

Eye on the World

Nov. 5, 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. 5, 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 Elisabetta Povoledo titled "Italy, Already Rattled, Is Struck by Another Powerful Quake" was posted at nytimes.com on Oct. 30, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

An earthquake, believed to be the strongest to hit Italy since 1980, struck the center of the country on Sunday, four days after two back-to-back quakes severely damaged buildings and left thousands homeless in the area. The temblor on Sunday also caused fresh damage to the towns destroyed by a quake that killed nearly 300 people in August.

The quake, which had a magnitude of 6.5, according to Italy's national geophysical and volcanology institute, struck at 7:41 a.m. with its epicenter near Norcia. It was felt as far away as Bolzano in northern Italy and Puglia in the south, according to Italian news reports.

Most of the towns in the area had already been evacuated after the recent seismic activity, so there were no immediate reports of deaths.

About 20 people were injured but none killed, said Fabrizio Curcio, the head of Italy's civil protection department. "It was an important earthquake," he said.

Helicopters were taking people to hospitals because some roads had been closed off, Mr. Curcio said. Search-and-rescue teams were converging on the area, he added, and mayors were verifying the conditions of residents in smaller hamlets.

As night fell, emergency teams worked to transfer residents of the stricken areas to temporary dormitories and hotels in outlying areas, overcoming the resistance of those who preferred to remain near their homes, Mr. Curcio said.

“This was a 6.5—we haven’t had an earthquake of this magnitude since 1980—so there are a series of controls we have to carry out,” he said, adding that people would be assisted better outside the earthquake areas.

Electrical power was out for many thousands of residences, many roads were blocked by debris or cracks, and several sections of the Via Salaria, the most important highway in the area, were not accessible, Mr. Curcio said. Emergency workers were preparing to work through the night to clear roads of debris.

“It will be a difficult night,” Mr. Curcio said after meeting with the mayor of Norcia, Nicola Alemanno, and Vasco Errani, the government’s point man for the earthquake reconstruction program in Norcia.



A Reuters article titled “Earthquake Hits Already Battered Central Italy, No Casualties” was posted at reuters.com on Nov. 3, 2016. Following is the article.

A strong earthquake hit the same area of central Italy on Thursday that has already been battered by a spate of recent tremors, but there were no reports of casualties or further serious damage.

The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) initially measured the quake at 5.0 but later revised it to 4.8. Its epicenter was in the Marche region, one of three areas hit repeatedly since August.

Nearly 10 hours after the latest quake, there were no reports of casualties, injuries or serious damage to buildings already weakened by previous tremors.

Earthquakes measuring 5.5 and 6.1 hit the area on Oct. 26, followed by a 6.6 magnitude quake on Sunday, the biggest tremor to strike Italy for 36 years.

The recent quakes have reshaped more than 600 square km (230 square miles) of land, lowering areas around the epicentre by up to 70 cm (28 inches), according to data released by Italy’s National Institute for Geophysics and Volcanology (INGV).

Central Italy was hit by an initial earthquake on Aug. 24 that killed 300 people, most of them in the town of Amatrice. Since then, some 21,600 aftershocks have battered the region, the INGV said, driving most residents from their homes.



An article by Ben Otto and Anita Rachman titled “Hard-Line Strain of Islam Gains Ground in Indonesia, World’s Largest Muslim Country” was posted at wsj.com on Nov. 4, 2016. Following is the article.

The biggest street protest in years shook this sprawling capital on Friday in a stark display of the more conservative, militant strain of Islam taking hold in the world's largest Muslim country.

Police said an estimated 100,000 people turned out for a rally called by hard-line Muslim groups against the capital's Christian governor, whom they accuse of having committed blasphemy.

The protest was peaceful during the day but scuffles broke out after nightfall. Younger protesters threw plastic bottles and rocks at police and struck their riot shields with sticks. Police fired tear gas and water cannon to disperse them. A local news portal said that two police trucks were set afire near the presidential palace.

Turnout was lower than some organizers had predicted, after the nation's largest Muslim organizations this week discouraged their members from attending.

President Joko Widodo had met with other political leaders amid calls for calm, but critics say he has been too slow since taking office in 2014 to respond to worsening tension for fear of being labeled anti-Muslim.

In a recent interview, Mr. Widodo said religious and political leaders had a responsibility to "cool temperatures down," and he vowed to protect minorities.

"We are one of the most tolerant countries in the world," Mr. Widodo told *The Wall Street Journal*. "My government won't tolerate any discrimination."

The Jakarta governor's election in February is building into a test.

"Religiosity is rising, especially among the middle class," said Yon Machmudi, an Islamic politics expert at the University of Indonesia. "A sense of identification is increasing."

Protesters were taking aim at Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, known as Ahok, who is the most prominent politician among the country's often-persecuted, ethnic Chinese minority. He was elected deputy governor in 2012 and elevated to the top job in 2014 after his boss, Mr. Widodo, was elected president.

Some hard-liners had tried to block his ascent then, saying Muslims shouldn't be ruled by a "kafir," or nonbeliever.

The blunt-spoken Mr. Purnama, 50 years old, also has irritated many with a brash, get-things-done manner that conflicts with Javanese traditions of polite compromise.

Mr. Purnama, now running for re-election amid high approval ratings, angered the groups again by citing a verse of the Quran in a public address in late September. He has apologized and said he would cooperate with a police investigation, but has since been the target of protests.

Vice President Jusuf Kalla met a group of protest leaders and said afterward that police would pursue a blasphemy case against Mr. Purnama. Local media

cited Mr. Purnama as saying he would meet with investigators Monday. The maximum penalty for blasphemy is five years imprisonment.

Scattered outbreaks of violence were reported as small groups dispersed into neighborhoods, including in North Jakarta, where they looted a minimart. About a hundred police officers guarded the complex where Mr. Purnama resides.

Shortly after midnight, Mr. Widodo appeared on television, saying that legal action concerning Mr. Purnama would be swift and transparent, and asked protesters to return home. He also said he deplored the violence that took place after the rally and that “political actors” had taken advantage of the situation. He didn’t elaborate.

Nearly 90% of Indonesia’s 250 million people are Muslim.

The Southeast Asian nation—some 18,000 islands straddling the Pacific and Indian oceans—has a long tradition of moderate Islam in a culture influenced earlier by Hinduism and Buddhism.

But the tenor has changed in recent years. Head scarves for women, once rare, are now widely worn and Islamic schools are expanding.

An effort to outlaw cohabitation and sex between unmarried people fizzled in 2013 but has returned this year, with proponents asking the Supreme Court for a constitutional prohibition.

Religious hard-liners staged antigay rallies early this year, and the government threatened to block websites it says promote lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender lifestyles. Netflix ran into trouble with Indonesia’s state-owned telecom provider in part because of complaints over some content.

A movement to ban alcohol is gaining steam and sales have been banned from convenience stores. Travel to Mecca for the minor pilgrimage of umrah, once a relatively uncommon undertaking for middle-class Indonesians, is newly popular.

Security experts say the rising conservatism paves the way for potential violence, pointing to some religious hard-liners who have rebranded themselves as cells of Islamic State.

In January, Indonesia suffered its first Islamic State-linked attack, with militants receiving funding from the terrorist group via a Syria-based Indonesian who once studied with a hard-line group in central Java. There have been sporadic attacks since then, including one last month where an Islamic State sympathizer stabbed three police officers.

“What we’ve seen in the last 18 months to two years is increasing crossover from organizations that started out ‘nonviolent but hard-line’ to organizations which are now committed to using violence,” said Sidney Jones, director of the Jakarta-based Institute for Policy Analysis of Conflict.

Still, Islamic parties have done poorly in elections since the downfall of long-time dictator Suharto in 1998. Indonesia has been one of the most stable

democracies in the region after overcoming a wave of terrorism and sectarianism in the early 2000s.

Many of those at Friday's protest had ridden for hours on trains and buses from other parts of Java island. They gathered at the Istiqlal mosque, the country's largest, before marching toward the presidential palace.

A 27-year-old from Pemalang in central Java said that while Mr. Purnama isn't his governor, he was seeking justice for Islam. Asked about comments from extremists about killing Mr. Purnama, he said: "It is an expression of how upset we are."

Security forces took up positions behind barbed wire around nearby government offices. Authorities said around 20,000 police and military personnel were on duty. There were no immediate reports of violence.

Streets in the famously congested city of 10 million people were relatively devoid of traffic as many workers stayed home. Many shops and offices closed.



An article titled "Saudi Congratulates Hezbollah-Backed Lebanon President" was posted at yahoo.com on Nov. 2, 2016. Following is the article.

Saudi Arabia has congratulated Lebanon's new President Michel Aoun on his election despite the support he received from the kingdom's regional foes.

King Salman telephoned Aoun to wish him success, "stressing the kingdom of Saudi Arabia's support for Lebanon and its unity", the official Saudi Press Agency reported late Tuesday.

Lebanese lawmakers elected the 81-year-old former army chief on Monday, ending a two-year vacancy caused by a deadlock between Iran- and Saudi-backed blocs in parliament.

Aoun had received the unstinting support of Iran's Lebanese ally, Shiite militant group Hezbollah, which Saudi Arabia blacklisted as a "terrorist organisation" in March.

His election followed a surprise U-turn by two key leaders of the pro-Saudi camp—billionaire Sunni former prime minister Saad Hariri and Christian Lebanese Forces leader Samir Geagea.

Hariri's influence in Lebanon has waned as his construction firm Saudi Oger has been hit by a slowdown in Saudi government infrastructure spending in what has been seen by some as a disengagement by his longtime sponsor.

Saudi Arabia's relations with both Hezbollah and its ally Iran have deteriorated sharply this year amid deep differences over the conflict in Syria.

Hezbollah has sent thousands of fighters to back President Bashar al-Assad. Riyadh supports the rebels.

Earlier this year, the kingdom halted a \$3 billion programme of military aid to Lebanon to protest what it said was "the stranglehold of Hezbollah on the state."

It also urged its citizens to leave Lebanon and avoid travel to the country.



An article by Nyshka Chandran titled "The US Has 7,100 Nuclear Warheads, China Has Just 260; Here's Why" was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 30, 2016. Following is the article.

China is catching up to the U.S. across a wide range of sectors; major banks expect the economy to be the world's largest in the 2020s, while the yuan's expanding usage has sparked calls for it to replace the dollar as the world reserve currency.

But when it comes to nuclear weapons, the heavyweight nations are unlikely to cross paths anytime soon due to strategic policy differences.

In a new report, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace notes the contrasting mentality and security paradigms behind nuclear decisions in each country.

"These disparities are not merely the result of differing security environments and levels of military strength; they also reflect differences in basic thinking because each country has developed its own nuclear philosophy in the process of implementing its security policy."

Here are a few key differences from the report.

The threat of retaliation in order to prevent an enemy attack, called deterrence, is a fundamental principle for the U.S. but not Beijing.

"Both Chinese and U.S. nuclear experts have long been perplexed by the differences in each other's approaches to nuclear deterrence. U.S. scholars believe that nuclear deterrence is appropriate, while Chinese scholars tend to believe that it has a strong intimidation effect. This difference is a problem," according to the report.

But the reason Beijing opposes deterrence is because it's confusing the idea with "nuclear compellance," the report flagged.

Whereas deterrence forces a rival to abandon an attack and thereby maintains the status quo, compellance is the idea that using a threat can force a rival to take action it does not wish to, which changes the status quo.

Washington distinguishes between the two ideas but apparently China does not.

"Chinese scholars take the position that various issues in a conflict are interrelated, and they pay close attention to conflict escalation," the report said. "Therefore, in their view, nuclear deterrence and compellance are indistinguishable."

Russia boasts the world's largest inventory of nuclear warheads at 7,300, followed by the U.S. (7,100), France (300), China (260) and the U.K. (215), according to U.S. nonpartisan organization Arms Control Association.

"The U.S. considers the quantity of nuclear weapons it possesses a symbol of its global leadership," the Carnegie report explained. "Its position has always been that if the size of its nuclear arsenal is excessively reduced, it will not be able to guarantee the security of its allies."

Beijing, on the other hand, does not seek to use nuclear weapons to establish hegemony. Its decision to hold nuclear weapons is based on the fact that its arsenal is lean but effective, and it has never engaged in an arms race with another country, the report said.

"Lean but effective implies that China has chosen appropriate technology and deployment methods that allow its nuclear weapons to sufficiently deter nuclear attacks. China's nuclear weapons serve no other purpose."

Both nations also have different definitions of what constitutes security concerns.

For China, lagging behind developed countries in economics, science, technology and military affairs represents a security challenge for policymakers because it leaves the country vulnerable, the report warned.

To avoid being caught helpless in the face of adversaries' new technologies, Beijing will master the latest innovations but that doesn't necessarily translate to deployment, the report continued.

"As far as China is concerned, what is important is ensuring that it has the technological leeway to avoid being caught off guard by new innovations. Yet U.S. scholars cannot fully comprehend this way of thinking, and China and the United States have almost never engaged in any serious dialogue about it."



An article by Michael W. Chapman titled "Christians Martyred by ISIS: 1,131" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 27, 2016. Following is the article.

A report submitted to the State Department earlier this year documented that between 2003 and June 9, 2014, at least 1,131 Christians—identified by name and place of death—had been murdered by the radical Muslims that comprise the Islamic State, also known as ISIS.

In addition, at least 125 Christian churches had been attacked or destroyed by ISIS.

The report, *Genocide Against Christians in the Middle East*, was submitted to Secretary of State John Kerry on March 9, 2016 by the Knights of Columbus and the humanitarian group In Defense of Christians. Eight days later, March 17, Kerry officially declared that ISIS's ongoing actions against Christians, Yazidis, and other religious minorities constituted genocide.

Britain, the European Parliament, the U.N.'s High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the Iraqi and Kurdish governments have also declared ISIS's actions genocide.

The report notes that genocide is a crime under federal and international law. It defines genocide as "any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: a) Killing members of the group; b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group."

"Murder of Christians is commonplace" in Iraq, Syria, and Libya, states the report. "Many have been killed in front of their own families. The Syriac Catholic Patriarch of Antioch, many of whose flock lived on the Ninevah plain or in Syria, reports that 500 people were killed by ISIS during its takeover of Mosul and the surrounding region."

"In Syria, where the organization Aid to the Church in Need has reported on mass graves of Christians, Patriarch Younan estimates the number of Christians 'targeted and killed by Islamic bands' at more than 1,000," states the report.

In section six of the report, it lists the names and place and "date of martyrdom" of 1,131 Christians who were murdered by the Islamic State. For instance, Alicia Nour was martyred in Mosul on Feb. 1, 2005. Ashoor Younan Botros was murdered in Baghdad on June 24, 2013. On July 1, 2015, Qays Abd Shaaya was martyred by the Islamic State in Baghdad.

The 1,131 martyrs are documented from the period 2003 to June 9, 2014. More Christians reportedly were murdered in 2015 and 2016 but names and places of death have yet to be compiled in one document.

In addition to the list of known martyrs, the report, *Genocide Against Christians in the Middle East*, lists 125 Christian churches known to have been attacked by ISIS. These include, for instance, Saint George Church in Mosul, which was blown up on March 9, 2015; Virgin Mary Chaldean Church, which was attacked by car bomb on June 9, 2008; and the Armenian Church in Mosul, burned on Jan. 25, 2015.



An editorial by Thomas Frank titled "Forget the FBI Cache; the Podesta Emails Show How America is Run" was posted at theguardian.com on Oct. 31, 2016. Following is the article.

The emails currently roiling the US presidential campaign are part of some unknown digital collection amassed by the troublesome Anthony Weiner, but if your purpose is to understand the clique of people who dominate Washington today,

the emails that really matter are the ones being slowly released by WikiLeaks from the hacked account of Hillary Clinton's campaign chair John Podesta.

They are last week's scandal in a year running over with scandals, but in truth their significance goes far beyond mere scandal: they are a window into the soul of the Democratic party and into the dreams and thoughts of the class to whom the party answers.

The class to which I refer is not rising in angry protest; they are by and large pretty satisfied, pretty contented. Nobody takes road trips to exotic West Virginia to see what the members of this class looks like or how they live; on the contrary, they are the ones for whom such stories are written. This bunch doesn't have to make do with a comb-over TV mountebank for a leader; for this class, the choices are always pretty good, and this year they happen to be excellent.

They are the comfortable and well-educated mainstay of our modern Democratic party. They are also the grandees of our national media; the architects of our software; the designers of our streets; the high officials of our banking system; the authors of just about every plan to fix social security or fine-tune the Middle East with precision droning. They are, they think, not a class at all but rather the enlightened ones, the people who must be answered to but who need never explain themselves.

Let us turn the magnifying glass on them for a change, by sorting through the hacked personal emails of John Podesta, who has been a Washington power broker for decades.

I admit that I feel uncomfortable digging through this hoard; stealing someone's email is a crime, after all, and it is outrageous that people's personal information has been exposed, since WikiLeaks doesn't seem to have redacted the emails in any way.

There is also the issue of authenticity to contend with: we don't know absolutely and for sure that these emails were not tampered with by whoever stole them from John Podesta. The supposed authors of the messages are refusing to confirm or deny their authenticity, and though they seem to be real, there is a small possibility they aren't.

With all that taken into consideration, I think the WikiLeaks releases furnish us with an opportunity to observe the upper reaches of the American status hierarchy in all its righteousness and majesty.

The dramatis personae of the liberal class are all present in this amazing body of work: financial innovators. High-achieving colleagues attempting to get jobs for their high-achieving children. Foundation executives doing fine and noble things. Prizes, of course, and high academic achievement.

Certain industries loom large and virtuous here. Hillary's ingratiating speeches to Wall Street are well known of course, but what is remarkable is that, in the party of Jackson and Bryan and Roosevelt, smiling financiers now seem to stand on every corner, constantly proffering advice about this and that.

In one now-famous email chain, for example, the reader can watch current US trade representative Michael Froman, writing from a Citibank email address in 2008, appear to name President Obama's cabinet even before the great hope-and-change election was decided (incidentally, an important clue to understanding why that greatest of zombie banks was never put out of its misery).

The far-sighted innovators of Silicon Valley are also here in force, interacting all the time with the leaders of the party of the people. We watch as Podesta appears to email Sheryl Sandberg. He makes plans to visit Mark Zuckerberg (who, according to one missive, wants to "learn more about next steps for his philanthropy and social action").

Podesta exchanges emails with an entrepreneur about an ugly race now unfolding for Silicon Valley's seat in Congress; this man, in turn, appears to forward to Podesta the remarks of yet another Silicon Valley grandee, who complains that one of the Democratic combatants in that fight was criticizing billionaires who give to Democrats.

Specifically, the miscreant Dem in question was said to be: ". . . spinning (and attacking) donors who have supported Democrats. John Arnold and Marc Leder have both given to Cory Booker, Joe Kennedy, and others. He is also attacking every billionaire that donates to [Congressional candidate] Ro [Khanna], many whom support other Democrats as well."

Attacking billionaires! In the year 2015! It was, one of the correspondents appears to write, "madness and political malpractice of the party to allow this to continue."

There are wonderful things to be found in this treasure trove when you search the gilded words "Davos" or "Tahoe." But it is when you search "Vineyard" on the WikiLeaks dump that you realize these people truly inhabit a different world from the rest of us.

By "vineyard," of course, they mean Martha's Vineyard, the ritzy vacation resort island off the coast of Massachusetts where presidents Clinton and Obama spent most of their summer vacations. The Vineyard is a place for the very, very rich to unwind, yes, but as we learn from these emails, it is also a place of high idealism; a land of enlightened liberal commitment far beyond anything ordinary citizens can ever achieve.

Consider, for example, the 2015 email from a foundation executive to a retired mortgage banker (who then seems to have forwarded the note on to Podesta, and thus into history) expressing concern that "Hillary's image is being torn apart in the media and there's not enough effective push back."

The public eavesdrops as yet another financier invites Podesta to a dinner featuring "food produced exclusively by the island's farmers and fishermen which will be matched with specially selected wines." We learn how a Hillary campaign aide recommended that a policy statement appear on a certain day so that "It wont get in the way of any other news we are trying to make—but far enough ahead of Hamptons and Vineyard money events."

We even read the pleadings of a man who wants to be invited to a state dinner at the White House and who offers, as one of several exhibits in his favor, the fact that he “joined the DSCC Majority Trust in Martha’s Vineyard (contributing over \$32,400 to Democratic senators) in July 2014.”

(Hilariously, in another email chain, the Clinton team appears to scheme to “hit” Bernie Sanders for attending “DSCC retreats on Martha’s Vineyard with lobbyists.”)

Then there is the apparent nepotism, the dozens if not hundreds of mundane emails in which petitioners for this or that plum Washington job or high-profile academic appointment politely appeal to Podesta—the ward-heeler of the meritocratic elite—for a solicitous word whispered in the ear of a powerful crony.

This genre of Podesta email, in which people try to arrange jobs for themselves or their kids, points us toward the most fundamental thing we know about the people at the top of this class: their loyalty to one another and the way it overrides everything else.

Of course Hillary Clinton staffed her state department with investment bankers and then did speaking engagements for investment banks as soon as she was done at the state department.

Of course she appears to think that any kind of bank reform should “come from the industry itself.” And of course no elite bankers were ever prosecuted by the Obama administration.

Read these emails and you understand, with a start, that the people at the top tier of American life all know each other. They are all engaged in promoting one another’s careers, constantly.

Everything blurs into everything else in this world. The state department, the banks, Silicon Valley, the nonprofits, the “Global CEO Advisory Firm” that appears to have solicited donations for the Clinton Foundation.

Executives here go from foundation to government to thinktank to startup. There are honors. Venture capital. Foundation grants. Endowed chairs. Advanced degrees. For them the door revolves. The friends all succeed. They break every boundary.

But the One Big Boundary remains. Yes, it’s all supposed to be a meritocracy. But if you aren’t part of this happy, prosperous in-group—if you don’t have John Podesta’s email address—you’re out.



An article by Greg Jaffe titled “Once the Hope Candidate, Obama in His Final Days a Hopeless Electorate” was posted at washingtonpost.com on Oct. 30, 2016. Following is the article.

I've seen a few articles like this in the past couple of months. As the sun sets (mercifully) on the Obama administration, a largely failed administration, his supporters and former supporters are looking around and asking, "What went wrong?"

What's interesting is that many of the people looking around bewildered now really did think that the TEA Party was some sort of reaction to a black president. And though race was an important factor in why some people did not like the president, it was a small minority of people and still it was only a factor with even them. (The truth is many "conservative" voters would love to vote for a conservative black candidate.)

The Obama believers didn't realize that many people were legitimately concerned by a president who was inexperienced, came from an urban political machine, who had been raised up in the Alinsky school of politics, who appeared hyper-partisan, and who was (and is) naively enamored with government action.

They, the TEA Partiers, some of the people who have now been defined as "deplorables," many just everyday generally non-political people, could see disaster on the horizon even while the "respectable" folks in Washington and New York talked up "hope and change."

It was plain as day to many that Obama was taking the country in the wrong direction. Yet the "hope and changers" could not see. They really thought Obama was something different even as the CEOs of the bailout banks walked in and out of the White House with ear to ear grins.

It is honestly surprising to me that so many people seem surprised that Obama turned out the way he did. I could tell from the outset that Mr. Obama was not as concerned with healing the racial divide in America, a divide that had grown smaller every year of my life until the Obama years, than with righting perceived racial wrongs and teaching the yokels in flyover country a lesson.

America he said "clung" to its guns and its God. They "didn't build that." Many people just looked around in disbelief. This is the president of the United States?

We have now suffered through two two term, largely failed presidencies. One defined by arguably the greatest foreign policy blunder of the last 100 years and one defined by a domestic agenda that eroded the basic foundation and the very rule of law of the country. The Bush/Obama era has been a tough one for America. We are tired. We are worn out. Obama leaves the presidency with an America that is exhausted.

And for those who are now "hopeless" as the Washington Post puts it, they should have probably listened when people were jumping up and down about the country going in the wrong direction. But Obama was for "change" and that was a good thing right?

Change? Change to what?

Well now we know.



An article titled "Chicago Soars Past 600 Homicides After Bloody October" was posted at cbschicago.com on Nov. 1, 2016. Following are excerpts of the article.

With 78 homicides, October was the second deadliest month of 2016, and Chicago surpassed 600 homicides for the first time in more than a decade.

The last time Chicago had at least 600 homicides in a single year was 2003.

Homicides and non-fatal shootings have skyrocketed in 2016, with 605 homicides and more than 3,600 shooting victims through the end of October.

In October, there were 78 homicides and 427 shooting victims. Only August had more homicides, when 90 people were slain in Chicago. It was the bloodiest month in the city in 20 years.

The city is on pace for 726 homicides in 2016, a number not seen since the late 1990s.

Chicago police said the majority of the increase in violence this year has happened in five districts on the South Side and West Side.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "The Rich and Us" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Nov. 2, 2016. Following is the article.

Microsoft co-founder Bill Gates, having a net worth of \$81.8 billion, and Amazon.com CEO Jeff Bezos, having a net worth of \$70.4 billion, are the nation's two richest men. They are at the top of the Forbes 400 list of America's superrich individuals, people who have net worths of billions of dollars. Many see the rich as a danger.

New York Times columnist Bob Herbert wrote, "It doesn't really matter what ordinary people want. The wealthy call the tune, and the politicians dance." His colleague Paul Krugman wrote, "On paper, we're a one-person-one-vote nation; in reality, we're more than a bit of an oligarchy, in which a handful of wealthy people dominate."

It's sentiments like these that have led me to wish there were a humane way to get rid of the rich. For without having the rich around to be whipping boys and distract our attention, we might be able to concentrate on what's best for the 99.9 percent of the rest of us.

Let's look at the power of the rich.

- With all the money that Gates, Bezos and other superrich people have, what can they force you or me to do?
- Can they condemn our houses to create space so that another individual can build an auto dealership or a casino parking lot?

- Can they force us to pay money into the government-run—and doomed—Obamacare program?
- Can they force us to bus our children to schools out of our neighborhood in the name of diversity?
- Can they force us to buy our sugar from a high-cost domestic producer rather than from a low-cost Caribbean producer?

The answer to all of these questions is a big fat no. You say, “Williams, I don’t understand.” Let me be more explicit.

Bill Gates cannot order you to enroll your child in another school in order to promote racial diversity. He has no power to condemn your house to make way for a casino parking lot. Unless our elected public officials grant them the power to rip us off, rich people have little power to force us to do anything.

A lowly municipal clerk earning \$50,000 a year has far more life-and-death power over us. It is that type of person to whom we must turn for permission to build a house, ply a trade, open a restaurant and do myriad other activities. It’s government people, not rich people, who have the power to coerce us and rip us off. They have the power to make our lives miserable if we disobey. This coercive power goes a long way toward explaining legalized political corruption.

Take just one of thousands of examples. The Fanjuls are among the biggest sugar cane growers, and they co-own the world’s largest refining company, American Sugar Refining, which markets its product under the brand names Domino, C&H, Redpath, Tate & Lyle and Florida Crystals.

During the 2014 election cycle, Florida Crystals contributed more than \$860,000 to candidates and political spending groups. It spent more than \$1 million lobbying Congress, the U.S. departments of Agriculture and Commerce, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

Here’s my question to you: Do you think it forked over all that money to help our elected representatives uphold and defend the U.S. Constitution? Nonsense.

The Fanjuls and other sugar producers want Congress to use tariffs to keep foreign-produced sugar out of our country so they can reap the financial benefits from being able to charge Americans two to three times the world price of sugar.

So here’s the ultimate question: If some rich people can line the pockets of politicians to do their bidding at the expense of the rest of us, who’s to blame?

I think it’s we, the people, who are to blame for not using our votes to run such politicians out of town—and that’s most of them. But that might be deceitful of us, for we also ask politicians to enable us to live at the expense of others.



An editorial by Dennis Prager titled “Still Think Hillary Clinton is a Role Model for Your Daughter?” was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 1, 2016. Following is the article.

Three months ago, I wrote a column refuting the claim repeatedly made by supporters of Hillary Clinton that having a woman president—specifically, Hillary Clinton—would be a terrific thing for girls and young women.

In light of how much more we now know about Clinton's activities while secretary of state and the renewal by the FBI of its investigation of her private email server as well as the revelation, denied months ago by Clinton, that it is investigating her family-run charities, it is a topic worth revisiting.

Good and decent men and women who are Democrats ought to stop thinking this way—for America's sake and for their daughters' sake.

Only those in willful denial can continue to reject the overwhelming evidence that Clinton is essentially a crook, prone to chronic lying, and, worst of all, she has betrayed America's best interests for those of herself and her husband.

There is nothing I can say to those people.

But to those Democrats who will vote for Clinton but who are nevertheless able to acknowledge Hillary Clinton's extraordinary ethical defects, I make the following appeal: Do not believe, let alone claim, that having her as president, if she is elected, will be a good thing for your daughters.

Quite the contrary.

The notion that Hillary Clinton is a role model for young American women is yet another testimony to the moral decline of America—not to mention to the moral state of the American Left and the Democratic Party.

While many of us who are voting for Donald Trump readily acknowledge our ambivalence over doing so, one never hears any moral ambivalence from Democrats, liberals or anyone else voting for Hillary Clinton.

Indeed, Clinton supporters—especially women—speak of the Democrats' nominee with pride. They actually say that they yearn for her to be president so as to serve as a model for young American women.

If Clinton supporters said, "I will support just about any Democrat for president, no matter how personally immoral, because I consider defeating Republicans the most important thing we Americans can do on Election Day," I could live with that.

The converse, after all, is my position. I will support just about any Republican for president, given the perhaps irreparable damage the Left and the Democrats have wreaked on America—on its universities, its economy, its race relations, its standing in the world, its allies, on free speech and on the moral fabric of American life.

But Clinton supporters don't say that. Rather, they extol the virtues of a profoundly unethical woman who, mounting evidence indicates, sold her country's interests for her and her husband's personal and political gain. And they

endlessly repeat the claim about how wonderful it would be for girls and young women to see this woman in the White House.

In my earlier column, I characterized the argument that it is important for women to vote for a woman president as morally primitive. I feel the same way about blacks voting for blacks, Jews for Jews, Hispanics for Hispanics, and Mormons for Mormons because the candidate is a member of their “tribe.”

Such group-think is the opposite of what America was set up to be—a place where, for once, the individual, not the individual’s group, is what most matters.

It is also worth noting that the majority of conservative women would not think this way. Women with conservative values are far less committed to female solidarity than liberal women.

Why is that?

Because conservatives do not think as tribally as liberals. People on the left think of themselves as worldly, but this is true only regarding national identity—they value national identity far less than people on the right. But what the left has done is trade in national identity for race, gender and class identity.

Most conservative women are not impressed with the idea of “female solidarity.” And almost all conservatives regard racial solidarity as just another term for racism.

Moreover, far more conservative women think that if a woman is going to serve as a model for their daughters, then her primary responsibility and achievement is making a healthy and character-building home. They are therefore less likely than liberal women to think in terms of astronaut or president when they think about a female role model for their daughter.

Certainly, in terms of America’s well-being, they are right. America needs far more great mothers and wives than it needs female astronauts and presidents.

Any support for Hillary Clinton because she is a female is troubling. It is statement that gender identity is more important than moral character. That is the message every parent who asks his or her daughter to look to Hillary Clinton as a model is communicating.



An editorial by Thomas Sowell titled “Random Thoughts” was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Nov. 1, 2016. Following is the article.

Random thoughts on the passing scene:

■ There seem to be fewer bumper stickers this year than in previous presidential election years. People may decide to vote for one of these candidates, but apparently they are not proud of their choice.

- It is astonishing that some people think that the answer to the problems of ObamaCare is to go to a “single payer” system. But “single payer” is just another way of saying “government monopoly.” Does anyone pay attention to how government monopolies operate—from the local DMV to Veterans Administration hospitals?
- Politics has turned the lofty ideal of equality into the ugly reality of resentments of other people’s achievements—and a feeling that the world owes you something, while you owe nobody anything, not even common decency.
- Why should the fate of the economy depend on the guesswork of the Federal Reserve—and the guesswork of the stock market about what the Federal Reserve will guess?
- Politicians have learned to call their spending of the taxpayers’ money “investment,” even when it is just pouring money down a bottomless pit, in order to win votes from the recipients.
- The NAACP’s decision to back the teachers’ unions, who donate money to them, against charter schools that provide thousands of black children their only hope of a better life, means that the NAACP should no longer be considered part of the civil rights movement, but just another part of the race hustling racket.
- In a few months from now, Barack Obama will no longer be President of the United States. But the same gullibility and frivolity of the voters that put him in the White House will still be there to put the fate of America, and of Western civilization, in other fatally unreliable hands in a nuclear age.
- Hillary Clinton has performed the verbal magic of turning her years of repeated disastrous decisions in foreign policy into a political asset called “experience.”
- The political left’s hatred of Donald Trump is ironic, because both he and they have the same pattern of automatic demonizing of those who disagree with their views, rather than confronting opposing arguments with hard evidence or convincing logic.
- If the media seriously wanted to report the news—instead of spinning it—they could stop calling rioters “protesters” and stop calling terrorists “militants.”
- Letter from a reader: “The Socialists want to take the ‘sting’ out of poverty. They don’t understand that it’s the ‘sting’ that got everyone I know out of poverty and not a minimum wage.”
- Have we reached the ultimate stage of absurdity where some people are held responsible for things that happened before they were born, while other people are not held responsible for what they themselves are doing today?
- The plight of Middle East refugees is something that any decent human being can sympathize with. But other refugees have been helped in their own

part of the world—with money, food, medicine and other things, in settings more compatible with their own way of life, rather than being brought across an ocean to a country that neither fits them nor which they fit in.

■ Each political party has picked a loser this year. Unfortunately, one of them is going to win, and then the whole country can lose, big time.

■ I am so old that I can remember when liberals were liberal, and when common decency was actually common.

■ Have you ever encountered even one human being—whether in person, in print or in the broadcast media—who denied that climates change? If not, why do you suppose zealots for the catastrophic “global warming” theory want laws passed to punish “climate change deniers”? Is it because they are losing the battle of evidence on “global warming” and need to shut up others?

■ One of the mysteries of the ages is why the political left has, for centuries, lavished so much attention on the well-being of criminals and paid so little attention to their victims.

■ The monumental tragedies of the 20th century—a world-wide Great Depression, two devastating World Wars, the Holocaust, famines killing millions in the Soviet Union and tens of millions in China—should leave us with a sobering sense of the threats to any society. But this generation’s ignorance of history leaves them free to be frivolous—until the next catastrophe strikes, and catches them completely by surprise.



An editorial by Thomas Sowell titled “The Left’s Vision” was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Nov. 2, 2016. Following is the article.

No one has presented the social vision of the left more often than Nicholas Kristof of the New York Times—and no one has been more certain that those who do not happen to share his vision “just don’t get it,” as he has repeatedly declared.

Mr. Kristof’s essay “Growing Up Poor in America” in the October 30th New York Times is a classic example of the mindset of the left.

It begins with the story of a poor black teenager in Arkansas, being raised by a single mom. Sometimes he goes hungry and his home does not have even one book. But it does have television sets with huge screens, and apparently there is money enough to buy marijuana.

Surely we can all agree that this young fellow has very unpromising future prospects ahead of him, and that this is a human tragedy. The circumstances of his life are unfair to him and none of us would want to be born into such circumstances. Moreover, he is just one of many who are brought up in a setting that is full of dangers and with a low probability of improvement.

But that is not enough for Mr. Kristof or for the political left in general. Of such youngsters he says, "as a society, we fail them long before they fail us."

Whoa! Just when did "society" make the decisions and engage in the actions that have led to this teenager being in the bad situation he is in? And just when did "society" acquire either the omniscience or the omnipotence to prevent it?

When the left says "society" they usually mean government. That is apparently what "society" means in this case, for Kristof laments that this teenager is "the kind of person whom America's presidential candidates just don't talk about."

If the left chooses to believe that government intervention is the answer to such tragedies, that is their right. But, if they expect the rest of us to share that belief, surely they could subject that belief to some empirical test. But we can, however.

The 1960s were the triumphant decade of those who wanted government intervention to "solve" what they called "social problems." How did that work out? What were things like before this social vision triumphed? And what were things like afterwards?

Homicide victimization rates among black males were going down substantially in the 1940s and the 1950s. But homicide victimization rates reversed and skyrocketed in the 1960s, wiping out all the progress of the two previous decades.

When the 1960s began, most black children were born into families with both a mother and a father. After the great welfare state expansion during the 1960s, most black children were born to a single mother, like the youngster in Arkansas today.

Kristof's essay also mentions a teenage girl who is a single mother, and suggests that "sex education" could have prevented her from getting pregnant. Teenage pregnancy was going down—repeat, *down*—during the 1950s. It reversed and shot up after the 1960s began bringing the "sex education" vision into schools across the country.

Very similar trends occurred in England, after very similar visions and policies also triumphed there in the 1960s. Perhaps it is the left that just doesn't get it—or cannot face the hard fact that its own vision and policies worsened the very things they claimed would be made better.



An editorial by Ross Douthat titled "The Dangers of Donald Trump" was posted at nytimes.com on Oct. 29, 2016. Following is the article.

In last Sunday's column, I wrote about the dangers that a Hillary Clinton presidency poses for the country. Since this is the final week for Hillary skeptics to agonize over whether to cast a vote for Donald Trump, it seems appropriate to outline why the risks of Trump are so distinctive as to throw the perils of a Clinton presidency into relative eclipse.

This is a challenging thing to explain because Trump is, among recent American politicians, *sui generis*. The mistakes and blunders that an establishment liberal like Clinton is likely to make can be envisioned by looking at peers like Angela Merkel, at recent occupants of the White House, at Hillary's own record.

But there are no obvious analogues for a President Trump; all the comparables, from Arnold Schwarzenegger to Silvio Berlusconi, only reflect part of what we would get with the Republican nominee as a superpower's president.

So considering the dangers of Trump requires a grounded speculation, which is what I'll attempt here. These are not my worst-case scenarios: They do not involve Trump making baldly authoritarian moves or accidentally touching off nuclear war. Rather, they're three baseline dangers for a Trump administration, three perils that we would very likely face.

■ The first is sustained market jitters, leading to an economic slump.

Trump's election alone would probably induce a Brexit-esque stock market dip, but the real problem would be what happened next. Instead of Theresa May's steadiness inspiring a return to fundamentals, you would have the spectacle—and it will be a spectacle—of the same Trump team that drop-kicked its policy shop and barely organized a national campaign trying to staff up an administration. Even without his promised pivot to mercantilism and trade war, a White House run as a Trump production is likely to mainline anxiety into the economy, sidelining capital, discouraging hiring and shaving points off the G.D.P.

■ The second peril is major civil unrest.

Some of Trump's supporters imagine that his election would be a blow to left-wing activists, that his administration would swiftly reverse the post-Ferguson crime increase. This is a bit like imagining that a President George Wallace would have been good for late-1960s civil peace. In reality, Trump's election would be a gift to bad cops and riot-ready radicals in equal measure, and his every intervention would pour gasoline on campuses and cities—not least because as soon as any protest movement had a face or leader, Trump would be on cable bellowing ad hominem at them.

■ The third likely highly-plausible peril, and by far the most serious, is a rapid escalation of risk in every geopolitical theater.

It's probably true that Trump, given his pro-Russia line, would be somewhat less likely than Clinton to immediately stumble into confrontation with Vladimir Putin over Syria. But it's silly to imagine Moscow slipping into a comfortable *détente* with a President Trump; Putin is more likely to pocket concessions and keep pushing, testing the orange-haired dealmaker at every opportunity and leaving Trump poised, very dangerously, between overreaction and his least-favorite position—looking weak.

That's just Russia: From the Pacific Rim to the Middle East, revisionist powers will set out to test Trump's capacity to handle surprise, hostile actors will seek to exploit the undoubted chaos of his White House, and our allies will build

American fecklessness into their strategic plans. And again, all of this is likely to happen without Trump doing the wilder things he's kind-of sort-of pledged to do—demanding tribute from allies, trying to “take the oil,” etc. He need only be himself in order to bring an extended period of risk upon the world.

The history of geopolitics prior to the Pax Americana is rife with examples of why this sort of testing should be feared. Overall, Trump's foreign policy hazing, his rough introduction to machtpolitik, promises more danger for global stability—still a real and valuable thing, recent crises notwithstanding—than the risks incurred by George W. Bush's interventionism, Barack Obama's attempt at offshore balancing, or (yes) Hillary Clinton's possible exposure of classified material to the Chinese, the Russians and Anthony Weiner's sexting partners.

There is no algorithm that can precisely calibrate how to weigh global instability against the reasons that remain for conservatives to vote for Trump. No mathematical proof can demonstrate that the chance of a solidly-conservative Supreme Court justice isn't worth a scaled-up risk of great power conflict.

But I think that reluctant Trump supporters are overestimating the systemic durability of the American-led order, and underestimating the extent to which a basic level of presidential competence and self-control is itself a matter of life and death—for Americans, and for human beings the world over.

I may be wrong. But none of my fears (and I have many) of what a Hillary Clinton presidency will bring are strong enough to make me want to run the risk of being proven right.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled “My Final Argument for Trump: Humiliate the Media!” was posted at anncoulter.com on Nov. 2, 2016. Following is the article.

(EDITORS: Please note graphic language in column.)

For every argument the media make against Trump, Hillary's worse.

(1) Eleven years ago, Trump said on a secretly recorded tape that celebrities can do anything—even grab a woman's [body-part slang].

Hillary, born-again Victorian virgin, campaigns with Beyonce, who performs a duet with the words “curvalicious, [same body-part slang] served delicious.”

Hillary is thrilled to have the support of Madonna—who has publicly offered to [perform a particular sexual act] to anyone who votes for Hillary. (She'll even remove her teeth!)

Hillary's campaign has deployed Miley Cyrus to canvas for her—when Cyrus is not busy inviting men in the audience to reach up and grab her [same body-part slang]. (Video of delicate flower Miley Cyrus in action.)

When Vernon Jordan was asked by CBS' Mike Wallace what he talked about while golfing with Bill Clinton—aka Hillary's husband—he answered: “[Same body-part slang].”

Oh, and 11 years before Teddy Kennedy ran for president as the Conscience of the Democratic Party—he killed a girl. After grabbing her [same body-part slang].

(2) Trump's a sexual predator!

Hillary's husband is a well-established rapist, groper and pants-dropper. She's his fixer.

Unlike the serial predations of her husband, leveled repeatedly throughout the decades, these 11th-hour allegations against Trump are highly suspect, for the timing alone.

Recall that *The New York Times* spent months investigating Trump's treatment of women earlier this year. The Newspaper of Record put its best reporters on the job, interviewed a dozen women, and the paper splashed the story on its front page. But the best the *Times* could come up with was a story about Trump, as a bachelor, publicly praising a model for looking great in a bikini at his pool party. Then they dated. The horror.

Five months later, just days before the election, there doesn't seem to be a female Democrat who isn't claiming to have been groped by Trump—and getting loads of fawning publicity.

(3) Trump doesn't give enough to charity.

The media only counts "charitable giving" if it can be taken as a tax deduction with the IRS. When Trump spent time and money saving a Georgia family farm from foreclosure in the 1980s, for example, he didn't get any tax write-off.

Hillary, by contrast, was a big philanthropist because, at about the same time, she was taking a deduction for donations of Bill's used underwear—the modern equivalent of smallpox-laden blankets. Today, the munificent Clinton Foundation spends less than 10 percent of its revenues on actual charity, using about 90 percent for salaries, offices and travel.

(4) Several of Trump's businesses went bankrupt.

Trump has created or helped create hundreds of businesses. Fewer than 10 went bankrupt. Hillary had one business, Whitewater Development Corp., and it went bankrupt—after ripping off scores of ordinary Americans. Also, a dozen prominent Arkansans went to prison in connection with sleazy financial transactions involving Whitewater.

(5) Trump University was a scam!

Approximately 10,000 graduates of Trump University were thrilled with the program and said so in writing. But a law firm that paid Hillary and Bill Clinton \$675,000 for three speeches managed to find a handful of disgruntled students to be the named plaintiffs in a class-action lawsuit against it.

Trump University was a minuscule portion of Trump's portfolio. Whitewater was a huge part of Bill and Hillary's get-rich-quick schemes, scamming the elderly, retirees and working-class Americans for the money-hungry Clintons.

As described by *The Washington Post*, people who bought property from the Whitewater Development Corp. were required to submit a down payment, followed by monthly payments, until the entire purchase price of the property was paid off. But if buyers missed a single payment for any reason, the entire transaction would be deemed null and void, and the property, as well as all prior payments, would be forfeited to the Whitewater corporation. No foreclosure proceeding, no court hearing, no due process.

More than half of Whitewater's customers lost their entire investment. (See "Whitewater Repossessions; Sales Practice Benefited Clintons, Partners," *The Washington Post*, April 21, 1994.)

Though Hillary had long claimed to have nothing to do with the operation of the business, when the books were finally opened, it turned out that the monthly checks were mailed to the Whitewater Development Corp.—"care of Hillary Rodham Clinton." (See "Records Show Wider Role for Hillary Clinton; Whitewater Papers Detail Involvement," *The Washington Post*, April 21, 1994.)

(6) We can't allow Trump access to nuclear codes!

Hillary is the one who is champing at the bit to go to war with Russia, which, I am reliably informed, is a nuclear power.

At least Hillary's adept at dealing with sensitive digital information. Huma! Quick! Are the nuclear launch codes on my Blackberry, my desktop thingy or my Facebook page?

Compared to Hillary, we'd be safer if the nuclear codes were held by Miley Cyrus (unless she kept them in her [same body-part slang]).

(7) Trump's temperament will get us into World War III.

Hillary's temperament drove her to push for intervention in the Libyan civil war against Moammar Gadhafi for the sole purpose of giving her a foreign policy success that could be all her own.

Obama was skeptical. Libya was Hillary's baby. (Sidney Blumenthal's email to Hillary: "First, brava! This is a historic moment and you will be credited for realizing it.")

After Gadhafi was killed, Hillary's temperament led her to go on TV and laughingly say, "We came. We saw. He died."

Unfortunately, Hillary hadn't given the slightest thought to what would come next. What came next was: the Muslim Brotherhood, the murder of Americans in Benghazi and millions of refugees pouring into Western Europe.

(8) Trump failed to denounce David Duke with the ferocity deemed sufficient by our media.

No one even knows if Duke actually exists or is just a phantom produced by the media every four years to smear Republicans.

I know that no one has ever been incited to commit murder after listening to a David Duke speech. Lots of people have been murdered by someone who'd just heard an Al Sharpton speech: seven at Freddy's Fashion Mart in Harlem, and one Orthodox Jew, plus one Italian mistaken for a Jew, in Crown Heights.

Hillary has not disavowed Sharpton—nor would our media be so rude as to ask.

The mother of Ferguson thug Mike Brown, Lesley McSpadden, campaigns with Hillary—she even took the stage at the Democratic National Convention. The father of Omar Mateen, the Orlando nightclub shooter, appeared on stage behind Hillary at a rally.

If the media won't ask her to "disavow" the relatives of criminals and terrorists featured at her events, could they at least ask her if she approves of their parenting techniques?

(9) Trump is a "racist" because of his plan to remove Muslim jihadists, Mexican drug dealers and rapists from our country.

Apart from the fact that "drug dealer," "rapist" and "jihadist" are not races, we didn't do anything to Muslims or Mexicans, except send them billions of dollars in foreign aid. The only "racism" Americans care about is that toward black Americans. We did something to them.

Hillary asks blacks to vote for her, then vows to bring in millions of Muslims and Mexicans to take their jobs—the ones that "Americans just won't do." That's racism.

(10) Trump "fat-shamed" Miss Universe!

No, he didn't—he saved her crown and she was grateful. It's on tape.

But more importantly, the Miss Universe in question is Alicia Machado, well-known in Venezuela as a publicity-seeking clown.

Machado is credibly accused of: driving the getaway car in an attempted murder; threatening to kill a federal judge; and being the baby mama to drug cartel kingpin Gerardo Alvarez-Vazquez, who was on the State Department's "Most Wanted" list under—let's see, checking my notes—Hillary Clinton.

Until 1975, everyone would have realized that it's stupid to bring in single mothers with no marketable job skills, to add to the dependent class. If we did bring them in, politicians wouldn't proudly introduce them at rallies.

But Machado is Hillary's model immigrant. Her only job skill is voting. Upside: Hillary gets another vote. Downside: You'll be supporting Machado and her anchor baby for the rest of their lives, America.

(11) Trump is challenging the very foundation of our democracy by saying elections are rigged!

They are rigged—ask former Sen. Norm Coleman of Minnesota, whose 2008 election was provably stolen from him when more than a thousand ineligible

felons voted for Al Franken in a race Coleman lost by 312 votes. (At least it wasn't an important election: Franken provided the 60th, and deciding, vote to pass Obamacare.)

In any event, Hillary says the election is rigged, too—by the Russkies!

The Democrats and the media have gone full John Birch Society on us. There's a fifth column in America—and their leader is Donald Trump!!!

This is a marked departure from their previous cosmopolitan sangfroid about communism. We could have really used this fighting spirit during the Cold War. Instead, we got Jimmy Carter warning Americans about their "inordinate fear of communism."

Today, bad-ass, eye-rolling journalists are somberly announcing: "I have in my hand a list—a list of Donald Trump supporters, who are a conscious, articulate instrument of the Russian conspiracy . . ."

(12) Trump is shallow, has a microscopic attention span and has not studied political issues deeply.

On the other hand, he has a good heart, good judgment and wants the right outcome for America: limits on immigration, fair trade deals, the elimination of Wall Street tax breaks and no more pointless Middle East wars.

Hillary doesn't want any of these things. She is good at memorizing all her little facts, but is deeply evil. She wakes up early in the morning to make sure she does the wrong thing for America.

(13) Trump has personal baggage.

This election is not about Trump. It's never been about Trump. Anyone running on his platform of putting Americans first would be torn to shreds.

There are probably lots of bad things Trump's done in his personal life in the past. The ruling class wants Hillary to do bad things to our country in the future.



A video and an article by James Longstreet titled "Assange: 'Trump Will Not Be Allowed to Win'" were posted at americanthinker.com on Nov. 4, 2016. Following were excerpts of the article.

In a most recent and revealing interview, Julian Assange met with his favorite documentarian, John Pilger. Assange offers several predictions and analyses, most quite revealing.

The two most glaring points raised by Assange are as follows:

- Trump will "not be permitted to win."

In answer to the question, "Is Wikileaks trying to put Trump in the White House?" Assange insists that Trump will not be permitted to win. "Banks, intelligence, arms companies, big foreign money, etc. is all united behind Hillary Clinton . . . and the media as well . . . the owners and the journalists themselves."

■ The Clinton Foundation has received significant contributions from some of the same countries that are funding ISIS. Hillary Clinton was aware of the Saudi funding of ISIS and also accepted money for her foundation from the Saudis.

Assange notes the most significant email in the entire load of emails may well be the one in which Hillary (2014) contacts John Podesta. This email states that "the governments of Qatar and Saudi Arabia which are providing clandestine financial and logistic support to ISIL and other radical Sunni groups in the region . . ." (video, 2:08) . Assange notes that the backing is from "the governments of Saudi Arabia and Qatar."

Pilger observes, ". . . ISIL or ISIS is created largely with money from the very people who are giving money to the Clinton Foundation." Assange agreed.

Also noted is the previous declaration by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton that "Donors in Saudi Arabia constitute the most significant source of funding to Sunni terrorist groups worldwide." (video, 3:18) It is also noted that the US in 2015 sold \$20 billion worth of weaponry to the Saudis.

The slant of this interview is obvious, but that does not make it incorrect. The challenge is to determine, logically and with the information at hand: is there sense and feasibility to Assange's conclusions?

The unreleased pages of the 9/11 Report feed the suspicions that constantly surround the Saudis. The relationships that are welded with the exchange of money can supersede and "interfere" with diligent public service. It can make presidents bow.



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."