

# Eye on the World

## Sept. 16, 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 September 16, 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 Patrick Goodenough titled "Iran to IAEA: No, You May Not Visit Our Military Sites" was posted at cnsnews.com on Sept. 13, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Iran on Tuesday rejected the notion that the U.N. nuclear watchdog has the right to request access to its military sites, calling into question again the Obama administration's contention that it had negotiated with Tehran the "most robust and intrusive" regime of inspections ever.

Weeks after U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Nikki Haley raised the issue during meetings with International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) officials in Vienna, IAEA director-general Yukiya Amano said Monday that in carrying out its duties under what's known as the Additional Protocol, "we do not distinguish [between] civilian locations—sites—and military."

Speaking to reporters in Vienna, Amano stressed that that principle "applies to all countries, including Iran."

But on Tuesday, supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei's senior foreign affairs adviser, Ali Akbar Velayati, directly disputed that.

"We have never agreed with anybody to let inspectors visit our military sites," Iranian state media quoted him as saying.

"Mr. Amano, his agents and no other foreigners have the right to inspect our military sites, because these sites are among off-limit sites for any foreigner and those affiliated with them," he said.

Velayati, a former foreign minister, added that no agreement endorsed by Iran had included permission for inspectors to visit Iranian military sites, adding that Iran would never have signed any agreement including that condition.

When it reached the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) nuclear deal with the U.S. and five other countries in 2015, Iran also undertook to implement the "Additional Protocol" of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which allows IAEA inspectors access to facilities that raise concerns.

In selling the JCPOA to the American people and Congress, the Obama White House frequently pointed to the Additional Protocol arrangement as a further defense against Iranian cheating on its obligations.

Shortly before the JCPOA was finalized, President Obama in April 2015 said Iran had "agreed to the most robust and intrusive inspections and transparency regime ever negotiated for any nuclear program in history."

The Trump administration is now reviewing U.S. policy towards Iran, including the national security implications of the lifting of sanctions under the JCPOA.



A Reuters article by Jack Kim and Kaori Kaneko titled "North Korea Fires Missile Over Japan That Lands Far Out in the Pacific" was posted at reuters.com on Sept. 14, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

North Korea fired a missile that flew over Japan's northern Hokkaido far out into the Pacific Ocean on Friday, South Korean and Japanese officials said, further ratcheting up tensions after Pyongyang's recent test of its most powerful nuclear bomb.

The missile flew over Japan and landed in the Pacific about 2,000 km (1,240 miles) east of Hokkaido, Japanese Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshihide Suga told reporters.

Warning announcements about the missile blared around 7 a.m. (2200 GMT Thursday) in the town of Kamaishi in northern Japan, footage from national broadcaster NHK showed.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis said the launch "put millions of Japanese into duck and cover," although residents in northern Japan appeared calm and went about their business as normal.

The missile reached an altitude of about 770 km (480 miles) and flew for about 19 minutes over a distance of about 3,700 km (2,300 miles), according to South Korea's military—far enough to reach the U.S. Pacific territory of Guam.

The U.S. military said soon after the launch it had detected a single intermediate range ballistic missile but the missile did not pose a threat to North America or the U.S. Pacific territory of Guam, toward which Pyongyang had previously threatened to launch a missile.



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Egypt and Peru Heed U.S. Calls to Isolate North Korea" was posted at [cnsnews.com](http://cnsnews.com) on Sept. 13, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Egypt says it has severed all military ties with North Korea, the latest international response to the regime's nuclear test and missile launches.

And Peru's foreign ministry announced Monday it was giving North Korean ambassador Kim Hak-chol five days to leave the country, after declaring him *persona non grata*.

Egypt's defense minister assured his South Korean counterpart about the severing of military ties during a visit to Seoul Monday, the South Korean state news agency Yonhap reported, citing the defense ministry.

It said Egypt's Sedki Sobhi was responding to a request by South Korean defense minister Song Young-moo "to join efforts to toughen sanctions on the North for its recent ballistic missile and nuclear tests."

The move comes three weeks after the Trump administration cut more than \$95 million in aid to Egypt and delayed transmission of another \$195 million in response both to human rights abuses and Cairo's military relationship with North Korea.

Although the State Department at the time focused more on the human rights concerns, spokeswoman Heather Nauert did say at an August 24 briefing that the U.S. was having "conversations with Egypt and many other countries around the world about the need to isolate" North Korea.

Last July, President Trump in a phone conversation with Egyptian President Abdel Fattah el-Sisi discussed North Korea. A White House readout said Trump had "stressed the need for all countries to fully implement U.N. Security Council resolutions on North Korea, stop hosting North Korean guest workers, and stop providing economic or military benefits to North Korea."

Meanwhile, the Peruvian foreign ministry, in expelling the North Korean ambassador, cited North Korea's "repeated and flagrant violation of the United Nations

Security Council resolutions” and said it has ignored repeated calls by the international community to “irreversibly and verifiably terminate its nuclear program.”

The step by Peru came four days after Mexico expelled North Korean ambassador Kim Hyong-gil.

The U.S. has been urging countries to cut diplomatic, military and economic ties with Pyongyang, a plea directed specifically at Latin American nations during a visit to the region last month by Vice President Mike Pence.

President Trump suggested after this month’s nuclear test that the U.S. was considering stopping all trade with any country that does business with North Korea.

■ According to data compiled by the Observatory of Economic Complexity at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, China is by far North Korea’s biggest trading partner, accounting for 85 percent of North Korea’s imports, and the destination for 83 percent of North Korea’s exports.

■ The next biggest importers of North Korean goods are India (3.5 percent), Pakistan (1.5 percent) and Burkina Faso (1.2 percent).

■ The next biggest suppliers of goods to North Korea are India (3.1 percent), Thailand (2.1 percent) and the Philippines (1.5 percent).



An article by Niclas Rolander titled “Denmark Suspends Refugee Resettlement Under UN Program” was posted at bloomberg.com on Sept. 9, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Denmark won’t allow any refugees into the country this year under a United Nations program and will seek flexibility in determining how many may resettle in the future instead of a set quota, the Ministry of Immigration and Integration said.

Since 1989, Denmark has pledged to take 500 refugees a year selected by the UN for resettlement. The program is separate from European Union efforts to distribute migrants among member states, which has encountered fierce opposition from countries including Hungary.

“It’s hard to predict how many refugees and migrants will show up at the border to seek asylum, and we know it may be hard to integrate those who arrive here,” Danish Minister of Immigration and Integration Inger Stojberg said in a statement on the UN program on Saturday.

“Hence, I would like to see a more flexible quota regime, so that we are prepared, but not obliged, to take a certain number of refugees for resettlement every year.”



A Reuters article by Arshad Mohammed and Yeganeh Torbari titled "U.S. Will Not Issue Some Visas in Four Nations in Deportation Crackdown" was posted at reuters.com on Sept. 13, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

The U.S. State Department on Wednesday will stop issuing certain kinds of visas to some citizens of Cambodia, Eritrea, Guinea and Sierra Leone because the nations are not taking back their citizens the United States wants to deport.

The new policies, laid out in State Department cables reviewed by Reuters on Tuesday and described in a department news briefing, are the latest example of U.S. President Donald Trump's effort to crack down on immigrants who are in the United States illegally.

The cables, sent by Secretary of State Rex Tillerson to consular officials around the world, said the four countries were "denying or unreasonably delaying" the return of their citizens, and that visa restrictions would be lifted in a country if it accepted its deportees.

"The Secretary determines the categories of applicants subject to the visa restrictions, and the categories differ slightly country by country," State Department spokeswoman Heather Nauert said in the news briefing on Tuesday.

- The visa sanctions vary in severity, with Eritrea facing the harshest ones. Any Eritreans who apply in their own country for most U.S. business or tourist visas will be rejected, according to one of the cables.
- In Guinea, the United States will no longer issue a range of tourist, business and student visas to government officials and their immediate family members who apply from inside the country, another cable said.
- In Cambodia, the sanction is tailored. Only Foreign Ministry employees at or above the rank of director general, and their families, who apply inside the country will be barred from getting some visas for personal travel, a third cable said.
- For Sierra Leone, only Foreign Ministry and immigration officials will be denied tourist and business visas at the U.S. Embassy in Freetown, according to a fourth cable.



An article by Andrew Arthur and Jessica Vaghan titled "Crucial Legislation Would Move to Control Alien Gang Violence" was posted at cnsnews.com on Sept. 13, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Transnational gangs are a unique and growing public safety threat in America, not only due to their members' propensity for violence and their focus on recruiting schoolchildren, but also because of their relationship with gang leaders based outside of the United States.

State and national gang threat assessments have documented an increase in transnational gang activity in recent years, particularly of those gangs associated with aliens from Central America, including MS-13 and 18th Street.

This increase has been fueled by the years-long surge in illegal arrivals of unaccompanied minors. Some gangs boosted their ranks by bringing in recruits from abroad who could take advantage of lenient policies at the border. In addition, established gang cliques in areas where many unaccompanied minors were settled targeted the new arrivals for recruitment, sometimes recruiting children as young as 10 years old.

The Center has identified 126 U.S. communities in 24 states (72 percent in suburban locations) that in the last two years have experienced a violent crime wave attributed to MS-13 and 18th Street. These two gangs are the most notorious Central American gangs, and have a large share of members who are illegal aliens. The hot spots include the Washington, D.C., suburbs, Long Island, N.Y., greater Boston, and Houston.

Among the crimes attributed to MS-13 were dozens of homicides, numerous attempted murders, arson, extortion, drug trafficking, firearms violations, rape, robbery, and witness tampering. Seventy percent of MS-13's homicide victims we tracked were under the age of 21.

Hundreds of gang members were able to obtain work permits and avoid deportation under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program due to lax screening and eligibility criteria that explicitly excused certain criminal convictions.

The most notorious example was Emmanuel Jesus Rangel-Hernandez, who murdered three people in Charlotte, N.C., in February 2015. Rangel-Hernandez was approved for DACA in 2013 even though he was in removal proceedings stemming from a prior arrest on drug possession charges, and even though his gang ties were noted in his record. In response to congressional scrutiny brought on by the Rangel-Hernandez case, USCIS did a special case review and found 282 additional cases of gang members and other criminals who had been approved for DACA.

USCIS terminated DACA benefits for many of these individuals, but according to the agency statements, apparently more than half were able to stay in the country even after losing their DACA status.

An MS-13 gang leader in Frederick, Md., received DACA benefits and was hired as a custodian at a local middle school. He is now incarcerated for various gang-related crimes. According to law enforcement sources, he was told

by gang leaders in El Salvador to take advantage of the lenient policies at the U.S. border to bring in new recruits, knowing that they would be allowed to resettle in the area with few questions asked. Several of these unaccompanied minors now have been arrested and incarcerated for various crimes, including a vicious random attack on a sheriff's deputy in 2015.

Alien gang members in the United States illegally are especially vulnerable to law enforcement.

Immigration authorities have been very effective in addressing this phenomenon in the past, taking tens of thousands of gang members off the streets and out of American communities over the past 10 years.

But today, the transnational gangs are not only more violent than we have seen in the past, they are more sophisticated and more organized. For this reason, federal immigration agencies need updated tools in order to be successful in suppressing this phenomenon.

Fortunately, on September 7, 2017, Rep. Barbara Comstock (R-Va.) introduced H.R. 3697, the "Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act," with the support of powerful House Judiciary Chairman Bob Goodlatte.

If passed, this crucial piece of legislation will provide the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) with additional weapons to address the growing issue of alien gang violence.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled "No Amnesty is a Good Amnesty" was posted at townhall.com on Sept. 13, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Donald Trump is being told that amnesty for "Dreamers," or DACA recipients, will only apply to a small, narrowly defined group of totally innocent, eminently deserving illegal immigrants, who were brought to this country "through no fault of their own" as "children." (Children who are up to 36 years old.)

Every syllable of that claim is a lie, and I can prove it.

To see how DACA will actually work, let's look at another extremely limited amnesty that was passed in 1986.

Farmers wanted temporary guest-worker permits for their cheap labor, so that they could continue pretending that the Industrial Revolution never happened and refuse to mechanize. (And, boy, did that work! We haven't heard a peep about "crops rotting in the fields" since then.)

The agricultural amnesty was supposed to apply to—at most—350,000 illegal aliens. It would be available only to illegals who were currently in the coun-

try doing the back-breaking farm work that no American would do. Without them, crops would wither on the vine. They were saving us from starvation!

Talk about deserving. Are any Dreamers saving us from starvation?

But instead of guest-worker permits, then-Rep. Charles Schumer—from the lush farmland of Brooklyn—decided to grant full amnesty to any illegals who had done farm work for at least 90 days in the previous year.

That's pretty restrictive, isn't it?

In the end, "up to 350,000 farm workers" turned into 1.3 million.

Oh well, what are you going to do? No use worrying—let's just move forward and get all these people voter registration cards!

This innocent little amnesty for a small, clearly defined group of illegals quickly became amnesty for anyone who applied. The same thing will happen with any other amnesty, no matter how strictly the law is written. (And it won't be written strictly.)

In the first few years of the agricultural amnesty, internal Immigration and Naturalization Service statistics showed that 888,637 legalization applications were fraudulent. According to immigration agents, "farm workers" stated in their interviews that cotton was purple or that they had pulled cherries from the ground.

Of the 888,637 fraudulent applications, guess how many our government approved. Answer: More than 800,000.

The agricultural amnesty was so carefully administered that not one, but TWO of the 1993 World Trade Center bombers were in this country because of it. (More on that in another column.)

The main problem with the farm worker amnesty, the DACA amnesty or any amnesty is that everyone involved in the entire immigration apparatus is feverishly working, on the taxpayer's dime, to transform this country into a Third World hellhole. Lawyers for La Raza and lawyers for the government both believe it is their mission to humiliate and destroy white Christian America. (Actually, this country is "biracial Christian America," plus a few Amerindians and anyone else who assimilated to Western European culture.)

There are multitudes of them, and they will never, ever stop.

Congress could pass a law granting amnesty to any 7-foot-tall, left-handed, red-headed illegal aliens from Lichtenstein—and hundreds of left-wing outfits would instantly set to work, demanding amnesty for witch doctors, cannibals, pederasts, terrorists and the rest of the multicultural universe that makes America so vibrant.

On the other side of the application process would be government immigration bureaucrats who either used to work at La Raza, or hope to in the future.

On the off chance that some particularly risible amnesty application is denied by a stodgy rules-follower in our immigration bureaucracy, that denial will be litigated before a federal judge in Hawaii, then appealed to the Ninth Circuit.

For two decades after the 1986 amnesty, the federal courts were tied up with dozens of class-action lawsuits brought on behalf of illegal aliens—regular illegal aliens, farm worker illegal aliens and still-in-Mexico illegal aliens—challenging every aspect of the law.

Is that how American tax dollars should be spent? On endless litigation, brought by America-hating activists on behalf of people who have no right to be in our country and decided by Democrat-appointed judges? (Who are also America-hating activists.)

And when their work is done, there will be a lot more Democrat-appointed judges because there will be a lot more Democrats.

Lawyers sued over everything—the absence of Creole interpreters, the requirement that illegals have proof of prior farm work and the rare denials of amnesty. Congress desperately tried passing laws that would prevent courts from hearing these cases—all to no avail. Left-wing lawyers just had to pick the right judge, and they won.

In 2005—nearly 20 years after the 1986 amnesty—the Ninth Circuit was still granting amnesty to hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens who claimed they had been unfairly denied because they were not in the country for the first amnesty. Seriously.

No matter how the law is written, as long as anyone is eligible for amnesty, everybody's getting amnesty.

President Trump is the last president who will ever have a chance to make the right decision on immigration. After this, it's over. The boat will have sailed.

If he succeeds, all the p@ssy-grabbing and Russia nonsense will burn off like a morning fog. He will be the president who saved the American nation, its character, its sovereignty, its core identity. But if he fails, Donald Trump will go down in history as the man who killed America.



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled "Never Forget: Muslim Hate Crime Hoaxes" was posted at michellemalkin.com on Sept. 13, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Another year. Another Sept. 11 anniversary. Another opportunity for grievance-mongering Muslim agitators to decry the imagined "epidemic" of "Islamophobia."

South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT) convened with Mad Maxine Waters and other House Democrats in Washington, D.C., to mark a somber occasion this week. No, not the coordinated jihadi mass murder of nearly 3,000 innocent people of all races, nationalities and religions on 9/11.

Instead, they lamented Sept. 12—"the 16-year anniversary of the day that South Asian, Muslim, Sikh, Hindu, Arab, and Middle Eastern Americans woke up to a new political reality in which the safety of our lives and the security of our homes were irrevocably compromised."

For left-wing zealots, the bloody lash of worldwide Islamic terrorism pales in comparison to the so-called "backlash" against Muslims. SAALT disseminated prefab tweets and declarations naming President Trump, outspoken anti-sharia activist Brigitte Gabriel and her grass-roots group, ACT for America, as well as "law enforcement, immigration enforcement, vigilantes," and "white supremacists" as their enemies.

They're all the same to the tolerance mob.

And "backlash" is a catchall trash can for everything from sideward glances to off-color jokes to offensive cartoons to unresolved crimes to actual acts of intimidation or physical violence. Mixed in with two shootings and a stabbing over the past year classified as hate crimes, SAALT noted that in August, "a Minnesota mosque was firebombed in what the governor rightly declared an 'act of terrorism.'"

One of those things is not like the other. I contacted the FBI this week to ask about the Minnesota mosque incident. It is unsolved after more than a month, and a \$30,000 reward for information remains unclaimed. An agent based in Minneapolis acknowledged to me that "it's always a possibility" that the crime may be a hoax.

That's what the Sept. 12 gripers want you to forget: People lie. And too many Muslim opportunists deceive in order to distract and divide.

Just two weeks ago, an alleged hate crime fell apart after a 22-year-old Muslim man admitted he had "exaggerated" an assault in a Durham, Ontario park restroom. Canadian police dropped charges against a 57-year-old man whom the Muslim man claimed had shouted anti-Muslim epithets and punched him in the face.

"We could have charged him with obstructing police or mischief and he was cautioned for those two offences," a police official told the Toronto Sun. But the faker escaped without punishment.

In late August, Indiana State University professor Azhar Hussain received one year's probation for fabricating anti-Muslim threats and an assault. He pleaded guilty to misdemeanor charges of obstruction for justice and harassment after lying to cops this spring about being attacked and sending anti-Muslim hate mails to the school.

"Based upon the investigation, it is our belief that Hussain was trying to gain sympathy by becoming a victim of anti-Muslim threats, which he had created himself," the campus police chief concluded.

In June, a small fire at a Des Moines, Iowa, mosque generated national headlines—until a young Muslim woman was arrested for starting it.

"Security cameras in the mosque showed a woman, later identified as Aisha Ismail, 22, pouring lighter fluid on the carpet and then starting the fire," police reported. "It doesn't appear that she was trying to burn the place down," the local chief said. "It seems like she was trying to make a statement."

In Houston, a "suspicious" fire at a Houston mosque in 2015 turned out to have been set by one of the center's own worshipers who prayed there five times a day for five years. The unindicted terror-funding co-conspirators at CAIR-Houston had clamored for law enforcement authorities to "investigate a possible bias motive for this fire" due to "the recent spike in hate incidents targeting mosques nationwide."

That same year, New Yorker Kashif Parvaiz was convicted of murdering his wife in front of his child after police debunked his cover story of being attacked by a group of bigots who called the family "terrorists."

For every rare and bona fide act of "Islamophobia" in North America, there are multiple acts of Islamo-faux-bia ginned up to stir attention, milk public compassion and generate unfounded fear.

It's bad enough when the Islamo-faux-bists operate any other time of year. It's downright disgusting when they exploit the true horrors of 9/11 to hype their delusions of systemic post-9/12 oppression and collective victimhood.



An article by John Bat titled "National Debt Hits Historic \$20 Trillion Mark" was posted at [cbsnews.com](http://cbsnews.com) on Sept. 11, 2017. Following is the article.

---

The U.S. national debt reached \$20 trillion for the first time ever last Friday [Sept. 8] after President Trump signed a bipartisan bill temporarily raising the nation's debt limit for three months.

While at Camp David, Mr. Trump, with the stroke of his presidential pen, increased the statutory debt last Friday by approximately \$318 billion, according to the Treasury Department. Before the bill's completion, the U.S. debt was sitting around \$19.84 trillion.

The legislation allowed the Treasury Department to start borrowing again immediately after several months of using "extraordinary measures" to avoid a financial default. The bill passed last Thursday 80-17 in the Senate and in

the House 316-90 on Friday. Around \$15 billion in emergency funding for Hurricane Harvey recovery efforts was attached to the borrowing measure.

The \$318 billion increase raised the U.S. national debt to \$20.16 trillion by Friday. Since Mr. Trump's inauguration, the debt has increased about \$215 billion from around \$19.94 trillion.

Mr. Trump shocked many Republicans by cutting an unexpected deal with House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi and Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer last Wednesday, which permitted the three-month debt-ceiling raise in exchange for quick action on Harvey aid and short-term spending.

Republicans, generally, wanted a longer extension for the debt ceiling. But Mr. Trump ultimately had his way, and the negotiations inside the Oval Office outweighed the immediate legislative desires of members of the GOP.

The Treasury Department will be able to continue borrowing until Dec. 8, which is when the bill is due to expire. At that time, Congress will have to face a new call for legislation tackling once again federal spending and the debt ceiling.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "We're All to Blame" was posted at [jewishworldreview.com](http://jewishworldreview.com) on Sept. 13, 2017. Following is the article.

---

The largest threat to our prosperity is government spending that far exceeds the authority enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

- Federal spending in 2017 will top \$4 trillion.
- Social Security, at \$1 trillion, will take up most of it. Medicare (\$582 billion) and Medicaid (\$404 billion) are the next-largest expenditures.
- Other federal social spending includes food stamps, unemployment compensation, child nutrition, child tax credits, supplemental security income and student loans, all of which total roughly \$550 billion.
- Social spending by Congress consumes about two-thirds of the federal budget.

Where do you think Congress gets the resources for such spending? It's not the tooth fairy or Santa Claus. The only way Congress can give one American a dollar is to use threats, intimidation and coercion to confiscate that dollar from another American.

Congress forcibly uses one American to serve the purposes of another American. We might ask ourselves: What standard of morality justifies the forcible use of one American to serve the purposes of another American?

By the way, the forcible use of one person to serve the purposes of another is a fairly good working definition of slavery.

Today's Americans have little appreciation for how their values reflect a contempt for those of our Founding Fathers.

You ask, "Williams, what do you mean by such a statement?"

In 1794, Congress appropriated \$15,000 to help French refugees who had fled from insurrection in Saint-Domingue (now Haiti).

James Madison, the "Father of the Constitution," stood on the floor of the House to object, saying, "I cannot undertake to lay my finger on that article in the federal Constitution which granted a right to Congress of expending, on objects of benevolence, the money of their constituents." Most federal spending today is on "objects of benevolence." Madison also said, "Charity is no part of the legislative duty of the government."

No doubt some congressmen, academics, hustlers and ignorant people will argue that the general welfare clause of the U.S. Constitution authorizes today's spending. That is simply unadulterated nonsense.

Thomas Jefferson wrote, "Congress (has) not unlimited powers to provide for the general welfare, but (is) restrained to those specifically enumerated." Madison wrote that "if Congress can do whatever in their discretion can be done by money, and will promote the general welfare, the Government is no longer a limited one possessing enumerated powers, but an indefinite one."

In other words, the general welfare clause authorized Congress to spend money only to carry out the powers and duties specifically enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 and elsewhere in the Constitution, not to meet the infinite needs of the general welfare.

We cannot blame politicians for the spending that places our nation in peril. Politicians are doing precisely what the American people elect them to office to do—namely, use the power of their office to take the rightful property of other Americans and deliver it to them.

It would be political suicide for a president or a congressman to argue as Madison did that Congress has no right to expend "on objects of benevolence" the money of its constituents and that "charity is no part of the legislative duty of the government."

It's unreasonable of us to expect any politician to sabotage his career by living up to his oath of office to uphold and defend our Constitution. That means that if we are to save our nation from the economic and social chaos that awaits us, we the people must have a moral reawakening and eschew what is no less than legalized theft, the taking from one American for the benefit of another.

I know that some people will say, "Williams, I agree with most of what you say, but not when it comes to Social Security. Social Security is my money I had taken out of my pay for retirement."

If you think that, you've been duped. The only way you get a Social Security check is for Congress to take the earnings of a worker. Explanation of your duping can be found in a 2010 article (I wrote titled "Washington's Lies").



An editorial by Cal Thomas titled "The Option Play" was posted at town-hall.com on Sept. 14, 2017. Following is the article.

---

What just happened? President Trump cut a deal with Democrats to pay for hurricane damage relief and raise the debt ceiling without getting anything in return, except the temporary avoidance of a government shutdown. How to describe this? Was it a sellout, or a pragmatic act?

It's football season again, so let's call this deal the "option play." It isn't used much by today's professional players, but the play is designed to give a quarterback the option of running the ball, or, if he sees he can't make it through the defensive line, toss it to a player trailing behind him in an effort to gain yards.

President Trump might consider these options in an effort to push through his agenda.

■ Apparently having grown tired of Republican ineptitude for failing to repeal and replace Obamacare, or do much else with their majorities in the House and Senate, other than to think up new excuses for their failures, the debt ceiling deal might give the president wiggle room to demand concessions from Democrats. The danger is that Democrats may not feel the need to compromise if they believe they can win concessions from a president who does not have an ideological core.

■ The second option might be to embarrass Republicans sufficiently to force them to unify and pass a true Republican agenda. That used to include lower taxes, smaller government and reducing the debt through less spending and economic growth. I'm not betting on this option.

■ Option three would be to put incumbent Republicans in such a bind that primary challengers next year could defeat "moderates" and others who failed to live up to their campaign promises. How many Republicans could successfully campaign on a platform of "re-elect me, because I accomplished nothing and opposed the president"?

There's also an option the Republican majority hasn't tried.

Rush Limbaugh mentioned it on his radio program: "If just at any time in the past six months, or anytime in the next six, if for just three months Ryan and McConnell would work with Trump to advance his agenda, they would own everything for who knows how long. If they would have repealed and replaced Obamacare, if they would have then moved on to tax cuts and . . . real tax reform, and if they had built the wall . . . If those three things had serious action with an appearance of unity within the Republican Party on those issues, the Democrats wouldn't stand a prayer for 25 years."

Too many Republicans remain embarrassed that Trump won. He would never be allowed to join their inner circle whose mantra appears to be "when the going gets tough, the weak surrender without a fight." For these Republicans, principles have been replaced by pragmatism.

Trump's deal with Democrats excluded the children of "undocumented" immigrants. Perhaps the president could allow DACA kids to remain in the country in exchange for money to build the wall. But why should Democrats compromise when they get what they want anyway?

Democrats have a problem of their own after doing a deal with a president they have reviled and ridiculed since he announced his candidacy. If the president is giving them what they want, how do Democrats run against him in next year's congressional elections?

The deal Trump made with Democrats expires in 90 days. Will Chuck Schumer and Nancy Pelosi use an option they have successfully employed in the past to win more concessions from the president? It's called the Christmas option, and it is designed to smear Republicans as "heartless" politicians who would harm children by not giving in to Democrats' demands.

President Trump has broken a legislative logjam. The question now is what happens next? That question goes not so much to Democrats as to the Republican leadership. It's their option now.



An editorial by Dennis Prager titled "Dear Liberals: Conservatism is Not Your Enemy; the Left Is" was posted at [cnsnews.com](http://cnsnews.com) on Sept. 13, 2017. Following is the article.

---

What is the difference between a leftist and a liberal?

Answering this question is vital to understanding the crisis facing America and the West today. Yet few seem able to do it. I offer the following as a guide.

Here's the first thing to know: The two have almost nothing in common.

On the contrary, liberalism has far more in common with conservatism than it does with leftism. The left has appropriated the word "liberal" so effectively that almost everyone—liberals, leftists, and conservatives—thinks they are synonymous.

But they aren't. Let's look at some important examples.

■ **Race:** This is perhaps the most obvious of the many moral differences between liberalism and leftism.

The essence of the liberal position on race was that the color of one's skin is insignificant. To liberals of a generation ago, only racists believed that race is intrinsically significant. However, to the left, the notion that race is insignificant is itself racist.

Thus, the University of California officially regards the statement, "There is only one race, the human race," as racist.

For that reason, liberals were passionately committed to racial integration. Liberals should be sickened by the existence of black dormitories and separate black graduations on university campuses.

■ **Capitalism:** Liberals have always been pro-capitalism, recognizing it for what it is: the only economic means of lifting great numbers out of poverty.

Liberals did often view government as able to play a bigger role in lifting people out of poverty than conservatives, but they were never opposed to capitalism, and they were never for socialism. Opposition to capitalism and advocacy of socialism are leftist values.

■ **Nationalism:** Liberals deeply believed in the nation-state, whether their nation was the United States, Great Britain, or France.

The left has always opposed nationalism because leftism is rooted in class solidarity, not national solidarity. The left has contempt for nationalism, seeing in it intellectual and moral primitivism at best, and the road to fascism at worst.

Liberals always wanted to protect American sovereignty and borders. The notion of open borders would have struck a liberal as just as objectionable as it does a conservative.

It is emblematic of our time that the left-wing writers of Superman comics had Superman announce a few years ago, "I intend to speak before the United Nations tomorrow and inform them that I am renouncing my American citizenship."

When the writers of Superman were liberal, Superman was not only an American but one who fought for "truth, justice, and the American way." But in his announcement, he explained that motto is "not enough anymore."

View of America: Liberals venerated America.

Watch American films from the 1930s through the 1950s and you will be watching overtly patriotic, America-celebrating films—virtually all produced, directed, and acted in by liberals.

Liberals well understand that America is imperfect, but they agree with a liberal icon named Abraham Lincoln that America is “the last best hope of earth.”

To the left, America is essentially a racist, sexist, violent, homophobic, xenophobic, and Islamophobic country. The left around the world loathe America, and it is hard to imagine why the American left would differ in this one way from fellow leftists around the world.

Leftists often take offense at having their love of America doubted. But those left-wing descriptions of America are not the only reason to assume that the left has more contempt than love for America.

The left’s view of America was encapsulated in then-presidential candidate Barack Obama’s statement in 2008. “We are five days away from fundamentally transforming the United States of America,” he said.

Now, if you were to meet a man who said that he wanted to fundamentally transform his wife, or a woman who said that about her husband, would you assume that either loved their spouse? Of course not.

■ Free speech: The difference between the left and liberals regarding free speech is as dramatic as the difference regarding race.

No one was more committed than American liberals to the famous statement, “I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.”

Liberals still are. But the left is leading the first nationwide suppression of free speech in American history—from the universities to Google to almost every other institution and place of work.

It claims to only oppose hate speech. But protecting the right of person A to say what person B deems objectionable is the entire point of free speech.

■ Western civilization: Liberals have a deep love of Western civilization. They taught it at virtually every university and celebrated its unique moral, ethical, philosophical, artistic, musical, and literary achievements.

No liberal would have joined the leftist Rev. Jesse Jackson in chanting at Stanford University: “Hey, hey. Ho, ho. Western civ has got to go.”

The most revered liberal in American history is probably former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who frequently cited the need to protect not just Western civilization but Christian civilization.

Yet leftists unanimously denounced President Donald Trump for his speech in Warsaw, Poland, in which he spoke of protecting Western civilization. They

argued not only that Western civilization is not superior to any other civilization but also that it is no more than a euphemism for white supremacy.

■ **Judaism and Christianity:** Liberals knew and appreciated the Judeo-Christian roots of American civilization. They themselves went to church or synagogue, or at the very least appreciated that most of their fellow Americans did.

The contempt that the left has—and has always had—for religion (except for Islam today) is not something with which a liberal would ever have identified.

If the left is not defeated, American and Western civilization will not survive. But the left will not be defeated until good liberals understand this and join the fight.

Dear liberals: Conservatives are not your enemy. The left is.



***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.”