

Eye on the World

Oct. 21, 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 October 21, 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 "Netanyahu: 'Trump Correctly Identifies That Iran is Not the Solution, But Perhaps the Problem in The Middle East' " was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 16, 2017. Following is the article.

Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu praised President Trump on Sunday for choosing to confront the risks posed by Iran rather than kick the can down the road for a future administration to deal with.

"He could have kicked the can forward, he could have said, well it's not going to happen on my watch so why should I deal with it? You know, Iran will become a nuclear power with a nuclear arsenal, if we just let the deal go through. but it won't happen on my watch," Netanyahu said.

"But he said, no, it's the duty of leaders—and it's perhaps the most difficult duty of leaders—to ward off danger before it becomes apparent to everyone, because when it becomes apparent to everyone, it may be too late."

Addressing Christian media representatives in Jerusalem, Netanyahu was asked a question that touched on differences in his relationship with Trump and that with former President Obama.

He described the relationship with Trump as "excellent," adding that there was "a sense of warmth and an instinctive understanding on many important things."

At the same time, Netanyahu said the “solidity” of the Israel-U.S. relationship had not been altered by the differences he and Obama did have over Iran and the nuclear agreement. He stressed appreciation in particular for the \$38 billion military aid package signed with the Obama administration exactly one year ago.

“So I think there is a basic alliance there that transcends differences that we may have over particular issues,” he said.

“But the issue of Iran wasn’t just another issue. The issue of Iran is existential for us. And I felt compelled to take our case to the American Congress because that [nuclear] deal—so-called deal—was a direct threat to our future, to our existence.”

“I think there’s been a change with regard to this central issue, because, because I think President Trump correctly identifies that Iran is not the solution but perhaps the problem in the Middle East,” he said. “The problem. The source of so much aggression, so much terror and so much misery.”

Netanyahu said Trump’s decision on Friday [Oct. 13] to announce he will not certify that Iran is complying with its commitments under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) was very important for Israel, but also “for the United States and for the future of the world.”

Netanyahu said when the JCPOA was being negotiated some said that once Iran signs the accord “it would join the community of nations.”

“So Iran received the first installment of about 50 million—50 billion—dollars coming in to its coffers, and what did they do? They didn’t join the community of nations. They’re devouring the nations, one after the other.”

“They’re in Yemen firing rockets deep into Saudi Arabia; they’re in Iraq killing people, now squeezing the Kurds; they’re in Syria, colonizing Syria and they intend to turn Syria into a military base for their war of destruction against Israel.”

Beyond Iran’s conduct across the region, the prime minister also turned a spotlight on its treatment of minority Christians at home.

“Christians are brutally persecuted in the Islamic Republic. Pastors are jailed for no reason—no reason other than for being Christian leaders. Christians have been lashed. You hear this? Christians have been lashed for sipping [communion] wine during prayer services; Christians have been brutally tortured for doing nothing more than practicing their faith.”

Netanyahu urged media outlets to highlight the plight of Christians suffering in Iran, and to “call out the lie and the lies of President [Hasan] Rouhani, who promised in 2013 that all religions would, quote, ‘feel justice’ in Iran—while so many Christians live there in constant terror.”



Looking back to April, here is an article by John R. Moore titled “The EMP Threat From North Korea is Real and Terrifying” that was posted at pjmedia.com on April 25, 2017.

Fifty-five years ago, the U.S. tested a nuclear weapon high above the atmosphere over the Pacific. At the time, my father—a nuclear weapons engineer—was listening on our ham radio.

When the device exploded, we heard nothing in Albuquerque. But, in Honolulu, 1000 miles from the detonation, the sky turned red as streetlights and telephones went out. EMP (Electromagnetic Pulse) effects from the distant nuclear explosion had struck.

Today we hear concern that cities might be destroyed by North Korean nuclear tipped missiles, but Starfish Prime should alert us to a more imminent danger: EMP. North Korea can launch an EMP attack before it has developed nuclear missile technology, and EMP may be far more deadly.

An EMP disaster from a high-altitude blast seems like science fiction: There is a silent flash high in the sky, and everything using electricity just . . . stops. Cars stop, power goes out, the Internet dies, satellites quit working, landline and mobile phone systems go out, and computers are destroyed. In a moment, we are back to 1850, as was dramatized in William Forstchen’s 2009 novel *One Second After*.

While the total wipeout depicted in *One Second After* is probably exaggerated, the effects could knock out our power grid for months, and destroy critical communications and computer systems.

As former CIA chief James Woolsey recently said: “If you look at the electric grid and what it’s susceptible to, we would be moving into a world with no food delivery, no water purification, no banking, no telecommunications, no medicine. All of these things depend on electricity in one way or another.”

In such a situation, there simply is no way to rule out the possibility that hundreds of millions could die.

To nuke one of our cities, the North needs to master ICBM construction, nuclear weapons miniaturization, precision long-range guidance technology, atmospheric re-entry vehicles, and fusing to trigger detonation at the right time after the hazardous re-entry. In contrast, an EMP attack requires only a small, light nuclear weapon and the ability to launch it as a satellite. Once over the U.S., it is detonated.

Already, two satellites launched by North Korea cross the U.S. every day.

Do they contain nuclear weapons? Probably not, but how can we know? Nuclear weapons don’t emit much radiation until they go off, so they are hard to detect. I used to fly in a nuclear bomber with the weapon station just a few feet from my station with no shielding—no need.

Meanwhile, North Korea continues striving to miniaturize its nukes—and may have already succeeded. They have released pictures of a miniaturized bomb, although that may just be propaganda.

Starfish Prime used a thermonuclear weapon, a “hydrogen bomb,” which was very powerful but which the North is still striving to build—a difficult task. But only a fission weapon or “atomic bomb” is needed for an EMP, and North Korea has tested several.

The yield would probably need to be increased over their latest test, but getting there is only a matter of time. Fusion boosting the weapon to higher yield is not a difficult step. The North recently restarted its Yongbyon reactor, which can produce the necessary tritium.



An article by James Carstensen titled “Germany’s Merkel for the First Time Concedes on Demands for Refugee Admission Ceiling” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 9, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel has for the first time announced plans to limit Germany’s refugee intake, in an apparent bid to create a united front ahead of tough coalition talks to form a new government.

The announcement comes two weeks after Merkel secured a fourth term as chancellor in national elections, albeit facing a new challenge in the form of the anti-immigration Alternative for Germany (AfD) party, the first far right party to enter the Bundestag since the 1930s.

After a 10 hour meeting between Merkel’s Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and its conservative sister-party in Bavaria, the Christian Social Union (CSU), the two parties agreed on a draft paper setting a 200,000 annual cap on refugee admission.

Up to now, Merkel has resisted calls from the CSU for a ceiling.

The 200,000-figure refers to controlled entries, such as refugees accepted at the E.U. level, or exchanges under an agreement between the bloc and Turkey. According to German Interior Ministry data, 280,000 asylum seekers arrived in Germany last year, compared to 890,000 in 2015.

In the past, Merkel repeatedly rejected the CSU’s calls for a refugee intake ceiling—a notion also rejected by the FDP and Greens.

CSU leader Horst Seehofer was openly critical of Merkel’s controversial decision in 2015 to open the country’s borders to all asylum seekers, and disagreements over issues such as a refugee limit had strained relations between the sister parties.

Bavaria, where the CSU governs, dealt with 67,000 asylum applications, according to Federal Office for Migration and Refugees data.

In 2017, that figure has dropped to a little over 16,000 applications to date, although that is still the second-largest number of asylum applications by any German state this year.

As she attempts to build a working coalition, Merkel faces the daunting task of trying to reconcile the diverse and conflicting interests of her own center-right supporters with those of the conservative CSU, the business-friendly FDP, and the left-leaning environmentally-focused Greens.



An article by Evelyn Cheng titled "Cash is Already Pretty Much Dead in China As the Country Lives the future with Mobile Pay" was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 8, 2017. Following are excerpt of the article.

Mobile pay is taking China by storm and changing daily commerce.

The transformation of a society limited to bills denominated in 100 yuan (\$15) or less into one where QR payment codes abound was by far the biggest change in mainland China since my last visit four years ago.

When eating out or shopping with local friends, they paid by scanning a QR code on the restaurant table or by showing a similar code on their smartphones to the store clerk. A spices shop, museum souvenir store and seller of traditional Chinese calligraphy brushes all had signs saying they accepted mobile pay.

Rather than, "Do you take credit cards?" the question was often "Do you take Alipay? WeChat Pay?"

Lack of red tape and a less developed financial system have apparently allowed mainland China to leapfrog the developed world into embracing mobile payments.

Mobile payment volume in the country more than doubled to \$5 trillion in 2016, according to Analysys data cited by Hillhouse Capital in a May report. In the first quarter of this year, Alipay had 54 percent of that mobile payments market, and WeChat Pay accounted for 40 percent, the study said.

The Chinese mobile pay habit is also affecting other countries. More than 6 million Chinese traveled abroad during the "Golden Week" national holiday in early October, according to state-backed media outlet Xinhua. That puts pressure on popular tourist destinations like Japan and Hong Kong to add mobile pay services.

The growth of mobile pay in China comes off a solid base of smartphone users. The ubiquitous WeChat messaging app from Chinese technology giant Tencent reached 963 million monthly active users in the second quarter. In

professional settings, adding each other on WeChat sometimes replaced business card exchanges.

Alipay, which is owned by Alibaba affiliate Ant Financial Services, has 520 million users, according to its international website.

The app is linked to online money market fund Yu'e bao, encouraging users to invest and spend with Alipay. Attractive interest rates of nearly 4 percent or more have turned it into the largest money market fund in the world, with 1.43 trillion yuan (\$217 billion) as of the end of June, according to state media reports citing Yu'e bao's manager, Tianhong Asset Management.

Hong Kong-based research investment company CLSA expects Chinese electronic payments volume to quadruple to 300 trillion yuan by 2021. During that time, online wealth management products' assets under management should triple to 6.7 trillion yuan and online loans could also triple to 3.5 trillion, said Elinor Leung, head of Asia Telecom and Internet Research at CLSA.

Mobile pay is growing so rapidly in mainland China that as a foreigner I sometimes found it difficult to complete basic transactions without it.

When I tried to pay at a Beijing McDonald's on a late night, the only payment options were China's Union Pay credit card system, Apple Pay or WeChat Pay and Alipay. As an American visitor without a Chinese bank account, I wasn't able to find a way to use those systems and the store clerk wouldn't take my cash.

"Cash is accepted in all McDonald's restaurants across China. After our investigation, we believe this is an isolated case that happened during night shift change, and thus, all cash counters were temporarily closed," a McDonald's China Customer Care Center told me in an email.

Taxis were also nearly impossible to hail in Beijing due to the rise of Didi, a ride-hailing app that bought Uber's China operations in a deal worth \$35 billion last summer. Because Didi was linked through WeChat, I couldn't use it without a Chinese bank account.

The growth of mobile pay in China has supported another business: bike sharing.

Led by a few start-ups, the number of bikes stacked along the side of the street or sometimes scattered even alongside highways in China has exploded. The number of monthly active users doubled from February to more than 20 million in March, according to TrustData cited by Hillhouse Capital.

Two of the largest Chinese-based start-ups, Ofo and Mobike, say they have a combined more than 13 million bikes around the world and have each raised at least \$1 billion.



A Reuters article by Jim Christe titled "Crews Push to Contain California Fires, Search for Bodies" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 17, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Crews fought their way across rugged, steep terrain on Tuesday in a push to gain full control of the deadliest wildfires in California history, as search-and-rescue teams picked through an ashy moonscape of destroyed homes looking for victims.

Though a dozen major blazes were still burning across the region, where 5,700 homes and businesses, some of them wineries, have been gutted, fire officials said they were gaining confidence they had finally gained the upper hand against the flames.

“There are still some concerns that if the west winds come up or we get some erratic winds they could push our lines, but as of right now we’re looking pretty good,” Steve Crawford, a fire operations chief, told reporters at a briefing in Sonoma County in the heart of California’s celebrated wine country.

At the same time, teams of searchers were moving house to house through neighborhoods where little was left standing, picking through ash and rubble to recover the bodies of those who did not make it out in time.

Already 41 people have been confirmed killed in the fires, which erupted last week and were driven by dry, hot winds into Northern California communities, giving residents little or no chance to escape.

Law enforcement officials said 63 people remained missing or unaccounted for in Sonoma and Napa counties.

Most of the over 1,900 people listed in missing-persons reports have turned up safe, including evacuees who failed to alert authorities after fleeing their homes, but authorities still fear they may find more charred bodies as they move into previously inaccessible areas.

Tens of thousands of people remained displaced. Many would return to find nothing left, leaving them to hastily make alternative plans for shelter.



An article by Deanna Wallace titled “On Its Birthday, Planned Parenthood Marks 101 Years Building a Culture of Death” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 16, 2017. Following is the article.

One hundred and one is a big number, but 328,348 is even bigger—that’s the number of abortions done by Planned Parenthood in 2016. As Planned Parenthood celebrates its 101st birthday, it’s important to remember that because of Planned Parenthood, there are 328,348 children that will never celebrate their birthdays.

When I bring this up, there’s always someone quick to remind me that “Planned Parenthood is more than abortion, and provides care to millions of

women with nowhere else to go.” But is this really true? The answer is a resounding “NO.”

A quick look at the numbers from Planned Parenthood’s 2016 Annual report shows a clear picture of their true priorities, and it’s not “women’s health”:

- Planned Parenthood performed 328,348 abortions, which is up from 2015’s 323,999.
- When combining all pregnancy services (abortions, prenatal care, miscarriage services, and adoption referrals), abortions accounted for 95.8% of services to pregnant women.
- Adoption referrals made up less than 1% of pregnancy services.
- Prenatal services were nearly cut in half, dropping a whopping 46%.
- Abortion patients made up 13.68% of Planned Parenthood’s patient total.
- Cancer screening and prevention services fell 2.5%.
- The number of Breast exams, HPV vaccinations, Colposcopy, and Cryotherapy services all decreased.
- Contraceptive services decreased 4.6%.
- The total number of patients continued to fall, from 2.5 million in 2014-2015, to 2.4 million in 2015-2016.
- The total number of clinics also decreased, with the 2014-2015 report claiming 661 clinics, and the 2015-2016 report claiming, “nearly 650 clinics.”

These numbers are nothing new either, but rather are part of a continuing trend of Planned Parenthood taking in more taxpayer money while providing fewer services to women in need.

Since 2006, when Cecile Richards became the leader of Planned Parenthood, clinics, patients, and health care services numbers have been dramatically reduced, while abortions, revenues, and government funding have increased:

- There has been a 22.5% decrease in the number of patients served.
- Cancer screening and prevention services have fallen 66%.
- Breast exams have decreased by 63.5%.
- Total services provided by Planned Parenthood have fallen by 6%.
- Abortions have gone up 13%.
- Federal funding for Planned Parenthood has increased by 64.7%.
- Planned Parenthood’s total revenues have increased 33%.

These figures raise an important question: Why should taxpayers continue to fund an abortion business that is providing fewer services, serving fewer patients, and closing clinics, despite increases to their government funding?

After all, it's no secret that Planned Parenthood clinics are outnumbered by community health centers 20 to one, with over 13,000 clinics nationwide that serve more than 21 million men, women, and children. These full-service medical centers provide routine health services and life-affirming care to millions of American women every year, all without needing to boost their bottom line with profit from abortions.

When you combine the alarming statistics on Planned Parenthood's declining services with the sheer number of available alternative providers to serve low-income and medically underserved communities, diverting Planned Parenthood's half a billion dollars in annual government funding to these comprehensive health clinics is clearly a more fiscally responsible use of our taxpayer dollars.

The additional funding would allow these health centers to hire more staff, expand services, upgrade equipment, and easily meet the needs of displaced Planned Parenthood patients.

Birthday celebrations are supposed to be about celebrating life and new accomplishments, but instead, Planned Parenthood is throwing a taxpayer-funded celebration of its 101 years of hurting women, killing children, alleged Medicaid fraud, decreasing services, and selling baby body parts.

The American people should remind Congress of their promise to defund the nation's largest abortion provider—and maybe next year we can celebrate the birthdays of 328,348 cute, chubby, 1 year olds instead.



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled "Obama Lied; My Fourth Health Plan Died" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 11, 2017. Following is the article.

Cue the funeral bagpipes. My fourth health insurance plan is dead.

Two weeks ago, my husband and I received yet another cancellation notice for our private, individual health insurance coverage. It's our fourth Obamacare-induced obituary in four years. Our first death notice, from Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield, arrived in the fall of 2013. The insurer informed us that because of "changes from health care reform (also called the Affordable Care Act or ACA)," our plan no longer met the federal government's requirements.

Never mind our needs and desires as consumers who were quite satisfied with a high-deductible PPO that included a wide network of doctors for ourselves and our two children.

Our second death knell, from Rocky Mountain Health Plans, tolled in August 2015. That notice signaled the end of a plan we didn't want in the first place that didn't cover our kids' dental care and wasn't accepted at our local urgent care clinic. The insurer pulled out of the individual market in all but one county in Colorado, following the complete withdrawal from that sector by Humana and UnitedHealthcare.

Our third "notice of plan discontinuation," again from Anthem, informed us that the insurer would "no longer offer your current health plan in the State of Colorado" in August 2016. With fewer and fewer choices as know-it-all Obamacare bureaucrats decimated the individual market here and across the country, we enrolled in a high-deductible Bronze HSA EPO (Health Savings Account Exclusive Provider Organization) offered by Minneapolis-based startup, Bright Health.

Now, here we are barely a year later: Deja screwed times four. Our current plan will be discontinued on Jan. 1, 2018.

"But don't worry," Bright Health's eulogy writer chirped, "we have similar plans to address your needs."

Riiiiight. Where have I heard those pie-in-the-sky promises before? Oh, yeah. Straight out of the socialized medicine Trojan horse's mouth. "If you like your doctor," President Obama promised, "you will be able to keep your doctor. Period. If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan. Period. No one will take it away. No matter what."

Is pathological lying covered under the Affordable Care Act?

Speaking of Affordable Care Act whoppers, so much for "affordable." Our current deductible is \$6,550 per person; \$13,100 for our family of four. Assuming we can find a new plan at the bottom of the individual market barrel, our current monthly premium, \$944.86, will rise to more than \$1,300 a month.

"What's taking place is a market correction; the free market is at work," says Colorado's state insurance commissioner, Marguerite Salazar. "(T)his could be an indication that there were too many options for the market to support."

This presumptuous central planner called federal intervention to eliminate "too many" options for consumers the free market at work. Yes, friends, the Rocky Mountain High is real.

This isn't a "market correction." It's a government catastrophe. Premiums for individual health plans in Virginia are set to skyrocket nearly 60 percent in 2018. In New Hampshire, those rates will rise 52 percent. In South Carolina, individual market consumers will face an average 31.3 percent hike. In Tennessee, they'll see rates jump between 20-40 percent.

Private, flexible PPOs for self-sufficient, self-employed people are vanishing by design. The social-engineered future—healthy, full-paying consumers being herded into government-run Obamacare exchanges and severely regulated regional HMOs—is a bipartisan big government health bureaucracy's dream come true.

These choice-wreckers had the arrogant audacity to denigrate our pre-Obama-care plans as “substandard” (Obama), “crappy” (MSNBC big mouth Ed Schultz) and “junk policies” (Sen. Tom Harkin, D-Iowa). When I first called attention to the cancellation notice tsunami in 2013, liberal Mother Jones magazine sneered that the phenomenon was “phony.” And they’re still denying the Obamacare death spiral. Liberal Vox Media recently called the crisis “a lie.”

I don’t have enough four-letter words for these propagandists. There are an estimated 450,000 consumers like us in Colorado and 17 million of us nationwide—small-business owners, independent contractors and others who don’t get their plans through group coverage, big companies or government employers. The costs, headaches and disruption in our lives caused by Obama-care’s meddling meddlers are real and massive.

But we’re puzzles to corporate media journalists who’ve never had to meet a payroll and don’t even know what is the individual market.

We’re invisible to late-night TV clowns who get their Obamacare-at-all-costs talking points from Chuck Schumer.

We’re pariahs to social justice health care activists and Democrats who want us to just shut up and subsidize everyone else’s insurance.

And we’re expendables to establishment Republicans who hoovered up campaign donations on the empty promise to repeal Obamacare—and now consider amnesty for immigrants here illegally and gun control higher legislative priorities than keeping their damned word.

We’re the canaries in the Obamacare coal mine. Ignore us at your peril, America. You’re next.



An article by Susan Jones titled “Bannon: GOP’s Entire ‘Establishment Globalist Clique’ Must Go” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 10, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) “is an absolute disgrace,” but he’s just one of the many Republican lawmakers who “have total contempt for the base,” Steve Bannon, Donald Trump’s former chief strategist, said Monday [Oct. 9] night.

“When you want to talk about why there’s no repeal and replace, why there’s no tax cut, why there’s no tax reform, why there’s no infrastructure bill, you saw it right there,” Bannon told Fox News’s Sean Hannity.

“Corker—McConnell and Corker and the entire clique—the establishment globalist clique on Capitol Hill—have to go. If we need any more proof about what they think, you heard it tonight. It’s an absolute disgrace.”

Bannon was referring to Sen. Corker's recent criticism of President Trump.

In a tweet on Sunday [Oct. 8], Corker called the Trump White House an adult daycare center.

Later, Corker complained to *The New York Times* about Trump's tweets, some of them very critical of Corker himself. Corker told the newspaper it feels like Trump is playing a part on "a reality show of some kind."

Corker also criticized Trump's handling of foreign policy, saying the president "doesn't realize, you know, that we could be heading towards World War III, with the kind of comments that he's making."

Corker announced last week that he plans to leave the Senate at the end of the year. Bannon said he'd like to see Corker replaced by Marsha Blackburn, whom he called "a real conservative."

Bannon said it's incumbent on Republicans to back President Trump's agenda, "but you don't see it. What you saw, what Corker said today, it's what they talk about on Capitol Hill. That's why I left the White House. Remember, I said I'm going after the Republican establishment. And we're going to go after them."

Bannon said he's building a coalition "that's going to challenge every Republican incumbent" except Sen. Ted Cruz of Texas.

"We're spending a ton of time with the grassroots organizations to make sure these candidates are fully vetted," he said. "You're going to see people announced this week that are going to have experience in government, you're going to see some outsiders that are authentic . . . you're going to see real candidates—and by the way, they're going to take on incumbents in every state and they're going to take on the Democrats after that."

Bannon said the Republican establishment lacks a sense of urgency. "By the way, these guys work three days a week," he said, at a time when some Americans are working two jobs to make ends meet because they are the victims of bad trade deals.

"We are declaring war on the Republican establishment that does not back the agenda that Donald Trump ran on," Bannon said.

Big donors are joining the effort, he added, "because they are tired of having their money burned up" on establishment candidates.

"It's a new game in town. We're going to cut off the oxygen to Mitch McConnell. Mitch McConnell's biggest asset is the money. We're going to make it the biggest liability. We're going after these guys tooth and nail."

Bannon said the effort to "blow up the establishment" and take the country back won't happen in one election cycle.

"This is something you're going to have to grind out, day in and day out, for the next 5, 10, 15, 20 years . . . But you know what? The grit determination and courage of the American working men and women—we're going to win."



An editorial by Allen West titled "A Republic, but Who Wants to Keep It?" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 16, 2017. Following is the article.

It was on September 17, 1787, that our rule of law, the US Constitution, was signed in Philadelphia. History tells us of an exchange that occurred outside of Independence Hall between Benjamin Franklin and a Philadelphia socialite, Mrs. Powell. Mrs. Powell inquired of Mr. Franklin, "Well, what is it that we have, a monarchy or a republic?" Mr. Franklin replied, famously, "a Republic, if you can keep it."

That was the challenge of 230 years ago, and now we must ask ourselves, do we truly want to keep this Constitutional Republic. However, there is a greater question, how many people know what it means to live in a Constitutional Republic?

- America is not a democracy. The means by which we elect our representation is through a democratic process of voting.
- Therefore we are a representative democracy.

Sadly, this was something once taught in High School civics, hardly the case today.

In our governmental structure, as learned by James Madison from Charles Montesquieu, we have three coequal branches of government, kept in alignment by a system of checks and balances. Now, however, that system is totally out of whack, and what we are witnessing is complete breakdown and dysfunction.

Consider last week as President Donald Trump signed an executive order on our healthcare system, opening up cross-state competition and ending health insurance company subsidies. There are those who were decrying his use of executive action, yet these were the same folks who said nothing as Barack Obama used executive action some 40 times to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Obamacare.

Any basic high school student would be able to understand that a law cannot be amended by executive action or order, it must be amended by legislative action. That is how it works in a Constitutional Republic where our legislative branch has the most enumerated powers.

But, in the case of Mr. Obama, who had lost the House of Representatives, then later the US Senate, he sought to circumvent our system of governance, and overrule our checks and balances all for his political purposes. And the same can be said about the executive agreements he entered this Nation into with the Paris Climate Accord, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), and the Iranian Nuclear agreement.

- These and many others represent an Executive branch that was seeking to rule by edict, let's not get started on the plethora of bureaucratic administration rules

and regulations of the Obama era as well. Those government agency regulations represented a taxation without representation, you remember that line right?

■ Our Constitution clearly states in the origination clause that all revenue-generating measures must emanate from the US House of Representatives.

If we are to keep this Republic, maybe we should study, and go back to our fundamental principles . . . then again, Barack Obama did say we were “five days away from fundamentally changing the United States of America.” If there is one thing I admired about Barack Obama, he did tell us who he was and what he wanted to do, he did not want to keep our Republic.

And as for President Trump and his executive actions, well, this is a result of a complete breakdown in the duties and responsibilities of the legislative branch. I understand that President Trump wants to get things done, sadly, he has a legislative branch that seemingly does not. What else can be the reason when you had the entire US Senate taking a Columbus week break, while Americans only got Columbus Day, or as some absurdly call it, Indigenous Peoples Day.

■ A major threat to the future of our Republic is that we have a dysfunctional legislative branch.

■ Now, I am not one for any semblance of progressivism, statism, Marxism, socialism, or any ideology of governance that places the institution of government over the individual.

■ That is a critical aspect of our Republic, individual sovereignty.

However, in examining where our legislative branch has gone it is apparent they are focused on creating more dependency and subservience of the individual to their institution. Look at the massive deficits and debt we have incurred, and the fact that the basic functions of our legislative branch go undone, just wait, there will be another massive Omnibus spending bill because they cannot pass a budget.

This current GOP controlled House and Senate has failed, and guess what, they still left their duty in August for a taxpayer-funded break. And we had to endure the dismissive and obtuse excuse of Senate Majority Leader, Mitch McConnell, who told us that, “our expectations were excessive.”

■ When we have a legislative branch that is woefully failing, then the executive branch seeks to take up the slack, or even an activist Judiciary.

Legislation, measures, are created and passed in the House and Senate based upon the representation of the people and the consent of the governed . . . notice I said governed, not ruled. Those bills, measures, legislation are then passed to the Executive branch for signing to become law. And if said law needs amending, it must go back through the legislative process. And the Judicial branch is responsible to ensure we are adhering to our rule of law.

Now we have such a breakdown of what we all learned from watching Schoolhouse Rock on Saturday mornings eating our cereal that our Republic

is unrecognizable. I mean even a city, county, or state can now dismiss our rule of law by becoming a sanctuary for illegal immigrants, and certain courts will uphold their illegal action.

What must happen?

■ First of all, the American people must accept Franklin's challenge and take seriously those whom we elect to public office. Taking the oath of office cannot be seen as some cursory mumbling of words, it is something that must be embraced. True liberty comes when the individual is elevated over the institution of government, our Founding Fathers recognized that premise and created something the world had never known, or seen, but needed. The words of Scottish political philosopher, Alexander Fraser Tytler, were so prescient, and relevant to where we are today in our Constitutional Republic, America.

He said, "A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves largesse from the public treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the public treasury with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy, always followed by a dictatorship. The average age of the world's greatest civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through this sequence: From bondage to spiritual faith; From spiritual faith to great courage; From courage to liberty; From liberty to abundance; From abundance to selfishness; From selfishness to apathy; From apathy to dependence; From dependence back into bondage."

Ask yourself today, what are you doing to keep this Republic, that is if you want to? And where in the cycle articulated by Tytler do you see the American Republic . . . that we are individually responsible to keep.



An editorial by John Kass titled "Harvey Weinstein and Hollywood's Dance of the Fools" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 13, 2017. Following is the article.

When Hollywood types walk the red carpet, gathering to pay tribute to their virtue—while lecturing the rest of us about our moral and political sins—an image comes to mind.

Jesters.

That's the first thing I think of when Hollywood award shows come on TV: a dance of medieval jesters in motley and harlequin, wearing curly-toed boots upon their two left political feet. They scamper excitedly upon that red carpet, chatting with celebrity journos, and later they hold golden trophies and make fine speeches.

Not all of Hollywood is a farcical grotesquerie, but the overwhelming liberal virtue-signaling becomes unbearable, with every award show a mummer's farce as jesters heap glory upon themselves and their lords.

A dark lord like Harvey Weinstein, a Hollywood lord without peer.

They feared him, and they loved him as the fearful and the broken love those with absolute power over them. He was someone who could do wonders for their careers if only they would submit and serve his appetites.

Perhaps actress Meryl Streep, in what is now a cringe-worthy moment, said it best when accepting a 2012 Golden Globe award for her portrayal of Lady Margaret Thatcher in a Harvey Weinstein-produced film, "Iron Lady."

Streep thanked her agent, Kevin Huvane, and one other.

"And God, Harvey Weinstein," she said to great applause, "the punisher, Old Testament, I guess."

Weinstein had built a reputation as a punisher. But God?

Perhaps the word came to her mind because he could reach down and bend and shape not only American culture from the silver screen but shape and twist careers too. So who said Hollywood irony was dead?

Weinstein indeed was a lord of Hollywood, a lord of culture, with celebrities and Democratic politicians sucking up to him for political funds and access to the flame of celebrity, and journalists with dreams of Hollywood screenwriting cash and glory, all of them stuck like crumbs to his chubby hands.

Then came the recent expose in *The New York Times*, revealing Weinstein as a serial sexual abuser of women, as the creepy cliché of the king of the casting couch became flesh once again. And more came out in the Times the other day, a series of actresses from Angelina Jolie to Gwyneth Paltrow talking publicly about harassment at Weinstein's hands.

Streep and several others have now properly denounced Weinstein as disgusting, and his pet Democrats, like Hillary Clinton and the Obamas, have finally come out with belated, safe statements of condemnation.

But no one knew a thing?

So many have been jabbering that they knew nothing, absolutely nothing, that they never heard and never suspected and never, ever countenanced it, you get the sense Weinstein's behavior was a secret to all the good people in Tinseltown and their counterparts in New York.

It was no secret. It was known. They protected Weinstein while condemning similar behavior in others because they feared him.

A quick hint of how that works was offered by "Saturday Night Live" boss Lorne Michaels, days after the Weinstein story broke, even though "SNL" had

jokes and skits ready to mock the Hollywood mogul, just as “SNL” had mocked Republicans like Donald Trump for boorishness.

But “SNL” didn’t touch Weinstein in that first show after the story broke. They shelved the Weinstein bits, although, with Gal Gadot of “Wonder Woman” as guest star, it would have been easy to do a “Harvey Weinstein Among the Amazons” skit, with plenty of screaming.

The Amazons had special treatments for men like Harvey Weinstein.

But what was Lorne Michaels’ explanation for leaving Weinstein alone?

“It’s a New York thing,” he told a reporter.

Ah, a New York thing, and a Hollywood thing, where friends protect friends. And still, it was known to leading Hollywood actresses, and their leading men, known to other producers and journalists for decades and decades.

The New York Times deserves credit for its recent stories on Weinstein, but it doesn’t come away clean, either, as former *Times* writer Sharon Waxman claims that she had the goods on Weinstein in 2004.

She now says that Weinstein, using connections and getting stars like Matt Damon and Russell Crowe to call on his behalf, put his advertising weight upon the story until the paper “gutted” her piece.

The Times denies this, and an editor suggested that Waxman did not have the story nailed down.

But there are many stories coming out now that it’s safe. Writing in *New York Magazine*, Rebecca Traister—whose boyfriend was grabbed in a headlock after the fat producer allegedly screamed obscenities and spit at her—explained it all in a paragraph.

“Back then, Harvey could spin—or suppress—anything; there were so many journalists on his payroll, working as consultants on movie projects, or as screenwriters, or for his magazine.”

It comes back to that: Weinstein’s liberal media connections, his political connections, his power, his celebrity virtue-signaling defenders.

And women knew that if they stood up to him, they’d be crushed by this liberal army as it protected itself and its source of nourishment: Weinstein.

They protected Bill Clinton the same way.

And now they’re all jesters, aren’t they? They’re holding rattles, shaking them in ostentatious anger, as Harvey shrieks and quakes and is devoured.

I bet they’re already writing movie treatments for his story.

But before the Harvey Weinstein movie wins an Oscar, I must apologize to medieval jesters for comparing them to Hollywood types.

Medieval jesters wrote their own material. And jesters took their own risks.

I am sorry, jesters.



An article by Christine Rousselle titled “Harvey Weinstein’s Contract Allowed for Sexual Harassment” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 13, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Well here’s something disgusting, courtesy of TMZ: Harvey Weinstein’s contract permitted him to settle sexual harassment cases and stay employed, so long as he wrote a check to the company. TMZ gained access to Weinstein’s contract from 2015.

Ironically, these contract details could mean that he may have been fired from his company illegally. Weinstein was fired from The Weinstein Company after the *New York Times* published an explosive article alleging a pattern of sexual harassment and assault claims over decades. Since then, many actresses have gone on the record to speak of how Weinstein acted inappropriately around them.

From TMZ:

- According to the contract, if Weinstein “treated someone improperly in violation of the company’s Code of Conduct,” he must reimburse TWC for settlements or judgments. Additionally, “You [Weinstein] will pay the company liquidated damages of \$250,000 for the first such instance, \$500,000 for the second such instance, \$750,000 for the third such instance, and \$1,000,000 for each additional instance.”

- The contract says as long as Weinstein pays, it constitutes a “cure” for the misconduct and no further action can be taken. Translation—Weinstein could be sued over and over and as long as he wrote a check, he keeps his job.

- The contract has specific language as to when the Board of Directors can fire Weinstein—if he’s indicted or convicted of a crime, but that doesn’t apply here.

This is sickening. Further, with this knowledge, how can anyone, especially people high up in the company, claim to not know about these allegations? It was literally spelled out in his contract. Hollywood shielded a serial sexual abuser. This is beyond shameful.



“Eye on the World” comment: Here is a list of some additional articles about the Harvey Weinstein scandal.

- A video and an article titled “Steyn on Weinstein: ‘Progressive Values in Hollywood in a Nutshell’ ” was posted at foxnews.com on Oct. 11, 2017.

- An article by Lloyd Grove titled “How NBC ‘Killed’ Ronan Farrow’s Weinstein Exposé” was posted at thedailybeast.com on Oct. 11, 2017.
- An article by Tammy Bruce titled “Harvey Weinstein Scandal—the Feminist Bar Is Very Low These Days” was posted at washingtontimes.com on Oct. 12, 2017.
- An editorial by Brent Bozell titled “Hollywood Moralists Exposed As Hypocrites” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 13, 2017.



An article by Craig Bannister titled “Bozell: Hollywood Calls for Gun Control, Yet Features Gun Violence 212 Times in Four of It’s Top Movies” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 12, 2017. Following is the article.

“Hollywood’s hypocrisy about Harvey Weinstein is only outdone by its hypocrisy about gun control,” Media Research Center (MRC) President Brent Bozell declared Thursday in response to findings of a new MRC study on movie gun violence.

Hollywood is calling for more gun control—but, features copious gun violence, including 100 uses of automatic weapons, in four of its most profitable movies in theaters today.

Bozell explained:

- “You just knew the Hollywood celebrity crowd would jump all over that issue in the wake of the Las Vegas massacre. Yet in just four of the biggest movies showing around the country at this very moment (Kingsman: Golden Circle, American Assassin, It, and Mother!), there are no less than 212 incidents of gun violence.”
- “In just these four movies the body count is at least 192, and in over 100 gun violence incidents some kind of automatic weapon is employed.”
- “But they want gun control.”
- “These were four of the five most popular movies in America when mass murderer Stephen Paddock modified his firearm into an automatic weapon and mowed down 59 innocent people from the 32nd floor of a Las Vegas hotel.”
- “Making tens of millions off movies that constantly depict gun violence, and then calling for gun control, is homicide hypocrisy.”



An article by Leah Libresco titled “I Used to Think Gun Control was the Answer; My Research Told Me Otherwise” was posted at washingtonpost.com on Oct. 3, 2017. Following is the article.

Before I started researching gun deaths, gun-control policy used to frustrate me. I wished the National Rifle Association would stop blocking common-sense gun-control reforms such as banning assault weapons, restricting silencers, shrinking magazine sizes and all the other measures that could make guns less deadly.

Then, my colleagues and I at FiveThirtyEight spent three months analyzing all 33,000 lives ended by guns each year in the United States, and I wound up frustrated in a whole new way. We looked at what interventions might have saved those people, and the case for the policies I'd lobbied for crumbled when I examined the evidence. The best ideas left standing were narrowly tailored interventions to protect subtypes of potential victims, not broad attempts to limit the lethality of guns.

I researched the strictly tightened gun laws in Britain and Australia and concluded that they didn't prove much about what America's policy should be. Neither nation experienced drops in mass shootings or other gun-related-crime that could be attributed to their buybacks and bans. Mass shootings were too rare in Australia for their absence after the buyback program to be clear evidence of progress. And in both Australia and Britain, the gun restrictions had an ambiguous effect on other gun-related crimes or deaths.

When I looked at the other oft-praised policies, I found out that no gun owner walks into the store to buy an "assault weapon." It's an invented classification that includes any semi-automatic that has two or more features, such as a bayonet mount, a rocket-propelled grenade-launcher mount, a folding stock or a pistol grip. But guns are modular, and any hobbyist can easily add these features at home, just as if they were snapping together Legos.

As for silencers—they deserve that name only in movies, where they reduce gunfire to a soft puick puick. In real life, silencers limit hearing damage for shooters but don't make gunfire dangerously quiet. An AR-15 with a silencer is about as loud as a jackhammer. Magazine limits were a little more promising, but a practiced shooter could still change magazines so fast as to make the limit meaningless.

As my co-workers and I kept looking at the data, it seemed less and less clear that one broad gun-control restriction could make a big difference. Two-thirds of gun deaths in the United States every year are suicides. Almost no proposed restriction would make it meaningfully harder for people with guns on hand to use them. I couldn't even answer my most desperate question: If I had a friend who had guns in his home and a history of suicide attempts, was there anything I could do that would help?

However, the next-largest set of gun deaths—1 in 5—were young men aged 15 to 34, killed in homicides. These men were most likely to die at the hands of other young men, often related to gang loyalties or other street violence. And the last notable group of similar deaths was the 1,700 women murdered per year, usually as the result of domestic violence. Far more people were killed in these ways than in mass-shooting incidents, but few of the popularly floated policies were tailored to serve them.

By the time we published our project, I didn't believe in many of the interventions I'd heard politicians tout. I was still anti-gun, at least from the point of view of most gun owners, and I don't want a gun in my home, as I think the risk outweighs the benefits. But I can't endorse policies whose only selling point is that gun owners hate them. Policies that often seem as if they were drafted by people who have encountered guns only as a figure in a briefing book or an image on the news.

Instead, I found the most hope in more narrowly tailored interventions. Potential suicide victims, women menaced by their abusive partners and kids swept up in street vendettas are all in danger from guns, but they each require different protections.

Older men, who make up the largest share of gun suicides, need better access to people who could care for them and get them help. Women endangered by specific men need to be prioritized by police, who can enforce restraining orders prohibiting these men from buying and owning guns. Younger men at risk of violence need to be identified before they take a life or lose theirs and to be connected to mentors who can help them de-escalate conflicts.

Even the most data-driven practices, such as New Orleans' plan to identify gang members for intervention based on previous arrests and weapons seizures, wind up more personal than most policies floated. The young men at risk can be identified by an algorithm, but they have to be disarmed one by one, personally—not en masse as though they were all interchangeable.

A reduction in gun deaths is most likely to come from finding smaller chances for victories and expanding those solutions as much as possible. We save lives by focusing on a range of tactics to protect the different kinds of potential victims and reforming potential killers, not from sweeping bans focused on the guns themselves.



An article by Jack Hellner titled "On Average, There Is Mass Killing Bigger Than Vegas in Chicago Each Month" was posted at americanthinker.com on Oct. 4, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

There were 762 murders in Chicago in 2016, the most in 19 years. On average, there was mass killing—by different perps—that adds up bigger than the Las Vegas massacre each month. Where is the wall-to-wall coverage?

Chicago has very strict gun laws, with no gun shops in Chicago. The Chicago police and politicians know where the criminals, gangs, and guns are, so why don't they get them off the street? We see more effort to restrain the cops instead of restraining the criminals.

In Chicago and elsewhere, we repeatedly see killings and other serious crimes committed by illegals and legal citizens with long criminal records. What we

have is a catch-and-release program instead of a system that protects the public. We have more concern for the criminals than either the cops or the victims.

Where is the outrage on the nighttime news and the late-night "comedy" shows about the mass killings each month in Chicago? Where was the demand for a discussion during Obama's eight years as to why the strict laws weren't working?

Instead of trying to save the children and others in Chicago at the hands of gangs and other criminals, we had discussions about how bad the police were. We had demands for sanctuary cities to coddle people who willingly violate our laws.

Many mass killings throughout the world occurred in gun-free zones. Why weren't the people safe?

The Nazis took away the guns. Did that make it safer for the citizens, or did millions die at the hands of the tyrant socialists who took away the guns?

Our founding fathers knew what they were doing when they gave us the Second Amendment to protect the people from the tyrants who throughout history have been willing to kill thousands and millions of their people.

So yes, let's have an honest nationwide political discussion.

- We should discuss why the gun crime rate is so much higher in Chicago than Houston, even though Houston has much more lenient gun laws and many gun shops.
- We should discuss why so many mass shootings occur in gun-free zones, since that is what they are supposed to protect against.
- We should honestly discuss black-on-black crime and murders, because that is the cause of most black deaths, not cops or whites.
- We should discuss why so many groups gin up hate on cops, since the significant majority of them do their best to protect the public and reduce crime.
- Let's have an honest discussion about sanctuary cities. Isn't it logical for people to believe they have the right to pick and choose what laws to obey if politicians who took an oath to enforce the laws pick and choose which ones they want to enforce? The majority of the public is against sanctuary cities, so why don't Democrats and reporters who live and die by polls care about those polls?
- We should also be honest about Colin Kaepernick. He kneeled as a protest against cops and to discuss race. When he wore pigs on his socks, he was ginning up hate against cops. He, along with Obama, wants to remake America. It was not about freedom of speech. When reporters, Democrats, other athletes, and Hollywood say it is about unity and freedom of speech, they should be asked about the pigs on the socks.

The protest by Colin wasn't popular, so we got the fantasy that it was about freedom of speech. Then we got the media, politicians, athletes, and others pretending Trump turned it to race. Reporters and others do a lot of pre-

tending about Trump. They were for Hillary, and they hate Trump, and almost all reporting reflects that.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Blacks vs. Police" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 4, 2017. Following is the article.

Let's throw out a few numbers so we can put in perspective the NFL players taking a knee during the playing of the national anthem.

Many say they are protesting against police treatment of blacks and racial discrimination. We might ask just how much sense their protest makes.

According to *The Washington Post*, 737 people have been shot and killed by police this year in the United States. Of that number, there were 329 whites, 165 blacks, 112 Hispanics, 24 members of other races and 107 people whose race was unknown.

In Illinois, home to one of our most dangerous cities—Chicago—18 people have been shot and killed by police this year. In the city itself, police have shot and killed 10 people and shot and wounded 10 others. Somebody should ask the kneeling black NFL players why they are protesting this kind of killing in the Windy City and ignoring other sources of black death.

Here are the Chicago numbers for the ignored deaths. So far in 2017, there have been 533 murders and 2,880 shootings. On average, a person is shot every two hours and 17 minutes and murdered every 12 1/2 hours.

In 2016, when Colin Kaepernick started taking a knee, Chicago witnessed 806 murders and 4,379 shootings. It turns out that most of the murder victims are black. Adding to the tragedy is the fact that Chicago has a 12.7 percent murder clearance rate. That means that when a black person is murdered, his perpetrator is found and charged with his murder less than 13 percent of the time.

Similar statistics regarding police killing blacks versus blacks killing blacks apply to many of our predominantly black urban centers, such as Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, St. Louis and Oakland. Many Americans, including me, see the black NFL player protest of police brutality as pathetic, useless showboating.

Seeing as these players have made no open protest against the thousands of blacks being murdered and maimed by blacks, they must view it as trivial in comparison with the police killings. Most of the police killings fit into the category of justified homicide.

- How much condemnation do black politicians, civil rights leaders and liberal whites give to the wanton black homicides in our cities?
- When have you heard them condemning the very low clearance rate, whereby most black murderers get away with murder?

- Do you believe they would be just as silent if it were the Ku Klux Klan committing the murders?
- What's to blame for this mayhem?

If you ask an intellectual, a leftist or an academic in a sociology or psychology department, he will tell you that it is caused by poverty, discrimination and a lack of opportunities. But the black murder rate and other crime statistics in the 1940s and '50s were not nearly so high as they are now. I wonder whether your intellectual, leftist or academic would explain that we had less black poverty, less racial discrimination and far greater opportunities for blacks during earlier periods than we do today. He'd have to be an unrepentant idiot to make such an utterance.

So what can be done? Black people need to find new heroes.

- Right now, at least in terms of the support given, their heroes are criminals such as Baltimore's Freddie Gray, Ferguson's Michael Brown and Florida's Trayvon Martin.
- Black support tends to go toward the criminals in the community rather than to the overwhelming number of people in the community who are law-abiding.

That needs to end. What also needs to end is the lack of respect for and cooperation with police officers. Some police are crooked, but black people are likelier to be victims of violent confrontations with police officers than whites simply because blacks commit more violent crimes than whites per capita.

For a race of people, these crime statistics are by no means flattering, but if something good is to be done about it, we cannot fall prey to the blame games that black politicians, black NFL players, civil rights leaders and white liberals want to play. If their vision is accepted, we can expect little improvement of the status quo.



"Eye on the World" comment: The following two articles show a difference of opinion between two popular sports' journalists who happen to be black.



An article by Trent Baker titled "FS1's Whitlock: The NFL Isn't the Platform for Players to Protest" was posted at breitbart.com on Oct. 9, 2017. Following is the article.

In a Monday [Oct. 9] appearance on Fox Business Network's "Cavuto: Coast to Coast," Fox Sports 1 personality Jason Whitlock praised Dallas Cowboys owner Jerry Jones for his statement that anybody who kneels for the national anthem "won't play."

"It is long past time for NFL ownership to try to take control of the situation," Whitlock told host Neil Cavuto.

Whitlock argued that the NFL is not the players' platform to make political statements.

"They're in uniform wearing the Dallas Cowboys or the New York Giants uniform. I can't do it on my job, you can't do it on yours. If you work at McDonald's, you can't do it while wearing their uniform. It's long past due for NFL ownership to put their foot down and say, 'Look, guys, we support what you say you're in support of, you just can't do it in uniform during our football game. We have business to conduct here. There's a time and a place for everything.' I think what Jerry said here is very appropriate," Whitlock explained.



An article by Avery Anapol titled "ESPN Commentator Compares Jerry Jones to a Slave Owner" was posted at thehill.com on Oct. 10, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

An ESPN commentator blasted Dallas Cowboys owner Jerry Jones this week, comparing him to a slave owner for his response to national anthem protests in the National Football League.

"The word that comes to my mind, and I don't care who doesn't like me using it, is 'plantation,'" ESPN commentator Michael Wilbon said Monday. "The players are here to serve me, they will do what I want no matter how much I pay them. They are not equal to me. That's what this says to me and to mine."

Jones had threatened to bench players who don't stand for the national anthem, a reprimand praised by President Trump, who has criticized the football protests.

Jones had previously come out arm-in-arm with his team members last month at the height of Trump's feud with the NFL.

Wilbon said the action by Jones was "as phony as a \$3 bill," in light of his new condemnation of the national anthem protests.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Our Broken Moral Compasses" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 11, 2017. Following is the article.

As George Orwell said, "some ideas are so stupid that only intellectuals believe them." Many stupid ideas originate with academics on college campuses.

If they remained there and didn't infect the rest of society, they might be a source of entertainment, much in the way a circus is. Let's look at a few stupid ideas peddled by intellectuals.

During the Cold War, academic leftists made a moral equivalency between communist totalitarianism and democracy. Worse is the fact that they exempted communist leaders from the type of harsh criticism directed toward Adolf Hitler, even though communist crimes against humanity made Hitler's slaughter of 11 million noncombatants appear almost amateurish.

According to Professor R.J. Rummel's research in "Death by Government," from 1917 until its collapse, the Soviet Union murdered or caused the death of 61 million people, mostly its own citizens. From 1949 to 1976, Communist China's Mao Zedong regime was responsible for the death of as many as 78 million of its own citizens.

On college campuses, the same sort of equivalency is made between capitalism and communism, but if one looks at the real world, there's a stark difference.

Just ask yourself: In which societies is the average citizen richer—societies toward the capitalist end of the economic spectrum or those toward the communist end?

In which societies do ordinary citizens have their human rights protected the most—those toward the capitalist end or those toward the communist end? Finally, which societies do people around the world flee from—capitalist or communist?

And where do they flee to—capitalist or communist societies?

More recent nonsense taught on college campuses, under the name of multiculturalism, is that one culture is as good as another.

Identity worship, diversity and multiculturalism are currency and cause for celebration at just about any college. If one is black, brown, yellow or white, the prevailing thought is that he should take pride and celebrate that fact even though he had nothing to do with it. The multiculturalist and diversity crowd seems to suggest that race or sex is an achievement.

That's just plain nonsense.

In my book, race or sex might be an achievement, worthy of considerable celebration, if a person were born a white male and through his effort and diligence became a black female.

Then there's white privilege. Colleges have courses and seminars on "whiteness." One college even has a course titled "Abolition of Whiteness." According to academic intellectuals, whites enjoy advantages that nonwhites do not. They earn higher income and reside in better housing, and their children go to better schools and achieve more. Based upon those socio-economic statistics, Japanese-Americans have more white privilege than white people.

And, on a personal note, my daughter has experienced more white privilege than probably 95 percent of white Americans. She's attended private schools, had bal-

let and music lessons, traveled the world, and lived in upper-income communities. Leftists should get rid of the concept of white privilege and just call it achievement.

Then there's the issue of campus rape and sexual assault. Before addressing that, let me ask you a question. Do I have a right to place my wallet on the roof of my car, go into my house, have lunch, take a nap and return to my car and find my wallet just where I placed it? I think I have every right to do so, but the real question is whether it would be a wise decision.

Some college women get stoned, use foul language and dance suggestively. I think they have a right to behave that way and not be raped or sexually assaulted. But just as in the example of my placing my wallet on the roof of my car, I'd ask whether it is wise behavior.

Many of our problems, both at our institutions of higher learning and in the nation at large, stem from the fact that we've lost our moral compasses and there's not a lot of interest in reclaiming them. As a matter of fact, most people don't see our major problems as having anything to do with morality.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Who Pays What in Taxes?" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 18, 2017. Following is the article.

Politicians exploit public ignorance. Few areas of public ignorance provide as many opportunities for political demagoguery as taxation. Today some politicians argue that the rich must pay their fair share and label the proposed changes in tax law as tax cuts for the rich. Let's look at who pays what, with an eye toward attempting to answer this question: Are the rich paying their fair share?

According to the latest IRS data, the payment of income taxes is as follows.

- The top 1 percent of income earners, those having an adjusted annual gross income of \$480,930 or higher, pay about 39 percent of federal income taxes. That means about 892,000 Americans are stuck with paying 39 percent of all federal taxes.
- The top 10 percent of income earners, those having an adjusted gross income over \$138,031, pay about 70.6 percent of federal income taxes. About 1.7 million Americans, less than 1 percent of our population, pay 70.6 percent of federal income taxes. Is that fair, or do you think they should pay more? By the way, earning \$500,000 a year doesn't make one rich. It's not even yacht money.

But the fairness question goes further.

- The bottom 50 percent of income earners, those having an adjusted gross income of \$39,275 or less, pay 2.83 percent of federal income taxes. Thirty-seven million tax filers have no tax obligation at all. The Tax Policy Center estimates that 45.5 percent of households will not pay federal income tax this year. There's a severe political problem of so many Americans not having any skin in the game.

These Americans become natural constituencies for big-spending politicians. After all, if you don't pay federal taxes, what do you care about big spending? Also, if you don't pay federal taxes, why should you be happy about a tax cut? What's in it for you? In fact, you might see tax cuts as threatening your handout programs.

Our nation has a 38.91 percent tax on corporate earnings, the fourth-highest in the world. The House of Representatives has proposed that it be cut to 20 percent; some members of Congress call for a 15 percent rate. The nation's political hustlers object, saying corporations should pay their fair share of taxes.

The fact of the matter—which even leftist economists understand, though they might not publicly admit it—is corporations do not pay taxes. An important subject area in economics is called tax incidence. It holds that the entity upon whom a tax is levied does not necessarily bear its full burden. Some of it can be shifted to another party. If a tax is levied on a corporation, it will have one of four responses or some combination thereof.

It will raise the price of its product, lower dividends, cut salaries or lay off workers. In each case, a flesh-and-blood person bears the tax burden. The important point is that corporations are legal fictions and as such do not pay taxes. Corporations are merely tax collectors for the government.

Politicians love to trick people by suggesting that they will impose taxes not on them but on some other entity instead. We can personalize the trick by talking about property taxes. Imagine that you are a homeowner and a politician tells you he is not going to tax you. Instead, he's going to tax your property and land. You would easily see the political chicanery. Land and property cannot and do not pay taxes. Again, only people pay taxes. The same principle applies to corporations.

There's another side to taxes that goes completely unappreciated. According to a 2013 study by the Virginia-based Mercatus Center, Americans spend up to \$378 billion annually in tax-related accounting costs, and in 2011, Americans spent more than six billion hours complying with the tax code.

Those hours are equivalent to the annual hours of a workforce of 3.4 million, or the number of people employed by four of the largest U.S. companies—Wal-Mart, IBM, McDonald's and Target—combined. Along with tax cuts, tax simplification should be on the agenda.



An article by Juliet Chung and Anupreeta Das titled "George Soros Transfers \$18 Billion to His Foundation, Creating an Instant Giant" was posted at wsj.com on Oct. 17, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

George Soros, who built one of the world's largest fortunes through a famous series of trades, has turned over nearly \$18 billion to Open Society Foundations, according to foundation officials, a move that transforms both the philanthropy he founded and the investment firm supplying its wealth.

Now holding the bulk of Mr. Soros's fortune, Open Society has vaulted to the top ranks of philanthropic organizations, appearing to become the second largest in the U.S. by assets after the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, based on 2014 figures from the National Philanthropic Trust.

Soros Fund Management LLC's 87-year-old founder now shares influence over the firm's strategy with an investment committee of Open Society. Mr. Soros set up the committee and is its chairman, but it is meant to survive him, people familiar with it said.

A new chief investment officer at the Soros firm is less a trader than an allocator of capital to various internal and external asset managers. Unlike past investment chiefs, the official, Dawn Fitzpatrick, doesn't report to Mr. Soros or others at his firm but to the philanthropy's investment committee.

Mr. Soros doesn't plan to trade the billions that now belong to Open Society, according to the people familiar with the situation. Mr. Soros was trading his own money, held separately within the Soros firm, as recently as last year, when he bet—wrongly, it turned out—that stocks would slump after Donald Trump was elected president.

"It's an ongoing process of migration from a hedge fund toward a pool of capital deployed to support a foundation over the long term," said Bill Ford, a committee member and the chief executive of General Atlantic LLC, a firm that invests in growth-stage companies.

Though the \$26 billion Soros Fund Management was a pioneering hedge fund, it returned outside investors' money several years ago and became a family office—a type of structure, largely free of regulation, that is increasingly popular with wealthy clans.

Mr. Soros began his giving in 1979 and stepped it up to fight communism across Eastern Europe. In 1984, he set up a foundation in Hungary, the country of his birth, that distributed photocopiers to universities and libraries to break the government's hold on information.

Having lived under both communism and a Nazi occupation in Hungary, Mr. Soros hoped to foster "open societies" in places where authoritarian governments held power. He named his foundation after a book by the philosopher Karl Popper, one of his teachers, that defended liberal democracies.

Open Society's activism has sometimes angered nationalist governments, such as the current one in Hungary, which targeted a university Mr. Soros founded and which has run poster campaigns singling him out for his support of refugees. Mr. Soros has urged developed countries in Europe and elsewhere to share the burden of increased migration from conflict-ridden countries. Anti-Soros politicians in Macedonia, Poland and some other European countries have attacked foreign-funded groups, including Open Society, for what they see as outside interference in their affairs.

In the U.S., where Mr. Soros is a major contributor to liberal and Democratic causes, he is a lightning rod for conservatives. Open Society has supported efforts to overhaul immigration policies and the criminal-justice system, including prisons, and funded mentoring programs for black and Latino young men. It has supported activists working on issues raised by the Black Lives Matter movement.

Mr. Soros funded Latino get-out-the-vote efforts last year and donated to largely Democratic district-attorney candidates around the country. A Hillary Clinton supporter, he was an outspoken critic of Mr. Trump, whose campaign cited Mr. Soros in a closing ad as part of a “global power structure” the ad said disadvantaged the working class. After the election, Open Society said it would spend \$10 million to fight hate crimes, a problem Mr. Soros said had been inflamed by the Trump campaign.

In all, Mr. Soros and Open Society have given \$14 billion so far, said a foundation spokeswoman.

When it comes to investments, philanthropic foundations typically focus more on preserving capital than maximizing returns, unwilling to tolerate the losses that can accompany high-risk, potentially high-reward trading. Now that Soros Fund Management’s main client is a philanthropy, several people close to the firm say they expect it to curtail its tradition of large “macro” trades—wagers on the direction of currencies, stocks, commodities or interest rates.

Mr. Soros immigrated to Britain as a youth, studied philosophy and then became a stock trader, before moving to the U.S. and setting up what became Soros Fund Management in 1969.

In a trade that brought him wide attention, he made a giant “short” wager against the British pound in the early 1990s, which paid off when Britain devalued its currency and withdrew from that era’s European Exchange Rate Mechanism. Mr. Soros’s firm earned roughly \$1 billion and he was dubbed the man who broke the Bank of England.

A run of rich annual returns hit a pothole in 2000, when the firm’s flagship Quantum fund lost heavily on cratering technology and biotech stocks. Discord with Mr. Soros over the soured tech bets factored in the departure of his investment chief of 11 years, Stanley Druckenmiller, to whom Mr. Soros credited the idea for the pound trade.

That marked the start of continued change atop the firm as chief investment officers cycled through. Some operations also were rejiggered, which ex-employees said was partly to make way for Mr. Soros’s eldest sons. At one point in 2003 Mr. Soros hired Steven Mnuchin, now U.S. treasury secretary, to run a credit business.

Despite regularly telling others he was retired, Mr. Soros occasionally stepped back into active trading, such as during the financial crisis, when he helped guide his firm to big gains. Former employees say some past investment chiefs bristled at how Mr. Soros inserted himself in operations, judging them critically on what they felt was short-term performance.

The longest-serving investment chief of recent years, Scott Bessent, stopped by Mr. Soros's estate in Southampton, N.Y., one July weekend in 2015 and said he was thinking of leaving to start a hedge fund of his own, adding he would want more authority were he to stay. He didn't get it. Mr. Bessent soon left, ending a strong run of 4 1/2 years with a \$2 billion investment in his new fund from Mr. Soros.

The departure, the fifth by a Soros investment chief in 15 years, coincided with a stepped-up pace of change at the firm. Mr. Soros decided that year to form the Open Society investment committee that now wields power, and his wealth transfers to the philanthropy accelerated around the same time.

That most of his fortune would eventually go to Open Society has long been known, but Mr. Soros previously funded it with annual donations. He plans to give it most of the rest of his wealth in his lifetime or upon his death, said people familiar with the matter, pushing its assets above \$20 billion.

Ms. Fitzpatrick, who began as investment chief in April, is an options trader by background who arrived from UBS Asset Management, where she oversaw teams managing more than \$500 billion in client money across a wide range of strategies.

Her priority isn't making her own trades but moving money as opportunities shift, said people familiar with the Soros firm. They added she is whittling the number of managers given money to invest and is seeking to build a more collaborative approach, such as by linking employee pay more closely to returns of the firm as a whole.

The firm has about \$6 billion in private-equity and related investing, from African cellphone towers to a stake in a restaurant chain called Dinosaur Bar-B-Que. The overseers of this chunk of money report to Open Society's investment committee.

Ms. Fitzpatrick, 47 years old, recalled how one Sunday morning shortly before she started, an unfamiliar number lit up her phone as she was walking out of church with her young daughter. It was Mr. Soros, wanting to share an observation on the markets. "I recognize his number now and pick up on the first ring," she said.

The two speak regularly, with Mr. Soros sharing his view of the markets but so far refraining from interfering in her decisions.

Mr. Soros now spends about half the year on the road in connection with Open Society's work and rarely visits his office at his firm's Manhattan headquarters. He still gets a daily copy of its profit-and-loss statement.



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.”