

Eye on the World

July 14, 2018

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 July 14, 2018.

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 Bani Sapra titled "World's Leading Cave Divers Came Together to Save Trapped Thai Boys" was posted at cnn.com on July 10, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Scores of foreign experts flew into a remote area of northern Thailand to help the Thai Navy SEALs execute a rescue mission that had been called urgent, risky and dangerous.

Divers, engineers, medics and military personnel from all over the world played a crucial role in helping devise a strategy to transport the boys the four grueling kilometers out of a flooded cave.

Thirteen foreign divers joined five Thai Navy divers for the initial rescue Sunday. The team of international experts included the two British divers who originally found the boys on July 2, Richard "Rick" Stanton and John Volanthen.

"Many people are coming," the divers told the boys, as they perched on a rocky ledge deep within the cave, nine days into what would be for some an 18-day ordeal.

The team also included Australian cave-diving medic Dr. Richard Harris, who reportedly canceled his holiday plans after British divers requested his presence at the scene.

Before the first mission Sunday, the Thai Navy SEALs posted a heartwarming picture of three hands clasped together in a show of unity on its Facebook page.

The message alongside it read, “We, the THAI Navy SEALs along with the international diver team, are ready to bring the soccer team home!”

In total, 110 Thai Navy SEALs were deployed to the scene, including off-duty and former members of the elite squad. They lost one of their own on Friday when former Thai Navy Sgt. Saman Kunan died after running out of oxygen in the cave.

His death underscored the risks involved, as teams of two split off to escort each boy out, one sticking close to each child, to ensure he followed the guide ropes. The other swimming behind as a safety measure to ensure everything went as planned.

Danish cave diver Ivan Karadzic, who was stationed at “Camp 6” to assist the rescue divers, told CNN that the divers believed Monday’s operation was “even more smoothly executed,” than Sunday’s.

Alongside volunteers, countries sent their own contingents to Thailand. Seventeen Australian police divers, 36 US military Pacific Command personnel, and six rescue specialists from Beijing joined the rescue efforts.

Australian Federal Police Commissioner Andrew Colvin said, “This is police cooperation at its very best and highlights the strong partnership with our neighbors.”

Jessica Tait, the Public Affairs Officer of the US Air Force echoed the same sentiment, calling the rescue effort “a celebration of humanity.”

“This is a Thai-led, multi-national rescue operation, and what’s fantastic is that you see the US here, the Australians, the Chinese, the British divers, obviously,” she said. “It shows that when militaries train together, it’s for this—it’s for the real world.”

Other volunteers living in Thailand also pitched in to help, including Israeli diver Rafael Aroush. International companies also offered equipment and expertise.

US billionaire entrepreneur Elon Musk flew in to Thailand Monday with “kid-size” submarines which he suggested could help to bring the boys out.

Musk said based on “feedback from Thailand,” the engineers decided to build a tiny sub using a large silver tube meant to be affixed to a SpaceX Falcon 9 rocket.

Musk explained the metal tube would be “light enough to be carried by 2 divers, small enough to get through narrow gaps” in the cave, and “extremely robust.”

The device is also outfitted with oxygen ports and a nose cone to protect it from impact with rocks, according to Musk’s tweets.

In the end, it was the expert divers who carried the boys to safety.



A Reuters article by Dan Williams and Gleb Stolyarov titled "Israel to Russia: Assad's Safe From Us, But Iran Must Quit Syria" was posted at reuters.com on July 11, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu told Russia on Wednesday that Israel would not seek to topple its ally, Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, but Moscow should encourage Iranian forces to quit Syria, a senior Israeli official said.

Netanyahu conveyed the message in talks with Russian President Vladimir Putin, the official said, just hours after Israel shot down what it described as a Syrian drone that had penetrated its airspace, underscoring the frontier's volatility.

Israel has been on high alert as Assad's forces advance on rebels in the vicinity of the Golan Heights, much of which Israel captured from Syria in 1967 and annexed in a move not recognized internationally. Israel worries Assad could let his Iranian and Hezbollah reinforcements entrench near Israeli lines or that Syrian forces may defy a 1974 Golan demilitarization.

Since turning the tide of Syria's civil war by intervening militarily in 2015 on Assad's behalf, Russia has turned a blind eye to scores of Israeli air strikes against Iranian and Hezbollah deployments or arms transfers, while making clear it wanted Assad kept immune.

Israel said a Syrian drone, apparently unarmed and designed for surveillance, entered its airspace and was downed with a Patriot missile near the Sea of Galilee on Wednesday. The interception set off sirens on the Golan and nearby Jordanian border.

Israeli cabinet ministers threatened this week to fire on Syrian forces that enter the Golan buffer zone set up as part of a 1974 U.N.-monitored armistice. The United Nations last month renewed the mandate of its Golan observer force UNDOF and on Wednesday called on all parties to abide by the armistice.

"There should be no military forces in the area of separation other than those of UNDOF," a U.N. spokesman said.

Israel has signaled openness to eventual ties with Assad, a tacit acknowledgement that he is re-consolidating power as he routs Syria's rebels.



An article by Herb Keinon titled "Analysis: The Message in Netanyahu—Putin Meeting" was posted at jpost.com on July 11, 2018. Following is the article.

Many and varied are the reasons Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has an interest in meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin as often as he does—and Netanyahu does meet the Russian leader a lot.

The prime minister's meeting with Putin on Wednesday evening in the Kremlin was the ninth time the two leaders have met since Russia became active militarily in Syria in September 2015.

During this three-year time frame, Netanyahu has met with Putin more than with any other world leader, including US presidents Barack Obama and Donald Trump.

Netanyahu has characterized these meetings as "very important for Israel's national security," and—following Russia's entrance into Syria—the reason is self-evident. Russia is militarily camped out in Israel's backyard, and it is important for the two countries to talk and coordinate so each understands the other's interests, so that they do not clash.

It is no small achievement that, indeed, there has not been any clash—accidental or otherwise—between Russian and Israeli forces in Syria over the last three years.

This is not something that can be taken for granted, something that just happens. Rather, the understanding and cooperation necessary to avoid those clashes have been a direct result from the meetings between the leaders at the top.

These nine meetings have ensured that Israel knows what Russia's vital interests are in Syria, that Russia understands the vital concerns of Israel, and that both countries steer clear of harming what is of critical importance to the other.

That's why the meetings are important for Netanyahu, and these are among the reasons that they are important for Putin as well.

But for Putin, there is more: he is using Netanyahu's visits to send a message to various audiences. This is also why—of late—Netanyahu's visits to Russia have been very high-profile.

Inviting Netanyahu to Moscow when the eyes of the world are on the capital because of the World Cup is a high-profile visit. Inviting him to Moscow in May to sit with him and review the parade in Red Square marking the 1945 victory over Nazi Germany is a very high-profile visit.

This is not Netanyahu secretly arriving in Amman for a meeting with Jordanian King Abdullah II, far from the cameras. This is the prime minister and Putin meeting in the full glare of the cameras for the whole world—and all the Russian people—to see, and doing so time and time again.

What message is Putin trying to send with these meetings?

First and perhaps least important in the Russian president's mind—though not insignificant—is the message to his own people.

After four years of being sanctioned and basically blackballed diplomatically by the West for his invasion and annexation of Crimea, Putin's meetings with Netanyahu show the Russian people that Moscow is still a very significant player which can't be ignored. Sure, Russia might have been drummed out

of the G8, which has reverted to being the G7, but its counsel and favors are sought after by leading international figures.

As odd as it may sound, Netanyahu gives Putin a degree of legitimacy that the Russian leader lost to a large degree in the West with his Crimean adventure.

Then there is the message these visits send to the Americans.

Syria and the Middle East will obviously be a major topic of conversation at Putin's summit with Trump next week in Helsinki.

Meeting with Netanyahu just days before, and prior to the unveiling by the administration of its long-awaited blueprint for Mideast peace, is Putin's way of reminding Washington that he and Netanyahu are on close terms, that regional issues are being discussed between them, and that Moscow cannot be left out of any broader regional plan that the Americans might unveil.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, is the message that Putin standing alongside Netanyahu sends to the Iranians.

Russian and Iranian interests in Syria are far from identical, and Moscow has let the Iranians know on more than one occasion that it would like them to leave Syria.

The meeting with Netanyahu, the closeness between the two, is a subtle hint to the Iranians that if they do not accede to Russia's demands—something that is by no means a given—Russia may give Israel a freer hand to operate in Syria than it has been given up until now.

The meetings between Putin and Netanyahu have become part of the message, but so, too, are the events that come directly before or after the meetings.

Within hours of Netanyahu's return from Israel last May, Israel struck hard at Iranian positions in Syria, after Iran fired missiles at the Golan, in a retaliatory action for a previous raid attributed to Jerusalem.

That timing was obviously not coincidental, and it beggars belief to think such an action was not discussed in the Kremlin just hours before it took place.

So, too, this week's attacks at the T4 air base, also attributed to Israel, should not be divorced from Wednesday's meeting.

The timing of these alleged actions sends an unmistakable message to the Iranians: Russia is not standing in the way of the Israeli actions.



An article by Jessie Yeung titled "Australian Experiment Wipes Out Over 80% of Disease-Carrying Mosquitoes" was posted at cnn.com on July 10, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

In an experiment with global implications, Australian scientists have successfully wiped out more than 80% of disease-carrying mosquitoes in trial locations across north Queensland.

The experiment, conducted by scientists from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) and James Cook University (JCU), targeted *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes, which spread deadly diseases such as dengue fever and Zika.

In JCU laboratories, researchers bred almost 20 million mosquitoes, infecting males with bacteria that made them sterile. Then, last summer, they released over three million of them in three towns on the Cassowary Coast.

The sterile male mosquitoes didn't bite or spread disease, but when they mated with wild females, the resulting eggs didn't hatch, and the population crashed.

"The invasive *Aedes aegypti* mosquito is one of the world's most dangerous pests," said CSIRO Director of Health and Biosecurity Rob Grenfell in a statement, describing the experiment as a victory.

"Although the majority of mosquitoes don't spread diseases, the three most deadly types—the *Aedes*, *Anopheles* and *Culex*—are found almost all over the world and are responsible for around (17%) of infectious disease transmissions globally."

The successful experiment offers a potential new solution against diseases which infect millions every year.

Many mosquito-spread diseases are difficult to treat. Some don't have effective vaccines, pesticides can be unsustainable, and methods such as clearing standing water are inefficient against mosquito breeding rates.

The Zika virus is an infamous example. Its explosive outbreak in 2015 infected millions worldwide, causing babies to be born with neurological disorders. Researchers raced to develop a vaccine, and many are still conducting trials.

An *Aedes aegypti* mosquito in a laboratory at the University of El Salvador, in San Salvador.

An *Aedes aegypti* mosquito in a laboratory at the University of El Salvador, in San Salvador.

Although the process used in the experiment, called the Sterile Insect Technique, has been around since the 1950s, it has never been used for mosquitoes like the *Aedes aegypti*.

"We learned a lot from collaborating on this first tropical trial and we're excited to see how this approach might be applied in other regions where *Aedes aegypti* poses a threat to life and health," Kyran Staunton from James Cook University said in a statement.

Scientists in the Cairns region of Australia have also used similar techniques replace populations with mosquitoes that couldn't spread infections, according to ABC News.

This CSIRO-JCU experiment, however, aimed to eradicate those populations altogether, working in partnership with Verily, a health research organization owned by Google parent Alphabet.

Since the *Aedes aegypti* is an invasive species native to Africa, wiping them out in Australia wouldn't do much ecological damage in the country.

"The main ecological impact would be to restore the ecosystem to how it was before the mosquitoes invaded," according to Verily.

The experiment has been limited to north Queensland for now, but Verily may hold further field trials, the organization said.



"Eye on the World" comment: The following list of articles consists of headlines of extra articles, which are considered international. The articles were not posted, but the headlines give the essence of the story.

■ An article titled "Diver Who Helped Thailand Rescue Says the Main Focus is to Keep Boys From Panicking" was posted at yahoo.com on July 8, 2018.

■ An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "As NATO Summit Begins, Trump Says Allies 'Must Pay More,' the US 'Must Pay Less' " was posted at cnsnews.com on July 10, 2018.

■ An article by David Wainer, Jonathan Ferziger and Donna Abu-Nasr titled "There Are Fears of New Conflicts at One of Israel's Quietest Border" was posted at bloomberg.com on July 11, 2018.

■ An article by Anne Applebaum titled "Brexit Turned Out to Be Harder Than They Thought—So the Brexiteers Are Quitting" was posted at washingtonpost.com on July 9, 2018.

■ An article by Tom DiChristopher titled "OPEC's Oil Output Jumps in June As Saudi Arabia Opens the Taps to Tame Crude Prices" was posted at cnbc.com on July 11, 2018.



An article by Jessica Summers titled "U.S. is Set to Become World's Top Oil Producer, Government Says" was posted at bloomberg.com on July 11, 2018. Following is the article.

The U.S. government sees oil production further climbing next year even amid transportation logjams in the country's most prolific shale play.

The Energy Information Administration [EIA] sees U.S. crude output averaging 11.8 million barrels a day in 2019, up from its 11.76 million barrel a day estimate in the June outlook.

"In 2019, EIA forecasts that the United States will average nearly 12 million barrels of crude oil production per day," said Linda Capuano, Administrator of the EIA. "If the forecast holds, that would make the U.S. the world's leading producer of crude."

U.S. crude output has remained above the 10-million-barrel a day mark since February. That's while Saudi Arabia told OPEC it pumped about 10.5 million barrels of crude a day last month as the kingdom sought to cap rallying prices by ramping up output, according to people familiar with the matter.

Concerns linger over the worsening bottleneck in the biggest U.S. shale region, the Permian Basin, and how that might affect domestic output in the second half of the year.

Due to limited pipeline transportation in the region, production may start to slow in the area, according to Scott Sheffield, the chairman of Pioneer Natural Resources Co. "We will reach capacity in the next 3 to 4 months," he said in June.

The EIA left its average domestic output forecast for this year unchanged at 10.79 million barrels a day, above the 1970 record of 9.6 million a day, according to the agency's Short-Term Energy Outlook released on Tuesday. Its global crude production forecast for next year was raised to 102.54 million barrels a day from a previous forecast of 102.21 million a day. The agency's world demand growth estimate for 2019 was lowered.



An article by Michelle Malkin titled "Jahi's Life Mattered" was posted at michellemalkin.com on July 4, 2018. Following is the article.

Amid all the raging political headlines and hyperventilating tweets of the Summer of Resistance, a searing ember of news stopped me in my tracks this week.

Jahi McMath has passed away.

I never had a chance to meet the young California teen, but her fight for life gripped me three years ago and was never far from my mind or heart—especially as my own daughter, the same age as Jahi, battled her own health crisis.

Do you remember Jahi? Medical experts declared her "brain dead" after a routine tonsillectomy gone wrong. Children's Hospital Oakland pushed to

have all life-sustaining medical treatment terminated; the professionals predicted quick deterioration. California declared Jahi legally “brain dead.”

But Jahi’s mother, professional nurse Latasha “Nailah” Winkfield, refused to accept their verdict. As a parent, caregiver and believer in Christ, Winkfield was compelled to protect her child. With the help of the pro-life Schiavo Foundation, Winkfield moved with her daughter to a long-term care facility in New Jersey.

Medical ethics scholar Wesley Smith visited Jahi with the Schiavo Foundation’s Bobby Schindler 10 months ago and reported: “At the time of the tragedy, I believed . . . that Jahi was, indeed, dead. But I now have strong doubts. It’s nearly four years later, and Jahi’s body still has not broken down . . . She has experienced no visible bodily decline . . . Disabled is not dead.”

Dr. Alan Shewmon, professor emeritus of pediatrics and neurology at the University of California, Los Angeles, reviewed nearly 50 videos of Jahi moving her fingers on command last year and wrote in a court declaration that Jahi was “a living, severely disabled young lady, who currently fulfills neither the standard diagnostic guidelines for brain death nor California’s statutory definition of death.”

And a team of Harvard researchers recently reported that over the past five years, Jahi was indeed growing, digested food, had menstrual cycles, healed wounds and fought off infections.

“We would say that Jahi’s parents were far from crazy in believing their daughter to still be biologically alive,” Dr. Robert Truog, director of the Harvard Center for Bioethics, concluded.

The changed tune of many “experts” came too late for Jahi’s family, which had been fighting in court to bring her back to California.

After undergoing several surgeries for intestinal problems, Jahi succumbed to excessive bleeding and liver failure after an operation. Jahi will finally head home to Oakland this week, where the family’s lawyer says her brain will be preserved for further study.

With all the roar these days of keeping families together, why is there so little media attention to the plight of American families of brain-injured children who’ve been forced to separate by medical elites making bright-line mortality judgments based on murky diagnostic criteria for what constitutes life?

Also suffering out of the selective media spotlight: Children with rare illnesses ripped from their homes in medical kidnappings by arrogant medical professionals and child welfare bureaucrats who scoff at parental sovereignty and autonomy.

Jahi’s life and death inspired other families of disabled children to fight back.

Jahi’s life and death raised awareness of patients’ rights, living wills, durable powers of attorney, “do not resuscitate” orders, revocable trusts and advance directives.

Jahi's life and death resonated beyond ideology, race and class. I'll not forget the Instagram image of Jahi's mom clasping her daughter's hand at her hospital bedside—an enduring symbol of hope, suffering, resilience and abiding love.

Jahi McMath mattered. She defied her California death certificate. She humbled the experts. She brought joy to her loved ones. Her heart and brain may have stopped, but the light she brought in her short time on earth will not be extinguished.



An article by Patrick Buchanan titled "Is a Trump Court in the Making?" was posted at townhall.com on July 9, 2018. Following is the article.

If Mitch McConnell's Senate can confirm his new nominee for the Supreme Court, President Donald Trump may have completed the capture of all three branches of the U.S. government for the Republican Party.

Not bad for a rookie.

And the lamentations on the left are surely justified.

For liberalism's great strategic ally and asset of 60 years, the judicial dictatorship erected by Earl Warren and associates, may be about to fall.

Judicial supremacy may be on the way out.

Another constitutionalist on the court, in the tradition of Antonin Scalia, could ring down the curtain on the social revolution the court has been imposing since the salad days of Chief Justice Earl Warren.

Among the changes Warren's court and its successors succeeded in imposing: The de-Christianization of all public institutions in America. The social war of the 1970s over forced busing for racial balance in the public schools. The creation, ex nihilo, of new constitutional rights, first to an abortion, and then to homosexuality and same-sex marriage.

But while the confirmation of a new Trump justice may bring an end to the revolution, it will return power to where it belongs in a constitutional republic, with elected legislators and elected executives.

There will not likely be any sudden and radical rollback of changes wrought in six decades. For some of those changes have become embedded in the public consciousness as the new normal, and will endure.

Roe v. Wade may be challenged. But even if overturned, states like New York and California, which had liberalized abortion laws before Roe, are not likely to re-criminalize it.

Affirmative action, however, racial discrimination against white males to promote diversity, may be on the chopping block.

Why did it take until Trump to restore constitutionalism to the Supreme Court, when the Warren Court had been a blazing issue since the 1950s and Republicans held the presidency for 28 years from 1968 to 2016, and had managed to elevate 12 justices?

Answer: Every GOP president save Bush II, has appointed justices who grew to believe the court had a right to remake America to conform to their image of the ideal liberal democracy. And they so acted.

Said Ike ruefully on his retirement: Two of my worst mistakes are sitting up there on the Supreme Court.

The two were Warren, who, as California's governor, had pushed to put Japanese-Americans in concentration camps in World War II, and William Brennan, the most radical justice to sit in over half a century.

Nixon came to office committed to rein in the court by naming "strict constructionists." Yet three of the four justices he named would vote for *Roe v. Wade* in 1973. Harry Blackmun, whom Nixon rushed onto the bench after his Southern nominees Clement Haynsworth and G. Harrold Carswell were trashed and rejected, became the author of *Roe*.

Nixon's fourth nominee, William Rehnquist, was his best, a brilliant jurist whom Reagan himself would elevate to chief justice.

Gerald Ford's sole nominee, John Paul Stevens, confirmed 97-0 in the Senate, turned left soon after his confirmation to join Blackmun.

Reagan named Sandra Day O'Connor, the first woman, and Scalia.

But when his effort to elevate Judge Robert Bork failed, he turned to Anthony Kennedy of California, whose seat Trump is filling today.

Over 30 years, Kennedy's vote proved decisive in 5-4 decisions to uphold *Roe*, to discover homosexuality as a constitutional right, and to raise same-sex unions to the legal level of traditional marriage.

George H.W. Bush's first choice was David Souter, who also turned left to join the liberal bloc. Bush I got it right on his second try in 1991, naming the constitutionalist Clarence Thomas.

As for George W. Bush, he chose John Roberts as Chief Justice to succeed Rehnquist and then Sam Alito as associate justice.

Thus, of 15 justices Republican Presidents have named since World War II, five—Warren, Brennan, Blackmun, Stevens and Souter—became liberal activists. Kennedy and Sandra Day O'Connor, both Reagan choices, became swing justices and voted with the court's liberals on critical social issues.

Democratic presidents have done far better by their constituents.

Of seven justices named by LBJ, Clinton and Obama, every one—Thurgood Marshall, Arthur Goldberg, Abe Fortas, Ruth Ginsburg, Stephen Breyer, Elena Kagan, Sonia Sotomayor—turned out to be predictably and consistently liberal.

Clearly, the advisers to George W. Bush and President Trump looked back at the successes and the failures of previous GOP presidents, and have done a far better job of vetting nominees. They reached outside for counsel.

It was Trump's 2016 pledge to draw his nominees to the high court from a list of 20 judges and scholars supplied by the Federalist Society that reassured conservatives and helped him unite his party and get elected.

On the issue of judicial nominees and justices to the Supreme Court, Trump has kept his word.

And the next Supreme Court may one day be called the Trump Court.



An article by Max Augros titled "Some Conservatives Criticize Kavanaugh" was posted at cnsnews.com on July 11, 2018. Following is the article.

Several leading conservatives and libertarians strongly criticized President Donald Trump's nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to replace Associate Justice Anthony Kennedy on the Supreme Court, with some describing Kavanaugh as the "Bush pick" and a judge who is not like Antonin Scalia or Clarence Thomas.

■ On Tuesday, the American Family Association [AFA], one of the leading conservative pro-life and pro-family Christian organizations in the country, issued a press release opposing Kavanaugh.

The AFA said it is "deeply concerned about how he might ultimately rule on issues related to abortion and religious liberty."

The AFA added that they "have no plans to fight President Trump on this nomination."

■ Libertarian Fox & Friends panelist Judge Andrew Napolitano also expressed his concerns about the nomination, affirming his belief that Kavanaugh was the "swamp pick."

Napolitano stated on Tuesday that he was "disappointed in the president because this is not the type of person he said he would pick. Justice [Neil] Gorsuch was. [Brett Kavanaugh] is at the heart and soul of the D.C. establishment against whom the president railed."

■ In an interview with CNN's Chris Cuomo on Monday night, former Sen. Rick Santorum (R-Penn.) asserted that the president failed to "energize the base with this pick."

Kavanaugh is “the establishment pick. He was the Bush pick,” Santorum said. “It just seems like, you know, Trump in this case just bowed to the elite in Washington and I think that’s going to rub a lot of people the wrong way.”

■ On his nationally syndicated radio talk show Tuesday, host Mark Levin strongly disapproved of Brett Kavanaugh’s decision to legally characterize the financial penalties of Obamacare’s individual mandate as a tax.

“You have to assume that Kavanaugh would have voted with Roberts” on Obamacare, Levin said. “He is not Scalia; he is not Thomas; he is not Alito; and in this case, he wasn’t even Kennedy. So we’ll see. The conservatives on the judiciary committee politely and legitimately need to pursue this. This is a big deal.”

President Donald Trump announced his nomination of Kavanaugh on Monday. The White House will look for the Senate to confirm and appoint the president’s nominee in time for the Supreme Court’s next term, which begins on Oct. 1.



An article by Jon Levine titled “ ‘Morning Joe’ Praises Brett Kavanaugh: ‘Not a Wild Judge Jeanine Pirro Pick’ ” was posted at thewrap.com on June 10, 2018. Following is the article.

The set of “Morning Joe” offered a warm review of Judge Brett Kavanaugh, President Donald Trump’s pick to replace the retiring Justice Anthony Kennedy on the Supreme Court.

In the opening minutes of Tuesday’s show, the regulars on set took turns praising the Bush-era judge who has been a fixture in D.C. for more than a decade.

“The truth of the matter is that where there are places progressives will disagree on guns, abortion and presidential power. This is not a wild Judge Jeanine Pirro pick as some were fearing,” said Willie Geist.

“This is an eminently qualified guy—and again you can disagree with his positions on certain issues—but this is a guy who is qualified for this job.”

“Senate Democrats were going to put up a fight whoever this was. We know that that fight is coming. They already talked about that last night,” he added.

“He’s such a mainstream pick,” Joe Scarborough said. “It is hard to paint him as a wild-eyed ideologue.”

Mike Barnicle added that it would please Susan Collins and other wavering pro-life Republicans, former RNC chief Michael Steele said Kavanaugh’s history as a former altar boy gave them an instant connection.

The Kavanaugh announcement puts to rest a week of speculation about who President Trump would tap to replace Kennedy, who has served on the high court for 30 years.

Trump, a former reality television star, kept the tension going until the final moments, and refused to give anyone around him a straight answer on who the final pick was. News only leaked out minutes before the announcement after Kavanaugh's parents were spotted in the audience at the White House.



An article by Ann Coulter titled "Kavanaugh Threatens the Left's Right to Cheat" was posted at anncoulter.com on July 11, 2018. Following is the article.

The fact that the media responded to the nomination of a Supreme Court justice by obsessively covering Paul Manafort, Michael Flynn, Russia and NATO proves that Trump has checkmated them with Brett Kavanaugh.

Liberals know they can't stop Kavanaugh's confirmation, so they'd just as soon not hear any news about it at all. Please cheer us up with stories about Paul Manafort's solitary confinement!

But there was one very peculiar reaction to the nomination. The nut wing of the Democratic Party instantly denounced Kavanaugh by claiming that his elevation to the high court would threaten all sorts of "rights."

Sen. Cory Booker, D-N.J., tweeted: "Our next justice should be a champion for protecting & advancing rights, not rolling them back—but Kavanaugh has a long history of demonstrating hostility toward defending the rights of everyday Americans."

Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., tweeted: "If Brett Kavanaugh is confirmed to the Supreme Court it will have a profoundly negative effect on workers' rights, women's rights and voting rights for decades to come. We must do everything we can to stop this nomination."

If only these guys could get themselves elected to some sort of legislative body, they could pass laws protecting these rights!

Wait, I'm sorry. These are elected United States senators. Of all people, why are they carrying on about "rights"? If senators can't protect these alleged "rights," it can only be because most Americans do not agree that they should be "rights."

That's exactly why the left is so hysterical about the Supreme Court. They run to the courts to win their most unpopular policy ideas, gift-wrapped and handed to them as "constitutional rights."

What liberals call "rights" are legislative proposals that they can't pass through normal democratic processes—at least outside of the states they've already flipped with immigration, like California.

Realizing how widely reviled their ideas are, several decades ago the left figured out a procedural scam to give them whatever they wanted without ever having to pass a law. Hey! You can't review a Supreme Court decision!

Instead of persuading a majority of their fellow citizens, they'd need to persuade only five justices to invent any rights they pleased. They didn't have to ask twice. Apparently, justices find it much funner to be all-powerful despots than boring technocrats interpreting written law.

Soon the court was creating "rights" promoting all the left's favorite causes—abortion, criminals, busing, pornography, stamping out religion, forcing military academies to admit girls and so on.

There was nothing America could do about it.

OK, liberals, you cheated and got all your demented policy ideas declared "constitutional rights." But it's very strange having elected legislators act as if they are helpless serfs, with no capacity to protect "rights."

It's stranger still for politicians to pretend that these putative "rights" are supported by a majority of Americans. By definition, the majority does not support them. Otherwise, they'd already be protected by law and not by Ruth Bader Ginsburg's latest newsletter.

On MSNBC, Sen. Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass., said people storming into the streets and making their voices heard about Kavanaugh is "the remarkable part about a democracy."

Actually, that isn't democracy at all. Liberals don't do well at democracy. Why don't politicians run for office promising to ban the death penalty, spring criminals from prison or enshrine late-term abortion? Hmmm . . . I wonder why those "I (heart) partial-birth abortion!" T-shirts aren't selling?

Unless the Constitution forbids it—and there are very few things proscribed by the Constitution—democracy entails persuading a majority of your fellow Americans or state citizens to support something, and then either putting it on the ballot or electing representatives who will write it into law—perhaps even a constitutional amendment.

Otherwise, these "rights" whereof you speak are no more real than the Beastie Boys' assertion of THE RIGHT TO PARTEEEEEEEEE!

Gay marriage, for example, was foisted on the country not through ballot initiatives, persuasion, public acceptance, lobbying or politicians winning elections by promising to legalize it.

No, what happened was, in 2003, the Massachusetts Supreme Court suddenly discovered a right to gay marriage lurking in the state's 223-year-old Constitution—written by the very religious John Adams. (Surprise!)

After that, the people rose up and banned gay marriage in state after state, even in liberal bastions like Oregon and California. The year after the Massachusetts court's remarkable discovery, gay marriage lost in all 11 states where it was on the ballot.

Everywhere gay marriage was submitted to a popular vote, it lost. (Only one state's voters briefly seemed to approve of gay marriage—Arizona, in 2006—but that was evidently a problem with the wording of the initiative, because two years later, the voters overwhelmingly approved a constitutional ban on gay marriage.)

Inasmuch as allowing people to vote resulted in a resounding "NO!" on gay marriage, liberals ran back to the courts. Still, the public rebelled. The year after the Iowa Supreme Court concocted a right to gay marriage, voters recalled three of the court's seven justices.

A handful of blue state legislatures passed gay marriage laws, but even in the Soviet Republic of New York, a gay marriage bill failed in 2009.

And then the U.S. Supreme Court decided that was quite enough democracy on the question of gay marriage! It turned out that—just like the Massachusetts Constitution—a gay marriage clause had been hiding in our Constitution all along!

Conservatives could never dream of victories like this from the judiciary. Even nine Antonin Scalias on the Supreme Court are never going to discover a "constitutional right" to a border wall, mass deportations, a flat tax, publicly funded churches and gun ranges, the "right" to smoke or to consume 24-ounce sugary sodas.

These are "constitutional rights" every bit as much as the alleged "constitutional rights" to abortion, pornography, gay marriage, transgender bathrooms, the exclusionary rule and on and on and on.

The only rights conservatives ever seek under the Constitution are the ones that are written in black and white, such as the freedom of speech and the right of the people to keep and bear arms.

Mostly, we sit trembling, waiting to see what new nonexistent rights the court will impose on us, contravening everything we believe.

So when you hear liberals carrying on about all the "rights" threatened by Kavanaugh, remember that by "rights," they mean "policy ideas so unpopular that we can't pass a law creating such rights."



"Eye on the World" comment: The following list consists of headlines of extra articles about Brett Kavanaugh. The articles were not posted, but the headlines give the essence of the story.

■ An article by Melanie Arter titled "McConnell: Dems 'Preemptively' Oppose Trump SCOTUS Nominee Before Nominee is Even Named" was posted at cnsnews.com on July 9, 2018.

■ An article by Laretta Brown titled "Abortion Groups Protest Kavanaugh, Launch Ad Campaign Targeting Vulnerable Republicans" was posted at townhall.com on July 10, 2018.

■ An article by Melanie Arter titled "NAACP: Kavanaugh 'A Dangerous Ideologue' With 'Extreme Views on Civil Rights' " was posted at cnsnews.com on July 11, 2018.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Shooting Ourselves in the Foot" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on July 11, 2018. Following is the article.

The Canadian government, lining the pockets of its dairy producers, imposes high tariffs on American dairy imports. That forces Canadians to pay higher prices for dairy products.

For example, Canadians pay \$5.24 for a 10.5-ounce block of cheddar. In Washington, D.C., that same amount of cheddar sells for \$3.64. Canadians pay \$3.99 for a 1-pound container of yogurt.

In Washington, D.C., you can get nearly twice as much yogurt for a little over \$4. It's clear that the Canadian government's tariffs screw its citizens by forcing them to pay higher prices for dairy products.

What should the U.S. response be to Canada's screwing its citizens?

If you were in the Trump administration, you might propose imposing tariffs on soft wood products that Americans import from Canada—in other words, retaliate against Canada by screwing American citizens. Canadian lumber—such as that from pine, spruce and fir trees—is used in U.S. homebuilding. Guess what tariffs on Canadian lumber do to home prices. If you answered that they raise the cost and American homebuyers are forced to pay higher prices, go to the head of the class.

This retaliation policy is both cruel and not very smart.

It's as if you and I were in a rowboat out at sea and I shot a hole in my end of the boat. What should be your response?

If you were Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross or Secretary of the Treasury Steven Mnuchin, you might advise retaliating by shooting a hole in your end of the boat.

If I were president, I'd try to persuade officials of other countries not to serve special producer interests by forcing their citizens to pay higher prices. But if they insisted, I'd say, "Go ahead, but I'll be damned if I'll do the same to Americans!"

The ruse used to promote producer interests through tariff policy is concern about our large trade deficit. It's true that we have a large current account trade deficit. However, that's matched exactly by a very large capital account surplus.

Translated, that means Americans buy more goods from other countries than they buy from us; that's our current account deficit. But other countries find our investment climate attractive and invest more in the U.S. than we invest in other countries; that's our capital account surplus.

Have you ever wondered why foreigners are willing to invest far more money in Texas and California than they are willing to invest in Argentina and Venezuela?

Do you think it's because they like North Americans better than they like South Americans?

No. We've always had an attractive investment climate, and we've had current account deficits and capital account surpluses throughout most of our nation's history (<http://tinyurl.com/jczqrhu>).

In fact, the only time we had a sustained current account trade surplus was during the Great Depression, when we had a surplus in nine out of 10 years, with 1936 being the lone exception.

Let's delve a bit into the politics of trade tariffs.

Whom do we see spending the most resources lobbying for tariffs on foreign steel and aluminum?

Is it American users of steel and aluminum, such as Harley-Davidson and John Deere?

Or is it United States Steel Corp. and Alcoa?

Of course it's U.S. Steel and Alcoa. They benefit from tariffs by being able to sell their products at higher prices. Harley-Davidson and John Deere lose by having to pay higher prices for their inputs, steel and aluminum, and their customers lose by having to pay higher product prices.

There's a lot of nonsense talk about international trade, which some define as one country's trading with another. When an American purchases a Mercedes, it does not represent the U.S. Congress' trading with the German Bundestag.

It represents an American citizen's engaging in peaceable, voluntary exchange, through intermediaries, with a German auto producer. When voluntary exchange occurs, it means that both parties are better off in their own estimation—not Trump's estimation or General Motors' estimation.

I'd like to hear the moral case for third-party interference with such an exchange.



"Eye on the World" comment: The following list of articles consists of headlines of extra articles, which involve the United States. The articles were not posted, but the headlines give the essence of the story.

Finances

- An article by Roberto Baldwin titled "Ford is Saying Goodbye to Cars [except for Mustangs] And Hello to Batteries" was posted at yahoo.com on July 9, 2018.
- An article by Kurt Schlichter titled "[Politicians] Love Socialism Because They Want to Take Your Stuff And Enslave You" was posted at townhall.com on July 9, 2018.
- An article by Patrick Gleason titled "Millionaires Flee California After Tax Hike" was posted at forbes.com on July 6, 2018.
- An article by Scott Cohn titled "Texas is CNBC's Top State for Business in America This Year" was posted at cnbc.com on July 10, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- An article by Katie Pavlich titled "Elizabeth Warren Just Lied About Why Kids at the Border Are Being Given DNA Tests" was posted at townhall.com on July 6, 2018.
- An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled "Does Alien Caught at Border Have Right to Bear Arms?" was posted at cnsnews.com on July 11, 2018.

Comments about weapons

- An article titled "Pistol-Packing Waitress Pulls Gun From Her Apron When Man Attacks Co-Worker [in Milwaukee]" was posted at yahoo.com on July 9, 2018.
- An article by Amy Swearer titled "Data Shows Firearms Used to Protect Life and Property More Often Than Used to Commit Crimes" was posted at cnsnews.com on July 10, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

- An article by John Scotto titled "Hey, Never Trumps, Where Would We Be With Hillary Clinton Right Now?" was posted at americanthinker.com on July 7, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

- An article by Max Greenwood titled "Mueller Asks Court for 100 More Blank Subpoenias Ahead of Manafort Trial" was posted at thehill.com on July 11, 2018.

News about the media

- An article by Glenn Greenwald titled "MSNBC Does Not Merely Permit Fabrications Against Democratic Party Critics; It Encourages And Rewards Them" was posted at theintercept.com on July 8, 2018.
- An article by Richard Howell titled "MSNBC Kavanaugh Coverage: 27 Guests, Zero Conservatives" was posted at newsbusters.org on July 10, 2018.

General interest

- An article by Chloe Aiello titled "What Data Scandal? Facebook's Stock Notches An All Time High, Shrugging Off User Privacy Woes" was posted at cnbc.com on July 8, 2018.
- An article by Max Augros titled "Study: Fewer U.S. Teens Using Facebook, But 45% Say They Use the Internet 'Almost Constantly' " was posted at cnsnews.com on July 11, 2018.



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."