the right of other people to make their own choices.

For example, under current California law, Hispanic school children cannot be taught in Spanish if their parents want them taught in English. Like parents in other immigrant groups before them, Hispanic parents tend to want their children to learn English, so that those children will have more opportunities when they become adults in an English-speaking country.

But the left in general, and Hispanic activists in particular, have fought against leaving Hispanic parents with that choice. At the heart of the left's vision of the world—and of themselves—is that they know better what is good for other people. This means that the left sees itself as having both a right and a duty to take away other people's options.

This issue was fought out 18 years ago, in a California referendum on so-called "bilingual education," which in practice meant largely teaching Hispanic school children in Spanish. All the forces of political correctness, including the media and the educational establishment, argued in favor of teaching those children in Spanish, even when their parents wanted them taught in English.

Despite a barrage of propaganda from the media and other organs of the left, a majority of California voters sided with Hispanic parents, and passed a law forbidding schools from imposing Spanish on children whose parents wanted them taught in English.

But the left never gives up on their pet notions. This year there is a new proposition on the California ballot—Proposition 58, very misleadingly phrased—that would take that choice away from parents, and let schools impose teaching in Spanish to Hispanic children, whether the parents want it or not.

The Spanish language issue in the schools is just one example of the left's vision, which applies to many other issues.

There is the same dogged resistance on the left to allowing black parents to choose to have their children educated in charter schools that are part of the public school system, but are not subject to all the bureaucratic rules that lead to such bad results in other public schools.

Many years ago, in a debate on William F. Buckley's program "Firing Line," I was told by a left-wing lawyer that black parents without a good education themselves could not make wise choices for their children's education.

But hard evidence says otherwise. There are whole chains of charter schools, such as the KIPP (Knowledge Is Power Program) schools and the Success Academy schools, where ghetto kids have academic achievements equal to those of children in affluent suburbs—and sometimes higher achievements.

Many of these charter schools are located in the very same buildings in ghetto neighborhoods where children in the regular public schools are failing miserably. Black parents who enroll their children in charter schools have apparently made better choices than the know-it-alls on the left.

Meanwhile, black children by the tens of thousands in New York alone are on waiting lists for charter schools because politicians, beholden to teachers' unions for money and votes, fight against the expansion of charter schools. Not all charter schools are successful. But at least unsuccessful charter schools can be shut down, while other failing public schools keep right on failing.

When it comes to crime and violence, the political left, including much of the media, are having a great time demonizing the police. Blacks are the biggest victims of the sharp upturn in murders that has followed. But, yet again, hard evidence carries very little weight when the left is feeling good about themselves, while leaving havoc in their wake.

The absurdity to which this kind of media frenzy about the police can lead is shown by the fact that a black policeman in Charlotte, North Carolina, shooting a black suspect who had a gun, has been blown up into a racial issue across the nation. Have we become so gullible that we are so easily manipulated and stampeded?



An editorial by Thomas Sowell titled "The Left and the Masses: Part III" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 21, 2016. Following is the article.

Claiming the role of champions of the masses is something the political left has been doing ever since there has been a political left—which is to say, ever since the late 18th century, when people with such views sat on the left side of the French National Assembly.

Like so much that is claimed by the left, their compassion for the masses has seldom been subjected to any factual test. Both their words and their deeds reveal their low opinion of the people they claim to be championing.

When Barack Obama referred to ordinary working people as people who are "bitter," and who "cling to guns or religion," that was not just a peculiarity of Obama. He was part of a centuries-long tradition on the left.

No one so epitomized the 18th century left as Jean Jacques Rousseau, who likened the masses to "a stupid, pusillanimous invalid." In the 19th century, Karl Marx said, "The working class is revolutionary or it is nothing"—in other words, millions of human beings mattered only if they carried out his vision.

Fabian socialist George Bernard Shaw included the working class among the "detestable" people who "have no right to live." He added: "I should despair if I did not know that they will all die presently, and that there is no need on earth why they should be replaced by people like themselves."

It sounds very much like Hillary Clinton's view of the "deplorables" who support her opponent, or Bill Clinton's characterization of the same people as "standard rednecks."

What role is there for the masses in the vision of the left?

One role is to provide a moral basis for the left to claim power, as defenders of the downtrodden. No secular doctrine has so swept across the world so swiftly, and with such widespread political impact as Marxism in the 20th cen-

tury. Its central premise is that the workers are poor because their employers have exploited them.

That was not a hypothesis to be tested but an axiom to be accepted as sacred dogma. Nowhere in the three volumes of Marx's classic "Capital" was there the slightest attempt to test that belief empirically.

It would not be difficult to put the Marxian exploitation thesis to a test. If capitalists' exploitation of the workers is what makes them poor, then in countries run by Marxists, the workers should have a higher standard of living than in countries with a capitalist economic system.

But among the many Communist countries that emerged around the world in the 20th century, there has not been a single one where the workers' standard of living has been as high as that of working people in the United States.

The political left in general has been able to claim that they have more compassion for the less fortunate, and to depict their opponents as lacking in compassion for others. For none of these assertions have they felt a need to offer hard evidence.

Such evidence as exists contradicts those assertions. An empirical study titled "Who Really Cares" by Arthur C. Brooks found that conservatives donate a higher percentage of their incomes to philanthropic causes, as well as more hours of their time as volunteers, and they donate far more blood.

Another study showed that President Ronald Reagan donated a higher percentage of his income to philanthropic causes than such liberal icons as President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Senator Ted Kennedy.

What may be more remarkable than these findings is that the left was able to get away with asserting the opposite for years, without evidence being asked for or given.

What is also remarkable is the extent to which the left's preservation of their own self-flattering vision is defended at virtually all costs—with both facts and thoughts to the contrary being dismissed, rather than answered, using such words and phrases as "stereotypes," "blaming the victim" or "racism."

People with a different vision of the world are not answered but characterized—as people needing to have their consciousness raised or as people who "just don't get it."

The near-monopoly of the left in academia allows such evasions to pass muster. But it cheats students out of practice in confronting opposing views on innumerable subjects, which they will have to do after they leave the insulated confines of academia.



An editorial by Thomas Sowell titled "Turnout Time" was posted at jewish-worldreview.com on Oct. 26, 2016. Following is the article.

Some of us this election year don't even want to say the words "Clinton" or "Trump"—and with good reason. However, there is one word that we should keep in mind: "Turnout."

If we sit home in disgust on election day, we forfeit the right—and the duty—to elect a Congress that can keep either of these dangerous people from doing permanent damage to this country and to the future of this generation—and generations yet unborn.

Control of Congress has probably never mattered more than in this election, simply because of two out-of-control people, one of whom is going to become President of the United States.

We need a Congress that can block dangerous legislative proposals coming from the White House, and block dangerous nominees to the federal courts, including especially the Supreme Court.

More than that, we need a Congress that can remove a dangerous President who ignores the law and commits impeachable offenses. Any Congress theoretically can do so, since the House of Representatives has the power to impeach and the Senate then votes on whether to remove the President from office.

However, as we have seen over the past seven years, that theoretical power means nothing, if neither House of Congress has the incentives and the guts to use the power they have.

Barack Obama has repeatedly exceeded the powers of his office, disregarding laws passed by Congress, and making in effect a unilateral treaty with Iran, exempting it from American sanctions for building nuclear bombs.

Just by not calling it a treaty, Obama has ignored the Constitution's requirement that all treaties be made only with Senate approval. Yet there has never been a treaty with more far-reaching—and potentially fatal—consequences than this unilateral presidential agreement with a foreign country.

Yet who was going to impeach "the first black President," with the media ready to go ballistic if they tried?

With no credible threat of impeachment, neither of this year's candidates for President will have any deterrent to indulging their already demonstrated headstrong disregard of anything other than their own interests and their own egos.

Not only does this mean that we have a duty to vote for Congress, even if we don't have the stomach to vote for either presidential candidate, it also means that we need to decide what kind of Congress we want, in light of the high stakes.

We need to ask which of our local candidates for the House of Representatives, and which of our statewide candidates for the Senate, is someone with the character and the guts to remove a President from office.

Don't try to hide behind the lame excuse that "They're all the same."

Let's not forget that President Richard Nixon resigned for a reason. That reason was that Senator Barry Goldwater led a delegation of Republican Senators to the White House to inform Republican President Nixon that they would not support him in the Senate if the House of Representatives impeached him.

We know it can be done, because it already has been done.

The real question now is: What kind of voters are we? Those who ask "What can I do, I am only one little person?" are just copping out.

"We the People" are not only the first three words of the Constitution, it is where the Constitution put the ultimate power to make or break any politician. What can you do? Everything.

If you can't be bothered, then be honest enough to say, "I can't be bothered." But don't cop out with a lame excuse. Too many other people's fate depends on whether you do your duty.

Painful as it may be to realize that we are reduced to considering the impeachability of a presidential candidate, that is a reality that will not go away, just because we don't like it.

How impeachable is Hillary Clinton? Since she would be "the first woman President," any criticism of her, much less any impeachment, would bring loud howls from the media across the country that ugly sexist bias was behind any opposition to anything she did—no matter how awful. Hillary in the White House would have a blank check, and she would not hesitate to use it.

Donald Trump has no such exemption. Neither the media nor Congressional Republicans would automatically spring to his defense if he overstepped the line. His impeachability may be his most important asset in a year of painful choices.



An editorial by Thomas Sowell titled "Immigration Controversies" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 27, 2016. Following is the article.

Despite controversies that rage over immigration, it is hard to see how anyone could be either for or against immigrants in general. First of all, there are no immigrants in general.

Both in the present and in the past, some immigrant groups have made great contributions to American society, and others have contributed mainly to the wel-

fare rolls and the prisons. Nor is this situation unique to the United States. The same has been true of Sweden and of other countries in Europe and elsewhere.

Sweden was, for a long time, one of the most ethnically homogeneous countries in the world. As of 1940, only about one percent of the Swedish population were immigrants. Even as the proportion of immigrants increased over the years, as late as 1970 90 percent of foreign-born persons in Sweden had been born in other Scandinavian countries or in Western Europe.

These immigrants were usually well-educated, and often had higher labor force participation rates and lower unemployment rates than the native Swedes. That all began to change as the growing number of immigrants came increasingly from the Middle East, with Iraqis becoming the largest immigrant group in Sweden.

This changing trend was accompanied by a sharply increased use of the government's "social assistance" program, from 6 percent in the pre-1976 era to 41 percent in the 1996-1999 period. But, even in this later period, fewer than 7 percent of the immigrants from Scandinavia and Western Europe used "social assistance," while 44 percent of the immigrants from the Middle East used that welfare state benefit.

Immigrants, who were by this time 16 percent of Sweden's population, had become 51 percent of the long-term unemployed and 57 percent of the people receiving welfare payments. The proportion of foreigners in prison was 5 times their proportion in the population of the country.

The point of all this is that there is no such thing as immigrants in general, whether in Europe or America. Yet all too many of the intelligentsia in the media and in academia talk as if immigrants were abstract people in an abstract world, to whom we could apply abstract principles—such as "we are all descendants of immigrants."

A hundred years ago, when a very different mix of immigrants were coming to a very different America, there was a huge, multi-volume study of how immigrants from different countries had fared here. This included how they did as workers in various industries and in agriculture, and how their children did in school.

Some people like to refer to the past as "earlier and simpler times." But it is we today who are so simple-minded that it would be taboo to do anything so politically incorrect as to sort out immigrants by what country they came from. As Hillary Clinton said in one of her recently revealed e-mails, she is for "open borders."

However congenial the idea of open borders may be to elites who think of themselves as citizens of the world, it is not even possible to have everyone come to America and the country still remain America.

What is it that makes this country so different that so many people from around the world have, for centuries, wanted to come here, more so than to any other country? It is not the land or the climate, neither of which is so different from the land and the climate in many other places.

Nor is it the racial makeup of the country, which consists of races found on other continents. What is unique are American institutions, American culture and American economic and other achievements within that framework.

People who came here a hundred years ago usually did so in order to fit within the framework of America and become Americans. Some still do. But many come from a very different cultural background—and our own multiculturalism dogmas and grievance industry work to keep them foreign and resentful of Americans who have achieved more than they have.

Some immigrant groups seek to bring to America the very cultures whose failures led them to flee to this country. Not all individual immigrants and not all immigrant groups. But too many Americans have become so gullible that they are afraid to even get the facts about which immigrants have done well and improved America, and which have become a burden that can drag us all down.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled “Dumb American Youth” was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 26, 2016. Following is the article.

Do you wonder why Sen. Bernie Sanders and his ideas are so popular among American college students? The answer is that they, like so many other young people who think they know it all, are really uninformed and ignorant.

You say, “Williams, how dare you say that?! We’ve mortgaged our home to send our children to college.”

Let’s start with the 2006 geographic literacy survey of youngsters between 18 and 24 years of age by National Geographic and Roper Public Affairs.

- Less than half could identify New York and Ohio on a U.S. map.
- Sixty percent could not find Iraq or Saudi Arabia on a map of the Middle East, and three-quarters could not find Iran or Israel.
- In fact, 44 percent could not locate even one of those four countries.

Youngsters who had taken a geography class didn’t fare much better. By the way, when I attended elementary school, during the 1940s, we were given blank U.S. maps, and our assignment was to write in the states. Today such an assignment might be deemed oppressive, if not racist.

- According to a Philadelphia magazine article, the percentage of college grads who can read and interpret a food label has fallen from 40 to 30.
- They are six times likelier to know who won “American Idol” than they are to know the name of the speaker of the House.
- A high-school teacher in California handed out an assignment that required students to use a ruler. Not a single student knew how.

- An article on News Forum for Lawyers titled “Study Finds College Students Remarkably Incompetent” cites a study done by the American Institutes for Research that revealed that over 75 percent of two-year college students and 50 percent of four-year college students were incapable of completing everyday tasks.

- About 20 percent of four-year college students demonstrated only basic mathematical ability, while a steeper 30 percent of two-year college students could not progress past elementary arithmetic.

- NBC News reported that Fortune 500 companies spend about \$3 billion annually to train employees in “basic English.”

Reported by Just Facts, in 2009, the Pentagon estimated that 65 percent of 17- to 24-year-olds in the U.S. were unqualified for military service because of weak educational skills, poor physical fitness, illegal drug usage, medical conditions or criminal records.

In January 2014, the commander of the U.S. Army Recruiting Command estimated this figure at 77.5 percent, and in June 2014, the Department of Defense estimated this figure at 71 percent (<http://tinyurl.com/guz7pqy>).

A few weeks ago, my column discussed the dishonesty of college officials. Here’s more evidence:

Among high-school students who graduated in 2014 and took the ACT college readiness exam, here’s how various racial/ethnic groups fared when it came to meeting the ACT’s college readiness benchmarks in at least three of the four subjects—

- Asians, 57 percent
- Whites, 49 percent
- Hispanics, 23 percent
- Blacks, 11 percent

However, the college rates of enrollment of these groups were—

- Asians, 80 percent
- Whites, 69 percent
- Hispanics, 60 percent
- Blacks, 57 percent

What I am labeling as dishonest, fraudulent or deceitful comes from the fact that many more students are admitted to college than are in fact college-ready. Admitting such students may satisfy the wants and financial interests of the higher education establishment, but whether it serves the interests of students, families, taxpayers and the nation is another question.

To accommodate less-college-ready students, colleges must water down their curricula, lower standards and abandon traditional tools and topics.

Emory University English professor Mark Bauerlein writes in his book *The Dumbest Generation*, tradition “serves a crucial moral and intellectual function . . . People who read Thucydides and Caesar on war, and Seneca and Ovid on love, are less inclined to construe passing fads as durable outlooks, to fall into the maelstrom of celebrity culture, to presume that the circumstances of their own life are worth a Web page.”



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.”