

# Eye on the World

## March 25, 2017

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 March 25, 2017.

**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 Danny Boyle, Sophie Jamieson, Barney Henderson and Chris Graham titled "London Attack: 'Sick and Depraved' Terrorist Kills Four Including Police Officer Before Being Shot Outside Parliament" was posted at telegraph.co.uk on March 23, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Five people have been killed in a "sick and depraved" terror attack that brought carnage to the heart of London, including the police officer who was stabbed and his assailant.

Mark Rowley, Scotland Yard's top anti-terror officer, confirmed that 40 people were injured after the attacker—armed with two large knives—mowed down pedestrians with his car on Westminster Bridge then rushed at the gates in front of the Houses of Parliament, stabbing a plain-clothes policeman before he was shot by armed officers on Wednesday afternoon.

The officer who died was later named as Keith Palmer, 48 a husband and father.

The three other fatalities are understood to be people who were hit by the car on Westminster Bridge.

Witnesses described scenes of terror when gunfire rang out as the attacker approached a second officer within yards of the Houses of Parliament.

The suspected attacker was pictured being treated by paramedics on a stretcher, as two knives used in the assault lay on the ground nearby.

Paramedics fought to save his life and that of his police victim on the floor of the cobbled courtyard in front of Parliament, with Foreign Office minister Tobias Ellwood among those who rushed to help.

The police officer was wheeled away on a stretcher with his face covered and it was later confirmed he had died.

MPs said that the terror attack could have been prevented if police on duty at a well-known security “weak spot” had simply kept it bolted.

The killer managed to get in through a vehicle gate in New Palace Yard—used by the Prime Minister and other members of the Government—because it was not locked.

Prime Minister Theresa May has described the attack as “sick and depraved.”

Speaking outside 10 Downing Street after chairing a meeting of the Government’s Cobra emergencies committee, Mrs May paid tribute to the “exceptional men and women” of the police force who responded to the attack.

Mrs May said that any attempt to defeat the values that Parliament stands for was “doomed to failure.”

And she vowed: “We will all move forward together, never giving in to terror and never allowing the voices of hate and evil to drive us apart.”



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled “US Pays 22.1% of NATO Budget; Germany 14.7%; 13 Allies Pay Less Than 1%” was posted at [cnsnews.com](http://cnsnews.com) on March 20, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

While President Trump’s weekend Twitter assertion that “Germany owes vast sums of money to NATO” is disputed by experts—and by Berlin—it draws attention to the fact that Germany, like the majority of the 28 members of the alliance, has yet to meet a NATO-agreed commitment to devote two per cent of GDP to defense spending.

At the same time, a closer look at NATO funding also underlines that—as is the case with the United Nations—the U.S. contributes more than one-fifth of the direct, collective funding that keeps NATO’s military and civilian operations on track.

Member countries contribute in line with an agreed cost-sharing formula, based on Gross National Income. (GNI equals GDP plus income obtained in dividends, interest etc. from other countries.)

- The U.S. contributes 22.144 percent of the NATO budget
- Germany contributes 14.65 percent.
- France contributes 10.63 percent.
- Britain contributes 9.84 percent.

■ Thirteen allies, mostly smaller former communist countries that joined the alliance after the fall of the Soviet Union and disintegration of Yugoslavia, pay less than one percent each—Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovakia and Slovenia.

An alternative way of assessing and comparing NATO members' defense spending is to examine defense spending per capita last year, which produces a rather different picture.

■ The United States is still significantly ahead, spending \$1,877 dollars for each citizen.

■ Norway comes in second (\$1,399 per head).

■ Britain (\$907).

■ France (\$753).

■ Denmark (\$684).

■ The Netherlands (\$602).

■ Germany (\$546)

■ Greece (\$532).

■ Hungary (\$151).

■ Romania (\$141).

■ Bulgaria (\$102).

■ Albania (\$50).



An article by Melanie Zanona titled "Feds Temporarily Ban Electronics on Certain Flights to US" was posted at thehill.com on March 20, 2017. Following is the article.

---

U.S. government officials reportedly have temporarily banned most electronics on certain flights into and out of the country.

Royal Jordanian posted on Twitter Monday that "following instructions from the concerned U.S. departments, we kindly inform our dearest passengers departing to and arriving from the United States that carrying any electronic or electrical device on board the flight cabins is strictly prohibited."

The tweet was later deleted, but a State Department source told CNN that affected countries and airlines are being informed of the ban.

The ban does not apply to cell phones or medical devices, but does include laptops, tablets, electronic games and cameras. Those items can be stowed in checked baggage, however.

Reuters reported the policy change would be officially announced on Tuesday. U.S. officials on Monday would not confirm or deny the temporary ban.

“We have no comment on potential security precautions, but will provide any update as appropriate,” said a spokesperson for the Department of Homeland Security.

But the ban appears to apply to 13 countries for the next 96 hours, according to Fox News, and could be in response to a new intelligence threat—not related to President Trump’s revised travel ban, which was frozen before it took effect last week.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled “We Have Now Hit Full-On Crazy” was posted at townhall.com on March 22, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Liberals are ecstatic that a judge in Hawaii is writing immigration policy for the entire country, and that policy is: We have no right to tell anyone that he can’t live in America. (Unless they’re Christians—those guys we can keep out.)

As subtly alluded to in the subtitle of “Adios, America: The Left’s Plan to Turn Our Country Into a Third-World Hellhole,” the goal of liberals is for the poor of the world to have a constitutional right to come here whenever they want.

I can’t help but notice that the Third Worlders aren’t moving to liberals’ neighborhoods.

After nearly 1 million Rwandans were murdered by other Rwandans in 1994, our government asked itself: Why not bring more of this fascinating Rwandan culture to America? Ten thousand of them poured in. So far, nearly 400 have been convicted in the United States of lying on visa applications about their role in the genocide.

And that’s why we have to tighten our belt, America! Massive international investigations don’t come cheap.

Almost every immigration case is a con, something we find out every time there’s a San Bernardino shooting and half the family turns out to have scammed our immigration officials. One hundred percent of the “humanitarian” cases are frauds.

Earlier this month, Rwanda’s Gervais Ngombwa was convicted for lying on his immigration application by claiming to have been a victim of the 1994 genocide. In fact, he was a well-known perpetrator—even featured in Rwandan newspaper articles as a leader of the genocide.

For most of the last two decades, Ngombwa has been living in Iowa with his wife and eight children in a house built by Habitat for Humanity—because no Americans need houses. He came to the authorities’ attention a couple years

ago by setting that house on fire after a domestic dispute, then filing a fraudulent \$75,000 insurance claim.

Another Rwandan genocidalist living in America was featured in "Adios, America": Beatrice Munyenyezi, granted refugee status as an alleged victim of the genocide, even though she, too, had helped orchestrate it.

Munyenyezi was living safely in Kenya when she applied for a refugee visa to America. The welfare is way better here. And, luckily for us, she had a "chronic medical condition" that required constant attention from a New Hampshire hospital.

Hesham Mohamed Hadayet arrived in the U.S. on a tourist visa, then immediately applied for "asylum" on the grounds that he was persecuted in Egypt—for being a member of an Islamic terrorist group.

Being a member of a noted terrorist group cannot be used to block you from coming to America, thanks to Barney Frank's 1989 amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act, because liberals love this country so very, very much. Being a talented neurosurgeon from Switzerland, however, is disqualifying.

Hadayet's refugee application wasn't denied until he'd already been living here for three years. When he was called in for a visa overstay hearing, he didn't show up, and the INS didn't bother looking for him. After allowing Hadayet to mill about America for another year, our government granted him permanent residency and a work permit.

On the Fourth of July following the 9/11 attack, Hadayet shot up the El Al ticket counter at the Los Angeles International Airport. I guess the Egyptians were right!

As bodies were being cleared away from the ticket counter, including Hadayet's, his wife blamed America for the attack, denying her husband had anything to do with it. "He is a victim of injustice," she explained. "In America, they hate Islam and Arabs after Sept. 11."

At least immigrants are grateful.

Immigration bureaucrats are so determined to transform America without anyone seeing what they're doing that the INS initially refused to release Hadayet's file to congressional investigators, in order to protect his "privacy."

Of course, anybody could miss Egypt's designating someone a terrorist. And maybe the INS's test for Rwandan "refugees" is: Would this person be able to convince Rolling Stone magazine that "Haven Monahan" raped her?

How about Rasmia Yousef Odeh? She waltzed into America after having been convicted and imprisoned in Israel for a supermarket bombing that left two Hebrew University students dead, and also for the attempted bombing of the British consulate in Israel.

She was released in a prisoner exchange—whereupon Odeh made a beeline for the U.S.

True, Odeh wasn't subjected to the Inquisition-like vetting accorded the humanitarian cases, like the Boston Marathon bombers (we were warned by Russia), Hadayet (we were warned by Egypt) or the Blind Sheik (same).

But how did our immigration authorities miss a *conviction for bombing in Israel*?

Apart from the terrorism, welfare and fraud, what great things did any of them do for our country?

Ngombwa was a custodian at the Cedar Rapids Community School District in Iowa, a job that, evidently, no American would do. Munyenyezi had a job as an advocate for refugees—just one of the many jobs being created by immigrants. Hadayet ran a failing limousine company and was \$10,000 in debt. Odeh was an unemployed waitress and a Palestinian grievance activist. Recently, she's been heavily involved in anti-Trump, anti-white male protests, because who doesn't like incessant Third World unrest?

In 1960, 75 percent of the foreign-born in America were from Europe. Today only about 10 percent are. More than a third of all post-Teddy Kennedy act immigrants—not just the wretched humanitarian cases—don't even have a high school diploma.

What is the affirmative case for this? How is it making America better? Improving the schools? The job market? Crime? The likelihood of terrorism?

Can the liberals doing cartwheels over a district judge's announcement that everyone in the world has a right to come here (except Europeans and Christians), give us the cost-benefit analysis they're using?

Twenty million Third World immigrants give us terrorists, welfare recipients, uncompensated medical costs, discrimination lawsuits, but it's all worth it because . . .



An editorial by Bernard Goldberg titled "The Pope, Panhandlers and Liberal Compassion" was posted at townhall.com on March 21, 2017. Following is the article.

---

A while back, when I was a correspondent at CBS News, a colleague and I had just finished shooting an interview and were walking down the street in midtown Manhattan when we stumbled onto a common sight in many of our big cities. A panhandler asked us for money.

I was prepared to just keep walking, but my friend, a Catholic who took his religion seriously, stopped to give the guy some money—a dollar or two as I recall.

You know there's a very good chance he's just going to spend it on booze or drugs, I told my friend. Yes, he told me, he knew, but he felt it was the right thing to do.

But you're not helping him, I said. And I added, politely, I think you gave him the money to feel better about yourself. He acknowledged that was part of it.

I thought about that encounter the other day when I heard what Pope Francis said about helping panhandlers.

Giving to the needy "is always right," he said, and he challenged those who make excuses for not giving money to people on the street.

Questioning my CBS News friend is one thing, but questioning the wisdom of the pope, especially when I'm not a member of his flock, is something else. But here goes anyway: Giving money to a wino is not always right. In fact, it may always be wrong.

My reaction wouldn't surprise Pope Francis. Because in his interview that was published in a Milan magazine, the pope acknowledged what I, and many of you, I suspect, are thinking: "I give money and then he spends it on drinking a glass of wine," the pope said. But if "a glass of wine is the only happiness he has in life, that's OK."

Really? How does that work? The guy on the street is an alcoholic, we give him money, he buys some garbage that will rot his insides, and "that's OK" because "a glass of wine is his only happiness in life"?

"Instead," the pope continued, "ask yourself what do you do on the sly? What 'happiness' do you seek in secret?" And we should realize that we "are luckier, with a house, a wife, children."

Well, one of the reasons we are "luckier" than the alcoholic or drug addict begging for money is precisely because we're not alcoholics or drug addicts. I realize that it's not the thing to say in polite company but we made one set of choices and the addict made another.

That doesn't mean the panhandler doesn't deserve help or compassion. But is it really compassionate to help some poor soul continue down a path that leads to still more destruction?

Let's get the obvious out of the way: The pope is a good man. His heart is in the right place. He cares about the less fortunate among us. And so should we all.

But isn't this the same old paternalism liberals are famous for? Isn't this the same kind of thinking that created and perpetuated the welfare state here in America—the same kind of compassion that in too many cases left generation after generation no better off than when the supposed compassion started?

Liberals may genuinely think they're helping, but they're not the ones paying the price for their compassion.

And it's no surprise that the pope got a big thumbs up from the bible of liberal American journalism, the editorial page of *The New York Times*.

"New Yorkers, if not city dwellers everywhere, might acknowledge a debt to Pope Francis this week. He has offered a concrete, permanently useful prescription for dealing with panhandlers.

"It's this: Give them the money, and don't worry about it."

How liberal of *The New York Times* to instruct us not to “worry about it.” Why should we? Even if our generosity doesn’t make the wino feel better—we’ll feel better about ourselves. And that’s really important, too, isn’t it?

The *Times* editorial also tells us that, “You don’t know what that guy will do with your dollar. Maybe you’d disapprove of what he does. Maybe compassion is the right call.”

Or maybe buying the poor guy a tuna fish sandwich and handing that to him instead of a dollar bill is the right call. Maybe buying a bunch of cheap blankets then handing them out to people on the street in the dead of winter would be the right call, and more compassionate than simply tossing him a few coins or a few dollars and continuing on our way.

In Proverbs 14:21 we’re told that, “blessed is the one who is kind to the needy.”

Yes, but it’s not kind to contribute to the ruin of a human being already tottering on the edge—even if our compassion makes us feel better about ourselves.



An editorial by Dennis Prager titled “The Most Dangerous Addiction of Them All: Entitlements” was posted at townhall.com on March 21, 2017. Following is the article.

---

All addictions—whether to drugs, alcohol, gambling, sex or cigarettes—are very hard to escape.

There is one addiction, however, that may be more difficult than any other to escape, in part because it is not even regarded as an addiction. It is entitlements addiction, the addiction to getting something for nothing.

One indication as to the power of entitlements addiction is the fact that while great numbers of people have voluntarily given up drugs, alcohol, gambling, etc.—almost always at great pain—few give up an addiction to entitlements.

For the majority of able-bodied people who get cash payments, food stamps, subsidized housing, free or subsidized health insurance, and other welfare benefits, the thought of giving up any one of those and beginning to pay for them with their own earned money is as hard as giving up alcohol is for an alcoholic.

Politicians know this, which is why it is close to impossible to ever reduce entitlements. And, of course, the left knows this, which is why the left almost always wins a debate over entitlements. Every American who is the beneficiary of an entitlement backs them, and many who are not beneficiaries of entitlements would like to be.

Aside from ideology, this is why the left constantly seeks to increase entitlements. The more people receiving government benefits, the more people vote left.

In this sense, the left in every country—in America, the Democratic Party—should literally be regarded as a drug dealer. Virtually every American given



a free benefit becomes an addict who relies more and more on his dealer, which is exactly what the left seeks.

As noted at the outset, one reason entitlements addiction is so powerful is unlike other addictions, it is not regarded as an addiction. As a result, few entitlement addicts see themselves as addicted. Why, then, would any of them seek treatment? To the entitlement addict, receiving entitlements is as natural and uncontroversial as breathing air. Air is free, and so are entitlements.

Another reason entitlements addiction is unique among addictions is that very few drug, alcohol or gambling addicts believe that they are owed drugs, alcohol or their gambling debts. Entitlement addicts, on the other hand, believe that society owes them every entitlement they receive—and often more.

The very word “entitlement” conveys the message that the recipient has a right to the benefits. So there is a moral component for entitlement addicts that does not exist among other addicts (except for opioid dependents, who are in pain; these patients really are owed painkillers, and society is immoral for not allowing them to receive them).

Not only do entitlement addicts believe there is moral virtue to their addiction but so do a vast number of non-addicts known as progressives. They believe that there is a moral imperative to give people more and more entitlements. This, in turn, feeds the moral self-image of those dependent on entitlements.

Yet another reason for the uniqueness of entitlements addiction is it ultimately does more damage to society than any other addiction. Other addicts can ruin their own lives and those of loved ones, and drunk drivers kill and maim people. But society as a whole can survive their addictions. That is not the case with entitlement addicts.

The more people who receive and come to depend on entitlements, the sooner society will collapse economically. Society does not directly pay for drug addicts’ drugs, alcoholics’ alcohol or gamblers’ gambling debts, but it pays every penny for entitlement addicts’ addiction. In fact, the current U.S. national debt is about equal to the reported \$22 trillion this country has spent on entitlement programs in the last 50 years.

When you combine the addiction and selfishness of many (certainly not all) of those who are dependent on entitlements (including middle- and upper-class Americans who receive a home mortgage deduction); the tendency for the addiction to grow from one generation to the next; the dependence of one of the two major political parties on the votes of those who receive entitlements for the party’s very existence; and the belief of tens of millions of non-addicted progressives that society is morally obligated to give more and more people more and more entitlements, it becomes very difficult to see a solution.

In the meantime, the entitlement state in every country is failing, forcing them to bring in tens of millions of migrants—many of whom share none of the countries’ values—to keep the entitlement state alive.

This addiction ultimately ruins the character of many of its recipients, the economy of all the countries in which it exists in large numbers and the value

system that created the prosperity that made so many entitlements possible in the first place.

But other than American conservatives, almost no one even recognizes it as a major problem, let alone an addiction.



An article by Robert Laurie titled "Pelosi on Healthcare: We 'Have a Right to Know the Full Impact of This Legislation Before Any Vote' " was posted at herman Cain.com on March 13, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Most of us felt it was impossible. After decades of listening to Nancy Pelosi spew mindless, inane, gobbledygook, we assumed there was no longer any way for her to one-up herself. Considering the level of asinine rhetoric we've come to expect from the former Speaker, we thought the worst was behind us. We believed we'd seen it all. We were wrong.

On Friday night [March 10], we achieved maximum Pelosi.

The following letter, sent from Pelosi to Paul Ryan, is so deeply out of touch with reality—so utterly free of anything even remotely resembling self-awareness—that it's set a new bar for political hubris, stupidity, and craven pandering.

"Dear Speaker Ryan,

"This week, the Committees on Energy & Commerce and Ways & Means will be marking up Republicans' long-feared bill to dismantle affordable health care. The GOP legislation will have life or death consequences for tens of millions of families across America, and extraordinary impacts on state and federal budgets long into the future.

"The American people and Members have a right to know the full impact of this legislation before any vote in Committee or by the whole House.

"Members must not be asked to vote on this legislation before the CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation have answered the following questions about your legislation in 2018 and 2019, over the 10-year budget window, and in the decade after: How will this bill measure up to the Affordable Care Act and current Medicaid law on coverage, quality, and cost? And how will it impact Medicare solvency?"

Nancy Pelosi has been in Congress since 1987. That's thirty years. Given the length of her tenure, you might assume it would be easy to outline her many, many, achievements and produce examples of her stirring oratory. Again, your assumption would be incorrect.

Most people would have to admit that, in the three decades of service, this was her most memorable moment:

Try to imagine the level of mendacity it takes for this woman to even dare entertain the notion of saying "The American people and Members have a right to know the full impact of this legislation before any vote in Committee or by the whole House."

Pelosi's public life, lack of incarceration, passage of ObamaCare, and her continued (if increasingly fragile) grasp on power are all built upon a foundation of obfuscation, hidden agenda, and buried truth. The idea that *Nancy Pelosi*—the woman who spearheaded a "signature law" that passed thanks to the "ignorance of the American voter"—would preach to us about transparency?

*That* is maximum Pelosi.



An article by Susan Jones titled "Cruz: 'Premiums, Premiums, Premiums'—'That's the Central Problem'" was posted at [cnsnews.com](http://cnsnews.com) on March 20, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

When it comes to health insurance, "The number one issue is premiums—premiums, premiums, premiums," Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) told CBS's "Face the Nation" on Sunday.

"When I am back home in Texas, what I hear from Texans every single day is, I can't afford health insurance—that Obamacare, the average family's premiums, they have risen over \$5,000 under Obamacare. That's the central problem.

"Now, the current House bill, as drafted, I do not believe it will pass the Senate. It doesn't fix the problem. My biggest concern with the House bill is, it doesn't lower premiums. And CBO, in fact, projected that, in the first two years, premiums would rise 10 to 20 percent.

"But I got to tell you, if Republicans hold a big press conference and pat ourselves on the back that we have repealed Obamacare, and everyone's premiums keep going up, people will be ready to tar and feather us in the streets, and quite rightfully."

Cruz said the cost of premiums is related to how many people are covered. And he said the only way to drive down premiums is to repeal all of the Obamacare mandates; allow insurance purchases across state lines; allow associations to form their own health insurance pools; and allow people to pay their premiums from health savings accounts, all at once.

"All of those will make it much more affordable for people to get health insurance," Cruz said.

The Republican repeal-and-replace plan, as crafted by House Republicans, envisions all of those things, but not in one bill. After the repeal of some Obamacare mandates and Obamacare taxes with the current bill, step two is reversing Obamacare regulations; and step three is legislating new health-care provisions, such as inter-state insurance sales.

"That ain't going to happen," Cruz said about step three—the Republican plan to legislate additional key elements of their health insurance plan. He noted that in the Republicans' "three-bucket solution," "all the good stuff is in bucket three."

But passing legislation (bucket three) requires eight Democrat votes, Cruz noted: "Right now, Senate Democrats are opposing everything. You can't get eight Senate Democrats to agree on saying good morning," he said.

"Anything in bucket three—I have called bucket three the sucker's bucket. And what I have been urging the president and the administration and leader in both houses, take everything in bucket three, put it in bucket one. We have got to actually fix this problem."

Cruz rejected the Republican argument that they can't put certain provisions in bucket one (the initial legislation) because it isn't budgetary in nature.

"You look at the insurance mandates—they impact billions of dollars of federal spending. And I will point out the Obama Justice Department went before the U.S. Supreme Court twice, and argued the mandates are integrally related, they're intertwined with the subsidies, you cannot sever them.

"Under the statute, we can do this now in bucket one. And if we don't, this bill doesn't pass. And if it doesn't pass, it is a substantive and political disaster for everyone involved."



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Liberty is Not for Wimps" was posted at [jewishworldreview.com](http://jewishworldreview.com) on March 15, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Most Americans, whether liberal or conservative, Democratic or Republican, do not show much understanding or respect for the principles of personal liberty. We criticize our political leaders, but we must recognize that their behavior simply reflects the values of people who elected them to office.

That means we are all to blame for greater governmental control over our lives and a decline in personal liberty. Let me outline some fundamental principles of liberty.

My initial premise is that each of us owns himself. I am my private property, and you are yours. If we accept the notion of self-ownership, then certain acts can be deemed moral or immoral. Murder, rape and theft are immoral because those acts violate private property.

Most Americans accept that murder and rape are immoral, but we are ambivalent about theft. Theft can be defined as taking the rightful property of one American and giving it to another, to whom it does not belong. It is also theft to forcibly use one person to serve the purposes of another.

At least two-thirds of federal spending can be described as Congress' taking the rightful property of one American and giving it to another American, to whom it does not belong. So-called mandatory spending totaled \$2.45 trillion in 2015. Thus, two-thirds of the federal budget goes toward Medicaid, Medicare, Social

Security, food assistance, unemployment and other programs and benefits that fall into the category of taking from some and giving to others.

To condemn legalized theft is not an argument against taxes to finance the constitutionally mandated functions of the federal government; we are all obligated to pay our share of those.

Many say that government spending guarantees one right or another. That's nonsense. True rights exist simultaneously among people. That means the exercise of a right by one person does not impose an obligation on another. In other words, my rights to speech and travel impose no obligations on another except those of noninterference.

For Congress to guarantee a right to health care, food assistance or any other good or service whether a person can afford it or not does diminish someone else's rights—namely, their right to their earnings. Congress has no resources of its very own. If Congress gives one person something that he did not earn, it necessarily requires that Congress deprive somebody else of something that he did earn.

Another area in which there is contempt for liberty, most notably on many college campuses, is free speech. The true test of one's commitment to free speech does not come when he permits others to say things with which he agrees.

Instead, the true test comes when one permits others to say things with which he disagrees. Colleges lead the nation in attacks on free speech. Some surveys report that over 50 percent of college students want restrictions on speech they find offensive. Many colleges have complied with their wishes through campus speech codes.

A very difficult liberty pill for many Americans to swallow is freedom of association. As with free speech, the true test for one's commitment to freedom of association does not come when one permits people to voluntarily associate in ways that he deems acceptable.

The true test is when he permits people to associate in ways he deems offensive. If a golf club, fraternity or restaurant were not to admit me because I'm a black person, I would find it offensive, but it's every organization's right to associate freely.

On the other hand, a public library, public utility or public university does not have a right to refuse me service, because I am a taxpayer.

The bottom line is that it takes a bold person to be for personal liberty, because you have to be able to cope with people saying things and engaging in voluntary acts that you deem offensive. Liberty is not for wimps.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Transgender Challenges" was posted at [jewishworldreview.com](http://jewishworldreview.com) on March 22, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Determining one's own sex or that of another used to be a simple matter. First, there was the matter of appearance, whether a person looked like a male or looked like a female. If appearance produced some uncertainties, one could determine sex by examining a person's birth certificate.

If appearance and a birth certificate produced uncertainties, the ultimate, absolute proof of sex was a person's chromosomes; XX marked a female, and XY marked a male. Case closed.

But those old-fashioned simple methods of identifying sex have changed. In fact, relying on those old tried-and-true methods of sex identification qualifies one for opprobrium, with the charge of being homophobic. Today—independent of appearance, genitalia, birth certificate and chromosomes—one is a male or female based on how one labels oneself.

This new liberty applies to not only sex but also race.

Rachel Dolezal, born Caucasian, chose to be a black person. By becoming a black person, she became the president of the Spokane, Washington, office of the NAACP and an instructor of Africana studies at Eastern Washington University. As far as she is concerned, she's still a black person now, and she has a new legal name, Nkechi Amare Diallo, which means "gift of GOD" in Ibo.

A notable beneficiary of racial fakery is Sen. Elizabeth Warren, who claimed that she was of Cherokee Indian ancestry. That helped her land a \$430,000 job for a year at diversity-hungry Harvard University as a professor of law. If Diallo and Warren were not leftist, learned college professors and students would condemn their behavior as racial appropriation.

But let's explore further the idea of freeing oneself from the oppression of biological determinism. There is no better testing ground than America's colleges, which are at the forefront of transgenderism, for seeing how this might work.

How tolerant would college administrators be of conservative male students, if they said that they feel womanish, going into the ladies' bathroom and showering facilities? Would these men, claiming to be women, be eligible for tryouts for the women's basketball or field hockey team?

Suppose a college honored the right of its students to free themselves from biological determinism and allowed those with XY chromosomes to play on teams formerly designated as XX teams. I would anticipate a problem competing with other colleges. An unenlightened women's basketball team might refuse to play against a mixed-chromosome team whose starting five consists of 6-foot-6-inch, 200-pound XYers.

The NCAA should have a rule stating that refusal to play a mixed-chromosome team leads to forfeiture of the game. It's no different from a team of white players refusing to play another because it has black players.

It's not just college sports that would yield benefits for those escaping biological determinism. What about allowing XYers who claim they are women to compete in the Women's International Boxing Association? Then there are

the Olympics. The men's fastest 100-meter speed is 9.58 seconds. The women's record is 10.49 seconds. What about giving XY people a greater chance at winning the gold by permitting them to compete in the women's event? They could qualify by just swearing that they feel womanish or suffer from gender dysphoria.

You say, "There you go, Williams, picking on colleges again!" I applaud the fact that some colleges are taking a leadership role in fighting biological determinism. Barnard College President Debora Spar wrote: "There was no question that Barnard must reaffirm its mission as a college for women.

And there was little debate that trans women should be eligible for admission to Barnard." With that announcement, Barnard College joined a growing list of women's colleges—along with Smith College, Mount Holyoke College, Mills College and Simmons College—that have updated their admissions policies to take transgender women's applications into consideration. The question that remains is just how much equality these enlightened colleges will permit between XXers and XYers.

Will they sexually integrate all of their facilities? Or will they endeavor to develop the morally repugnant policy of "separate but equal"?



A video and an article titled "Krauthammer: 'The Story Line Now is That the President was Wrong' " were posted at foxnews.com on March 20, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Charles Krauthammer told viewers Monday on "Special Report with Bret Baier" that when it comes to President Trump's allegations via Twitter about wiretapping by President Obama, "the storyline now is that the President was wrong."

His comments come after FBI Director James Comey and NSA Chief Michael Rogers testified before the House Intelligence Committee regarding Russian interference in the 2016 election. Comey said he has "no information to support" Trump's wiretapping allegations.

"His own FBI director is saying it and speaking on behalf of all the Department of Justice which is Trump's own department of Justice which makes Spicer look ridiculous," Krauthammer said. "Because it's his own department saying the president is wrong. But that's the price of doing this kind of tweeting."



An article by John Crudele titled "\$20 Trillion Debt Deserves As Much Attention As Dow Hitting 20,000" was posted at nypost.com on March 20, 2017. Following is the article.

---

The media and Wall Street got all excited when the Dow Jones industrial average hit 20,000 earlier this year—and justifiably so.

But why not give the same sort of attention to the US federal debt, which will slip past \$20 trillion later this year or in early 2018.

The symmetry of these two numbers is just too precious to ignore.

As of Monday afternoon, the US debt, according to [usdebtclock.org](http://usdebtclock.org), stood at \$19.849 trillion—and was rising at the rate of \$13,404,542 an hour.

That's \$321,709,008 million a day.

At this pace, the first digit on the tote board will flip in 469 days—on July 2, 2018.

But don't trust me when it comes to predicting the exact circumstances of a future event—my bracket had Duke winning the NCAA tournament.

Of course, a lot of things can happen between now and July 2, 2018. Some of those things, like spending a lot of money on infrastructure or on the Mexican border wall, will speed up the clock while other "things," like more revenue pouring into the Treasury from added jobs and a faster-growing economy, will slow the debt clock down.

And by "things," I mean practically anything that could ever happen.

To make matters a bit more cloudy, the Treasury Department, which maintains the official debt stats, has a different number from the debt clock.

One of them is promoting fake news.

Hey, our country is in serious financial trouble. But that doesn't mean we can't have some fun with it. Pick a date and let's see who gets closest.



***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."