

Eye on the World

Aug. 4, 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 August 4, 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).



A Reuters article by Sinan Abu Maizar and Nidal Al-Mughrab titled “Israeli Police Raid Al-Aqsa Mosque After Clashes; Two Dead in Gaza” was posted at reuters.com on July 27, 2018. Following is the article.

Israeli troopers entered Jerusalem’s al-Aqsa mosque, the third-holiest shrine in Islam, and carried out arrests on Friday [July 27] in what police described as a pursuit of youths who had lobbed rocks and fireworks during clashes with its forces outside.

The rare raid, on a site that is an emblem of Palestinians’ statehood hopes and a frequent catalyst of their conflict with Israel, came as medics in Gaza said Israeli army gunfire killed two people—including a boy—during a weekly border protest.

A police spokesman said the troopers were sent into al-Aqsa after suspects who had barricaded themselves in after running confrontations in the surrounding compound, during which masked men launched firecrackers from handheld canisters.

There was no immediate word of any violence in the mosque, whose older male worshippers said they had been allowed to exit after being searched. Witnesses later saw around 20 younger men detained by police, and said mosque prayers later resumed.

Police put the number of arrests at 24, and said four of its officers were injured in the melee. Muslim authorities said dozens of people were hurt by Israeli police stun grenades.

"The continued Israeli attacks against occupied Jerusalem will increase tensions and will drag the region into a religious war that we have long warned against," Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas's office said in a statement.

Al Aqsa compound, also revered by Jews as a vestige of their two ancient temples, was among areas Israel captured in a 1967 war with Jordan, which retains a stewardship role at the mosque.

In Gaza, medics said a man and a 14-year-old boy were killed and dozens wounded by army fire, bringing to 154 the Palestinian death toll during demonstrations launched on March 30 to demand rights to land lost to Israel in the 1948 war of its founding.

The dead man, 43-year-old Ghazi Abu Mustafa, was brought to a hospital tent staffed by his wife, a medic, who collapsed when she discovered him among the casualties, her colleagues said.

The Israeli military said troops opened fire to hold off thousands of Palestinians, some of whom threw rocks and rolled burning tyres at the border fence in attempts to sabotage it.

Israel says its lethal tactics are needed to prevent armed infiltrations and accuses Gaza's Islamist Hamas rulers of encouraging the disturbances to distract from their governance problems under an Israeli-Egyptian blockade. Hamas denies this.

While several foreign powers have censured Israel's handling of Gaza, the United States has echoed its blaming of Hamas.

The four months of Gaza tensions have also seen cross-border shelling and gunfire exchange. Over the last week, an Israeli soldier was killed and another wounded by what the army said were Gaza snipers, and seven Hamas gunmen died in air strikes.

Israel has lost tracts of farmland and forests to fires set by kites and helium balloons, laden with incendiary material and flown over from Gaza. The Israelis have responded by preventing the entry of non-essential commercial goods to Gaza.

In the occupied West Bank, another territory where Palestinians want independence, a teenaged Palestinian knifed a Jewish settler to death and wounded two others on Thursday [July 26] before being shot and killed. Locals said that Israeli troops, raiding the assailant's village on Friday [July 27], wounded a man.



A Reuters article by Michael J. Armstrong titled "Commentary: Israel-Gaza's Risky Brinkmanship" was posted at reuters.com on Aug. 1, 2018. Following is the article.

Israel and Gaza are increasingly alternating between ceasefires and gunfire. This violent instability—the worst in four years— isn't surprising, as each side inches closer to war while hoping their provocations will make the other side back down.

It's a classic form of brinkmanship—and understanding this strategy means understanding just how easy it is for the situation to unintentionally spin out of both sides' control.

Relations between Israel and the Gaza Strip have become increasingly violent since the Palestinian "Great March of Return" protests began in March. Since then, Palestinian authorities say that 157 Gazans have been killed and thousands injured.

The firepower employed by both parties has steadily escalated while purported truces have crumbled more quickly. The ceasefire announced May 30 perhaps seemed promising, but those of July 14 and July 21 seemed like aspirations rather than expectations. After the last one, a senior U.N. official said another war had appeared "just minutes away."

This skirmishing basically represents bargaining moves by Israel and Gaza over the terms of their relationship. But their demands regarding military security, economic activity, and prisoner exchanges appear mutually incompatible. Each therefore is hoping brinkmanship will force the other to make concessions.

Brinkmanship is a powerful but risky strategy.

The U.S. successfully used it against the Soviet Union during the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. President John F. Kennedy avoided nuclear war by ordering a naval "quarantine" of Cuba and responding selectively to Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev's demands. They reached a deal for removing Soviet missiles from the island, but not before the Soviets shot down an American spy plane and U.S. forces went to DEFCON 2—a state of alert meaning war was imminent.

The strategy was less successful during America's 1981 air traffic controller strike, when neither the controllers' union nor President Ronald Reagan would back down. Over 11,000 controllers lost their jobs and flights were disrupted for months.

The Israel-Gaza situation, like those two earlier examples, displays three key features.

- First, if the two sides don't eventually reach agreement, they'll suffer a disaster both wish to avoid.

Neither the Netanyahu government nor Hamas want a replay of 2014's Operation Protective Edge rocket war.

While Israel's Iron Dome interceptors and civil defenses would likely limit its casualties from Hamas' estimated 12,000-plus rockets, another war could cost Israel billions of dollars in military expenses and lost economic activity, just as Protective Edge did.

On the Gaza side, Israeli air and ground assaults could devastate Gaza's already-weak infrastructure and topple its Hamas government.

■ Brinkmanship's second feature is both sides deliberately (albeit perversely) inching toward the mutual disaster.

Each proclaims its determination and willingness to approach the disaster's edge. Each hopes the mutual threat will cause the other to back down first.

Israeli and Gazan firepower escalations demonstrate this progression.

In April Gaza militants began using incendiary kites and balloons to burn Israeli crops and forests. In May, they fired 188 rockets and mortar shells, the first significant barrage since 2014. In June explosives-laden balloons joined the fire-carrying ones. July saw an estimated 200 rockets being fired from the Gaza Strip in one day and sniper fire killing the first Israeli soldier there in four years.

Israel's responses likewise intensified. Its military initially dealt with arson kites by intercepting them with drones. In June it began firing warning shots near groups launching the kites. It started targeting them directly in July, resulting first in injuries and then a death. Airstrikes, such as the nearly 50 tons of bombs dropped July 14, were initially used only after rocket attacks. But they've since become common retaliation for kites too.

Rhetoric from both sides has similarly escalated. Last week Hamas claimed its forces are on "highest alert." An Israeli cabinet minister said the country is making "great strides" toward launching a military operation. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu called the situation a "test of will."

■ The third feature of brinkmanship, particularly relevant here, is a risk of losing control.

Both sides may fully intend to stop short of disaster. But they know it's increasing likely they'll accidentally stumble into the abyss.

This may already be happening with Gaza. While Hamas runs the government, it has limited control over Palestinian Islamic Jihad and other militant groups. Islamic Jihad reportedly started the May rocket barrage, with Hamas only belatedly joining-in.

The July 21 ceasefire fell apart July 25 when another Israeli soldier was wounded by a sniper described as being affiliated with "rogue" militants. The next day Islamic Jihad unilaterally declared the ceasefire over and nine more rockets or shells were fired from Gaza toward Israel.

The Israelis could likewise misstep. Statements like the Minister of Education's call for a military operation might begin as mere posturing. But they could become politically impossible to walk back later. Simple mistakes could also occur. An Israeli bomb falling short, for example, could flatten a crowded civilian residence instead of an empty Hamas workshop.

These risks are amplified by hair-trigger retaliations that make little allowance for misunderstandings.

After the second soldier was shot, Israeli tanks and planes promptly attacked Hamas installations and killed three Palestinians. Gaza militants responded by firing nine rockets. That triggered seven more Israeli airstrikes. The entire escalation cycle took only a day.

Israel and Gaza may yet pull back from the brink. But absent some miracle, the violent instability seems likely to continue, leaving the two sides only one incident away from war.



An article by Jackson Richman titled "Christians United for Israel Summit; Harsh Rhetoric on Iran, Hamas, Palestinian Authority" was posted at christianpost.com on July 26, 2018. Following is the article.

In addition to showcasing a major pro-Israel constituency, Christians United for Israel's 13th annual summit, which took place from July 23-24, emphasized the contrast between the current White House administration and previous ones, with Israel's ambassador to the United States hailing U.S. President Donald Trump as the best ally Israel has ever had.

"Over the decades, Israel has been blessed with strong supporters in Congress on both sides of the aisle. We have been blessed with presidents, Democrat and Republican alike, who were steadfast friends of Israel," Israel's Ambassador to the United States Ron Dermer said in front of a packed, energetic and flag-waving crowd in Washington on Monday. "We have been blessed with Cabinet secretaries and senior officials who were stalwart champions of the U.S.-Israel alliance."

"But there has never been a U.S. administration more supportive of Israel than the Trump administration—frankly, it is not even close," continued Dermer. "From President Trump to Vice President [Mike] Pence to Secretary [of State Mike] Pompeo, from [National Security Adviser] Ambassador [John] Bolton to [U.S.] Ambassador [to the United Nations Nikki] Haley to [U.S.] Ambassador [to Israel David] Friedman, from [Senior Adviser to the President] Jared Kushner to [Middle East envoy] Jason Greenblatt to Sarah Sanders, this is an administration that sees Israel as an ally and that treats Israel as an ally."

The Iranian regional and nuclear threat, America's moving its embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem and defunding U.S. assistance to the Palestinian Authority were the main issues addressed by Dermer and other speakers at the event, which was attended by approximately 5,000 people, according to CUFI co-executive director Shari Dollinger.

Other speakers on Monday included Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu (live through satellite), retired British Col. Richard Kemp and Haley.

Haley, who was presented with CUFFI's "Defender of Israel" award, elicited the loudest cheers from the crowd for her defense of Israel at the United Nations, which Dermer denounced for its anti-Israel bias.

"Washington may be a swamp, but the U.N. is a cesspool—a cesspool of anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism," he said.

Haley joined the chorus and, as she has done at the United Nations itself, denounced the organization for its rejection of the embassy move, its condemnation of Israel's reaction to violent Hamas protests along the Gaza border and for the makeup of the Human Rights Council [UNHRC], with countries including Sudan and Venezuela, which notoriously violate human rights. The United States withdrew from the UNHRC in June.

"The United States will not just block the anti-Israel measures, we will shine a light on those that are responsible," said Haley. "There won't be any free passes for those who bully Israel at the U.N."

"Sometimes, we are winning at the U.N. through persuasion," she added. "But there are other times when we just have to say, 'Enough is enough.' "

Stuart Force, whose son Taylor Force, 28, was murdered in Tel Aviv by Palestinian terrorists in 2016, also spoke at the summit.

Taylor Force's death prompted the passage last March of the Taylor Force Act, which was signed by the president as part of the \$1.3 trillion omnibus bill. The measure defunds most U.S. assistance to the Palestinian Authority for rewarding terrorists and their families—a longtime policy known as "pay to slay."

Tuesday's speakers included Sens. John Cornyn (R-Texas), Tom Cotton (R-Ark.), Ted Cruz (R-Texas) and Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.). Also at the podium were Reps. Doug Lamborn (R-Colo.), Mark Meadows (R-N.C.) and Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-Wash.).

The speakers applauded the president for withdrawing from the 2015 Iran nuclear deal and moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem. Additionally, Graham, Cruz and Cornyn each announced legislation they have or plan to be introduced.

Graham, who was a major player behind the Taylor Force Act, said he would propose "Round Two of the Taylor Force Act" to punish the "ministers who actually carry out the new Palestinian law that incentivizes more young people to commit terrorism, not less" amid the Palestinians reportedly increasing its payments to terrorists and their families.

"We're going to consider them agents of terrorism," he added. "We're going to name names."

Cruz announced a bill that would sanction members of terrorist groups, like Hamas, which use civilians as human shields. The proposed measure already has bipartisan support.

In addition to co-sponsoring legislation to provide military assistance to Israel, Cornyn touted a bipartisan bill that targets Iranian airline Mahan Air,

which he said works with the country's Quds Force, "an elite unit of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard and Hezbollah as well."

"This airline is the primary way which terrorist personnel and weapons are spread to places like Syria and Lebanon, presenting a clear danger to the security of Israel," stated Cornyn. "That's an unacceptable condition that my bill changes, and I hope we'll pass this bill with your support in a larger package soon."

CUFI is an organization founded in 2006 by Pastor John Hagee and currently boasts more than 4 million members. Its mission, according to its website, is "to provide a national association through which every pro-Israel church, parachurch organization, ministry or individual in America can speak and act with one voice in support of Israel in matters related to Biblical issues."

Dollinger, who is Jewish, told JNS that the Christian characteristic of her organization is crucial. "We're a Christian organization, first and foremost," she said. "We are about faith, and we are about the fact we are united Christians for Israel—it's in the title."

As part of his remarks, Dermer said "the long history of the relationship between Christians and Jews is a history riddled with anti-Semitism and persecution, suspicion and distrust."

"This has dramatically changed over the past few decades," he continued. "Today, there is unwavering support for the Jewish state among millions of devout Christians. That is a blessing for which Israel is deeply grateful."

"This change didn't happen on its own. It happened because a few bold leaders in the Christian community helped make it happen," added the ambassador. "Leaders like [Pastor] John Hagee, who for nearly 40 years has been building bridges between Christians and Israel. When it comes to supporting Israel, Pastor Hagee didn't join the bandwagon. He drove the bandwagon."

Hagee, who emceed the event, reiterated the importance of Christian support for the Jewish state. "You often hear the phrase 'Christian anti-Semitism,'" he said. "There is no such thing as Christian anti-Semitism. Christianity is driven by the love of G-d."

"Anti-Semitism is driven by hatred," the pastor added. "Call them pagans, call them secularists, call them anything. They're not Christians."

Hagee concluded with fighting words, quoting former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill: "You ask what is our aim. I can tell you in a word. Our aim is victory, no matter the struggle, no matter the cost. Victory is our aim because without victory there is no survival."



An article by Ted Cruz titled "Israel is Our Friend" was posted at jpost.com on July 30, 2018. The article is from a speech delivered by Mr. Cruz at the 13th

annual Christians United for Israel (CUFI) Summit in Washington, D.C. on July 23-24. Following is the article.

We would be remiss today if we did not at least pause and reflect what a difference a couple of years can make. What a difference Ambassador Nikki Haley makes. What a difference Ambassador David Friedman makes.

It was just November and December of 2016, the end of the previous administration, when we saw the United Nations passing Resolution 2334 condemning—with the voice of the international community—condemning Israel as illegal occupiers. Declaring the Jewish quarter of Israel illegally occupied. Declaring the Western Wall illegally occupied. Done with the acquiescence and energetic support of the Obama administration.

It was only a year and a half ago, we had the secretary of state, John Kerry, describing Israel as an apartheid state. It was only a couple of years ago that we had members of Congress boycotting Prime Minister Netanyahu as he addressed a joint session of Congress. But oh, how the world has changed.

This has been a year of celebration. Just a few months ago, I was so incredibly privileged and humbled to be in Jerusalem for the opening of the United States Embassy.

Many of you were there on the 70th anniversary of the creation of the modern State of Israel. As we stood there dedicating that embassy, fulfilling a promise that we had seen presidents from both parties make.

We'd seen Republicans make that promise, we'd seen Democrats make that promise, and yet, when it came time for action, neither one followed through. But this year, America did follow through.

The joy of being in Jerusalem visiting with Israelis, visiting with Americans, particularly those of the generation that went through the Holocaust. The survivors that were still there that you would visit had tears in their eyes, as they would look at you and say, "I never ever thought this day would come."

THE DECISION to move the embassy was a perilous debate. Within the Trump administration, it caused division. Within the administration you had certain voices at State, at Defense, that argued, "If we move the embassy, it will be provocative. If we move the embassy, the enemies of Israel will be unhappy." As compared to their usual state of happiness.

For a year and a half, a great battle waged within the administration as I and many other voices made the case to the president that this is the right thing to do. In every other nation on Earth, our embassy is not in some other city, it is not in some other place, it is in the capital. And in Israel, the capital is the one and undivided and eternal city of Jerusalem.

The argument on the other side was, "Well, this may make it harder to achieve peace." Now listen, every one of us longs to see peace in the Middle

East. But what the men and women here gathered understand, is that the obstacle to peace is not the people of Israel. Nobody wants peace more than the men and women of Israel because it is their babies who are being murdered as a result of the war.

I do not believe we will have peace so long as two conditions exist.

- The Palestinian leadership refuses to acknowledge Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State.
- The Palestinian leadership continues to embrace terrorism as a public policy to be advanced.

With those preconditions in place, peace I believe is impossible until those are changed.

I'll tell you the case that I made to the president and to the administration, is that I said whatever the chances of peace are, in the near term in my view, moving the embassy increases the chance of peace.

Why is that? Because it will be seen by our friends and our enemies alike as saying that America stands with Israel. Period. The end.

When I encouraged the president, I said, "You know, when we move the embassy, we can expect our allies to disagree. We can expect them to disagree loudly, we can expect that they will believe, for domestic political reasons, that they have to do so. But at the same time, I believe quietly, they will be deeply relieved."

Because what I believe the Egyptians, and the Saudis, and the Jordanians will say when we move the embassy, is, "You know, a president and an administration with enough backbone to move the embassy may well also have enough backbone to stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons."

I've joked: retroactively, Barack Obama may well have deserved the Nobel Peace Prize, because he managed to do something that nobody had been able to do for millennia that unifies the Arabs and the Israelis.

All he had to do is talk about giving the Iranians nuclear weapons and suddenly, everyone else said, "Are you out of your mind?"

So that day of celebration, when we opened the embassy, was a new page in history. I do not believe it was coincidental that the very same week we opened the embassy, is the very same week that the United States finally withdrew from the disastrous Obama Iranian nuclear deal.

That, too, was a major battle within the administration. Indeed, the battle lines were much the same. State and Defense, the same forces that were saying not to move the embassy, were the forces saying we had to keep the deal. And the same forces on the other side were making the case directly to the president that this deal is a disaster, that there is no greater threat to the safety and security of the United States of America, and there is no greater threat to the safety and security of Israel than the Ayatollah Khomeini with nuclear weapons.

I'm reminded of a political cartoon I saw some years ago, that had a picture of the Ayatollah saying, "Death to America" and it had John Kerry responding, saying, "Can I meet you halfway?"

The reason for the threat is simple. When a religious zealot and extremist, when the Ayatollah stands and leads the mobs in chanting, "Death to America" and "Death to Israel," I believe him.

I don't think those are simply empty rhetoric. I don't think he's simply looking for something else to put on the next bumper sticker.

The so-called "Father of the Iranian nuclear program," a nuclear scientist, who has since gone to meet his maker, some say with an expedited trip provided by the Mossad, had written into his last will and testament the following. He said when he died that he wished to be written on his tombstone, "Here lies a man who sought the annihilation of Israel."

I want you to think for a second about the deep, bilious hatred, the loathing, the rage, that your entire life, everything you've done on this planet, you wish to be summed up, you want to be remembered for eternity for one thing: hatred of the Jews.

When the Ayatollah chants "Death to America" and "Death to Israel."

When he describes Israel as the "Little Satan" and America as the "Great Satan."

If history teaches us anything, it is that when somebody tells you they want to kill you, believe them.

The shift we've seen in the Middle East when the Obama Iran deal was signed, \$150 billion flowing into the Ayatollah and the Mullahs, because what bad could happen?

With Ayatollahs with billions of dollars, you'll recall \$150 billion flown in the dead of night on pallets of unmarked cash.

By the way, there's a legal term for that, that's called "indicia" of wrongdoing.

Let me give you another example. Let's suppose you were selling your house and I came to buy your house. We went to the closing and I said, "You know what, I don't have a mortgage company. I don't even have a cashier's check to buy your house. I've got in the trunk two duffle bags of rolled up twenty-dollar bills with rubber bands around them."

Now, would that maybe raise some red flags on your part?

Who exactly is this guy and why are we meeting again at two in the morning behind the Circle K?

That's essentially what the Obama Iran deal was: we'll meet you behind the Circle K with \$1.7 billion in unmarked cash. And what happens when you give terrorists billions of dollars? Here's a crazy concept: they use those billions of dollars to kill people.

We've seen in the last couple of years Iran getting more and more aggressive. We've seen Iran moving Iranian soldiers into Syria. We've seen Iran sending drones into Israel. We've seen Iran funding radical Islamic terrorists in Yemen. Throughout Africa, throughout the Middle East, even throughout Latin America. But what a difference cutting off the cash makes.

I, for one, am thankful that we have a president and an administration that understand a simple and powerful truth: that Israel is our friend and that the Ayatollah Khomeini should never ever be allowed to have nuclear weapons.

That they will stop, or we will stop them. There are battles that will continue. There are battles against BDS. There are battles against human shields, including the legislation I'm introducing this week to go against human shields.

These battles will continue for some time, but I want this morning for us just to take a moment and pause and reflect and say thank you, God.

Thank you for the tremendous improvement we have seen, and thank you for the faithfulness of the brothers and sisters gathered here who pray for Israel, who pray for America, and who lift us up. God Bless you.

At Passover every year we say, "Next year in Jerusalem." Well, I am so happy to be able to say, "This year in Jerusalem." God bless you.



"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 by Damien Cowley titled "For First Time in a Decade, Italian-Flagged Vessel Returns Migrants to Libya; Open Borders Activists Outraged" was posted at thegatewaypundit.com on Aug. 1, 2018.
 - An article by Paul Vieira and Kim Mackrael titled "Trudeau Faces Growing Doubts Over Canada's Refugee Policy" was posted at wsj.com on Aug. 3, 2018.
 - An article by Corey Charlton titled "Ecuador President Says Wikileaks' Julian Assange Must Leave Embassy But Wants Assurances He Won't Be Executed" was posted at thesun.co.uk on July 27, 2018.
 - An article by Herman Lugo Galicia titled "Donkey Herds Are Dwindling As Hungry Venezuelans Slaughter Them for Food" was posted at miamiherald.com on July 27, 2018.
 - An article titled "Venezuela's President Admits Economy Has Failed" was posted at france24.com on July 31, 2018.
 - An article by Nicole Winfield and Rodney Muhumza titled "After Decades of Silence, Nuns Talk About Abuse by Priests" was posted at apnews.com on July 27, 2018.

- An article titled “Pope Blasts Supermarket of Idols of Money, Drugs, Vanity” was posted at apnews.com on Aug. 1, 2018.
- An article titled “Phone Calls Losing Ground to Chat Apps” was posted at theweek.co.uk on Aug. 2, 2018.
- An article by Alex Lockie titled “The Bin Laden Family Says Osama’s Youngest Son Went to Afghanistan to ‘Avenge’ His Father” was posted at business-insider.com on Aug. 3, 2018.
- An article titled “U.S. Goes Ahead With Tax on Canadian Newsprint” was posted at detroitnews.com on Aug. 2, 2018.



An article by Ann Coulter titled “The ACLU Won’t Rest Until Every Illegal Gets In” was posted at anncoulter.com on Aug. 1, 2018. Following is the article.

After all the wailing about the children streaming across our wide-open, wall-less border, there was very little media interest in the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on Tuesday on this very subject.

Knowing facts could interfere with their showboating displays of compassion.

Among the facts journalists might have learned is that, although the Constitution technically gives Congress the power to write laws, it turns out our immigration laws are written by the ACLU.

The children clamoring across our border can’t be held for more than 20 days. This isn’t because Congress, after hearings, debate and negotiation, passed a law. The 20-day rule was the ACLU’s innovation.

The Alien Civil Liberties Union brought endless lawsuits, resulting in a 1997 “settlement agreement” between two parties who appeared to be opposed, but were actually on the same side: the pro-open borders Janet Reno Justice Department versus the pro-open borders ACLU. No, no—not the briar patch, ACLU! Anything but that!

The 20-day limit is unfortunate because, from capture to final order, an immigration proceeding takes 30 to 40 days.

- Illegals who are detained at the border cost the taxpayers \$1,600 to remove.
- By contrast, releasing illegals, even under the much-celebrated “alternatives to detention” (ankle monitors and “community supervision”), costs U.S. taxpayers \$75,000 per removal—and most of them don’t ever get removed. By some estimates, 90 percent don’t even show up for their hearings.

The biggest spike in illegal border crossings came after Dolly Gee, an Obama-appointed federal district court judge in California, announced in 2015 that

not only “children,” but also any adults traveling with them, had to be released into our country after 20 days.

I wonder if Judge Gee’s order created any sort of incentive. Drag some unfortunate child across thousands of miles of desert and ... YOU WIN! You’re in and will most likely never be caught and deported. Arrive alone and you will be detained and probably removed after 30 days.

How insane was that ruling? It was too much even for the Ninth Circuit, which ruled that the free pass applies only to “the children.” (Child defined as “anyone who claims to be under 18 years old.”) Drug dealers, coyotes and scam artists would have to wait for Rachel Maddow to cry about SEPARATING FAMILIES! for their free passes.

If the kids can’t be held for longer than 20 days and the parents can’t be separated from their (alleged) children, then the only option is to release both adults and children into the U.S. As Matthew Albence, an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) official, said, Judge Gee effectively imposed “catch and release” on the entire country.

Members of Congress pass laws to stop child trafficking—and then the ACLU comes in and creates a gigantic incentive to engage in child trafficking.

The parents are so broken up about being separated from “their” children that hundreds of them have gone home without them. Reams of articles hysterically claimed that the evil Trump administration tricked these super-involved parents into signing forms they couldn’t understand!

- “Migrant parents were misled into waiving rights to family reunification, ACLU tells court”—The Washington Post, July 26 2018
- “Immigrant Parents Unwittingly Signed Away Right to Reunite With Children, Lawyers Say”—Huffington Post, 07/25/2018
- “‘Why Did You Leave Me?’ The Migrant Children Left Behind as Parents Are Deported’ ”—The New York Times, July 27, 2018

Nowhere will you read that the form the parents signed was written by the ACLU. Liberals don’t care about kids. They want to wreck our country.

More than 700,000 illegals who were caught sneaking into our country—not the 40 million we didn’t catch—are now living here free. Really free: free health care, free housing, free food. Last year, with a force less than half the size of the New York City Police Department, ICE removed more than 100,000 illegal aliens with criminal convictions.

At \$75,000 per removal and assuming 80 percent are ordered removed, it will cost taxpayers approximately \$42 billion to remove the 700,000 illegals the ACLU made us release, forget the ones we never caught in the first place.

That’s just procedural costs—not the costs in welfare, schooling, vaccinations, dental care, drunk driving accidents, MS-13 violence and the ongoing heroin epidemic.

How much would that wall cost, again?



An article titled "Dem Senator Doesn't Understand That People Here Illegally Broke the Law" was posted at ntknetwork.com on July 31, 2018. Following is the article.

Sen. Mazie Hirono (D-HI) seemed to not understand at a Senate hearing on Tuesday that undocumented immigrants broke the law when they unlawfully crossed the U.S. border.

"These individuals are [at detention facilities] because they have broken a law," ICE official Matthew Albence told Hirono.

"They have broken a law only as deemed so by the president," Hirono argued.

Albence then cited the exact statute, passed by an act of Congress, that criminalized unauthorized border crossings. "Illegal entry is both a criminal and civil violation," he explained. "They have broken the law."

The ICE official added that even prior to Trump's executive order, Border Patrol had prosecuted illegal border-crossers with criminal penalties.

"I'm confused," Hirono responded. Albence then offered additional clarification.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Some Ideas to Think About" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Aug. 1, 2018. Following is the article.

Poverty is no mystery, and it's easily avoidable. The poverty line that the Census Bureau used in 2016 for a single person was an income of \$12,486 that year.

For a two-person household, it was \$16,072, and for a four-person household, it was \$24,755. To beat those poverty thresholds is fairly simple. Here's the road map: Complete high school; get a job, any kind of a job; get married before having children; and be a law-abiding citizen.

How about some numbers?

A single person taking a minimum wage job would earn an annual income of \$15,080. A married couple would earn \$30,160. By the way, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, less than 4 percent of hourly workers in 2016 were paid the minimum wage. That means that over 96 percent of workers earned more than the minimum wage. Not surprising is the fact that among both black and white married couples, the poverty rate is in the single digits. Most poverty is in female-headed households.

Socialist Sen. Bernie Sanders' presidential campaign garnered considerable appeal from millennials. These young people see socialism as superior to free market capitalism.

Capitalism doesn't do well in popularity polls, despite the fact that it has eliminated many of mankind's worst problems, such as pestilence and gross hunger and poverty.

One of the reasons is that capitalism is always evaluated against the nonexistent, non-realizable utopias of socialism or communism. Any earthly system, when compared with a utopia, will not fare well.

Indeed, socialism sounds good but, when practiced, leads to disaster. Those disasters have been experienced in countries such as the USSR, China, most African nations and, most recently, Venezuela. When these disasters are pointed out, the excuse is inadequacies of socialist leaders rather than socialism itself.

For the ordinary person, free market capitalism, with all of its warts, is superior to any system yet devised to deal with our everyday needs and desires.

Here are a couple of questions.

Does an act clearly immoral when done privately become moral when done collectively?

Does legality or majority consensus establish morality?

Before you answer, consider that slavery was legal; South African apartheid was legal; the horrendous Stalinist, Nazi and Maoist purges were legal. Clearly, the fact of legality or a majority consensus cannot establish morality.

You might ask, "If you're so smart, Williams, what establishes morality?" That's easy, and you tell me when I make the wrong step.

My initial premise is that we own ourselves. You are your private property, and I am mine. Self-ownership reveals what's moral and immoral. Rape is immoral because it violates private property. So is murder and any other initiation of violence. Most people probably agree with me that rape and murder are immoral, but what about theft? Some Americans would have a problem deciding whether theft is moral or immoral.

Let's first define what theft is. A fairly good working definition of theft is the taking by force of one person's property and the giving of it to another to whom it does not belong.

Most Americans think that doing that is OK as long as it's done by government. We think that it is OK for Congress to take the earnings of one American to give to another American in the form of agricultural subsidies, business bailouts, aid for higher education, food stamps, welfare and other such activities that make up at least two-thirds of the federal budget.

If I took some of your earnings to give to a poor person, I'd go to jail. If a congressman did the same thing, he'd be praised.

People tend to love a powerful government. Quite naturally, a big, powerful government tends to draw into it people with bloated egos, people who think they know more than everyone else and have little hesitance in coercing their

fellow man. Nobel laureate Friedrich Hayek explained why corruption is rife in government: "In government, the scum rises to the top."



An article by David Marcus titled "Why Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez Could Be the Left's Donald Trump" was posted at thefederalist.com on July 25, 2018. Following is the article.

I'll never forget the moment I realized something bizarre was going on with American politics. It was February 2016 and I was at a Donald Trump rally in Manchester, New Hampshire. I wandered around the floor of the arena, chatting with attendees, and then it happened.

A young man, maybe about 26, told me, "For me it's a choice between Trump and Bernie Sanders." Gobsnacked, I asked him to repeat his statement. Wouldn't you know, I had heard him correctly.

On paper few figures appear more dissimilar than Trump and New York Democratic primary upset winner Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, the self-described democratic socialist, but in terms of political style and temperament, the two have much in common. In fact, there is much overlap between these two neophyte candidates.

Both Trump and Ocasio-Cortez won primaries against the establishment in parties that didn't want them. Both used social media as the primary tool to do an end-run around those party establishments. Both ride a wave of celebrity that propels them to larger audiences and relevance, and both espouse views that quite recently would have been disqualifying but no longer are.

Let's consider each of these points in their turn.

■ The power of social media

In the few scant years it has existed, no politician, or possibly even entity of any kind, has used social media as successfully as Trump. He used it to achieve what most people thought was impossible.

This mainline into the bloodstream of a body politic jonesing for quick fixes made short work of his profound GOP opponents, who, as P.G. Wodehouse would have put it, appeared to lack ginger and the stuff that wins.

Now, in 2018, it is Ocasio-Cortez who is using social media to take down the elite in her party. It was in no small part a viral video spread on Facebook and Twitter that most helped her take down the powerful Rep. Joe Crowley. Since that victory and her rise to prominence, her social media use has only grown more sophisticated and powerful.

Yesterday proved a prime example of Ocasio-Cortez's social media strategy. In reaction to a satirical video from conservative outlet CRTV, which swapped

clips from another TV show to make her appear to say things she didn't say, her response looked familiar.

In Trumpian style, she took the attack and hit back harder, making her critics look pathetic and weak. She won the exchange in a knockout. This is Trump Social Media 101, a course that, had it been offered at Trump University, could have made that institution rival Princeton.

■ The cult of fame

To her credit, Ocasio-Cortez is in many ways a self-made woman with a good, if exaggerated, backstory.

So is Trump. Yes, he was born well off, but he was the one who invented his playboy real estate magnate persona, eventually becoming a reality TV star, then our president. He was the outer borough kid who made good in Manhattan among the elite. Now that outer borough resident is Ocasio-Cortez.

Ocasio-Cortez didn't have the advantage of being a reality TV star, but she had the next best thing. She's a young woman with an attractive brand that draws attention and accolades. Our society is the house in which female charisma can live.

As we found out, the going can be tough for a qualified older woman. This may sound cynical or even sexist, but there is a reason our top movie stars have always been mainly men in their 50s and women in their 20s. This is not to take away from Ocasio-Cortez's success, merely to say she has some marketable advantages, like Trump.

■ Acceptable discourse

Time and again during the 2016 campaign, Trump said things that most people thought were disqualifying: his remarks about David Duke, suggestion that judges of Mexican descent can't be fair and honest, and eventually his thoughts on what famous men are allowed to grab.

But so desperate, it turned out, were the people for change that norms were abandoned and he paid little political price.

Not so long ago, praising socialism was a similar third rail in American politics. The idea that the federal government would become a kind of parent of the people, paying for them and setting the rules of the household, was a nonstarter.

Yet the genocidal horrors of Marxism and mortal threat of the Soviet Union seem like old timey ideas now. That was then. Maybe it will work this time.

To conservatives who laugh and say, "Go ahead, progressives, vote for the socialist," I'd urge caution. Plenty of progressives said, "Go ahead, conservatives, vote for the guy with the arguably racist rhetoric."

As the old saying goes, who's laughing now?

The greatest fear conservatives should have about Ocasio-Cortez is that she will normalize Marxism in a way that even Sanders never could have dreamed of.

Sander's socialism is also something of a different breed, one that at least nominally places value on individual rights. Ocasio-Cortez has not been clear about any fidelity to the Constitution and its protections. She may well believe in a central government that makes Sander's vision look like an Ayn Rand novel.

As I learned in New Hampshire, what feels like several decades ago now, the appeal of Trump, Sanders, and Ocasio-Cortez is based less in a belief that they have the answers, and more in a belief that the status quo is broken beyond repair and we need something—anything—new. This is a dangerous attitude that makes little sense given the peace, prosperity, and wellbeing most Americans enjoy today.

Ocasio-Cortez is 28 years old and is about to win a congressional seat in a district more blue than Billie Holiday at a funeral. She could hold the seat for half a century. The question is whether she will bring her party along with her into the philosophy of Marx. There is a good chance she can.

Trump's great success is good reason for us to worry she can be very successful doing that nationally.



An article by David Catanese titled "Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's Risky Road Show" was posted at usnews.com on July 27, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

The socialist wunderkind from the Bronx is attempting to leverage her overnight political stardom for other underdogs in far-flung places around the country.

Abdul El-Sayed is currently running third in Michigan's Democratic primary for governor.

The 33-year-old former Detroit health commissioner is young, progressive, Muslim and an undeniable underdog.

But he also happens to be one of eight candidates around the country who have earned the blessing of Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, the Democratic Socialist wunderkind from New York City who convulsed the political world by pulling off the upset of the year in her late June primary defeat of Rep. Joe Crowley.

In the month since her win, Ocasio-Cortez has gotten too big to stay put in the Bronx. She's become an instant celebrity of the Democratic resistance as well as a prime pinata for right wing adversaries seizing on her every utterance.

And now her show is on the road, as she lends support to a brigade of start-up insurgents she hopes to help lift into her fold. Last weekend, she trekked from Kansas to Missouri to rally for three congressional candidates. This weekend, she'll hit four cities in Michigan to campaign for El-Sayed.

The idea behind her national tour is to make her moment more than an anomaly in a single liberal enclave where she's heavily favored to become the youngest woman ever elected to Congress. It's to try to show that a rising tide of unrepentant liberalism can flourish from the surfing beaches in Hawaii to the corn fields in Kansas.

Ocasio-Cortez's double-digit victory was surely powerful, but there's healthy reason to wonder whether it's transferable.

Just because a slate of candidates crave the Ocasio-Cortez endorsement, doesn't mean they are embracing her label.

While they largely sign on with her tenets of Medicare for all, a \$15 hourly minimum wage and swearing off corporate money, many of the Ocasio-Cortez candidates identify as Democratic Socialists.

Socialism is a lightning rod term for many Americans that conjures up images of Karl Marx and is often convoluted with communism and the loss of individual liberty.

"Name one country that socialism has ever worked!" said Meghan McCain on a tirade against the ideology on *The View* this week.

As Ocasio-Cortez gains breakneck notoriety, she is attracting withering scrutiny. Her honeymoon phase won't last forever. It might even already be over.

- In an interview on PBS' *Firing Line*, she attributed low unemployment numbers to everyone working two jobs and when challenged by host Margaret Hoover on her assertion that Israel is occupying Palestine, she threw her hands up and admitted, "I am not the expert on geopolitics on this issue."

- During a trip to Kansas, she appeared in a video promising to turn a Republican seat "red" instead of blue, an innocent error that still prompted widespread mockery among conservative agitators.

- Republican Rep. Ron DeSantis, a candidate for governor in Florida, described her as "in a totally different universe. "It's basically socialism wrapped in ignorance," he told a group of supporters.

- Even some Democrats think she's overplaying her hand. "She beat Joe Crowley because he didn't spend enough time in the district and now she's off already running around the country," notes a staffer for the moderate Blue Dog Democratic caucus in the House.

Still, Ocasio-Cortez is unquestionably the rock star of the moment, and perhaps of the cycle.

And each candidate who is blessed by her gets an amplified voice, as well as a fervent, growing supporter base.

Some veterans of the Ocasio-Cortez campaign are already in Detroit to help El-Sayed claw from behind in his gubernatorial primary.

“We’re using a lot of the same sort of technological outreach tools to identify folks and pull them out,” he says. “We’re pulling out all the stops. I know that we will be successful in changing Michigan’s electorate in 2018.”

Ultimately, Ocasio-Cortez’s success—and that of progressives at large—will be defined by wins and losses.

The scoreboard will be posting numbers soon.

Kansas, Missouri and Michigan all hold their primaries on Aug. 7.

Even if she incurs defeats, her star might dull but won’t likely die.

Because more than Democratic socialism or progressivism, Ocasio-Cortez represents the power of the possible.



Following are excerpts from a speech on YouTube titled “President Reagan’s Radio Address on Canadian Elections and Free Trade on Nov. 26, 1988.”

In recent years, the trade deficit led some misguided politicians to call for protectionism, warning that otherwise we would love jobs. But they were wrong, again.

In fact, the United States not only didn’t love jobs, we created more jobs than all the countries of Western Europe, Canada, and Japan combined. The record is clear that when America’s total trade has increased, American jobs have also increased. And when our total trade has declined, so have the number of jobs.

Part of the difficulty in accepting the good news about trade is in our words. We too often talk about trade while using the vocabulary of war. In war, for one side to win, the other must lose. But commerce is not warfare. Trade is an economic alliance that benefits both countries. There are no losers, only winners. And trade helps strengthen the free world.

Yet today protectionism is being used by some American politicians as a cheap form of nationalism, a fig leaf for those unwilling to maintain America’s military strength and who lack the resolve to stand up to real enemies—countries that would use violence against us or our allies.

Our peaceful trading partners are not our enemies; they are our allies.

We should beware of the demagogues who are ready to declare a trade war against our friends—weakening our economy, our national security, and entire free world—all while cynically waving the American flag.

The expansion of the international economy is not a foreign invasion; it is an American triumph, one we worked hard to achieve, and something central to our vision of a peaceful and prosperous world of freedom.



“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 Jeff Cox titled “Second-Quarter GDP Jumps 4.1% for Best Pace in Nearly Four Years” was posted at cnbc.com on July 27, 2018.
- An article by Matt Vespa titled “Today’s Economic Report Was a Sledgehammer to the Faces Who Thought Trump Couldn’t Do It” was posted at townhall.com on July 27, 2018.
- An article by Guy Benson titled “US Worker Pay Hits Highest Level in a Decade, Consumer Confidence Nears 18-Year Peak” was posted at townhall.com on Aug. 1, 2018.
- An article by Alan Bjerga titled “U.S. Farmland Values Hit a Record Despite Trade Fears” was posted at bloomberg.com on Aug. 2, 2018.
- An article by Jeff Cox titled “Payrolls Rise 157,000, Missing Expectation [190,000], But Overall Picture Still Strong” was posted at cnbc.com on Aug. 3, 2018.
- An article by Jeffrey Bartash titled “U.S. Trade Deficit Remains on Track for 10-Year High After Climbing 7% in June” was posted at marketwatch.com on Aug. 3, 2018.
- An article by Michael Sheetz titled “China Says It Will Retaliate With Tariffs on \$60 Billion in U.S. Goods” was posted at cnbc.com on Aug. 3, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- An article by Claudia Lauer titled “Philadelphia to Further Limit Cooperation With ICE” was posted at apnews.com on July 27, 2018.
- A Reuters video and an article by Jon Nazca titled “Migrants Land on Spanish Beach, Flee As Tourists Look On” were posted at reuters.com on July 27, 2018.
- An article by S.A. Miller titled “Noncitizens Across U.S. Find It Easy to Register to Vote, Cast Ballots” was posted at washingtontimes.com on July 31, 2018.
- An article by Melanie Arter titled “DHS Official: ICE Arrested More Than 127,000 Criminal Aliens During FY 2017” was posted at cnsnews.com on July 31, 2018.
- An article by Natalia Mittelstadt titled “Seven Armed Illegal Aliens Charged in Texas Mall Robbery” was posted at cnsnews.com on Aug. 1, 2018.
- An article by Susan Jones titled “Trump Calls for Voter ID: ‘Only American Citizens Should Vote in American Elections’ ” was posted at cnsnews.com on Aug. 1, 2018.

- An article by Andy Borowitz titled "Millions of Americans Denied Groceries After Failing to Provide I.D." was posted at newyorker.com on Aug. 1, 2018.

- An article by Susan Jones titled "Dems Who Opposed Citizenship Question on Census Want to Ask About Sexual Orientation" was posted at cnsnews.com on Aug. 1, 2018.

Comments about weapons

- An article by Erika Haas titled "Country Singer [Eric Church] Blasts the NRA for Inaction After Las Vegas Massacre" was posted at townhall.com on July 27, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

- An article by Chuck Ross titled "Judge Orders Fusion GPS to Reveal Dossier Details in Buzzfeed Lawsuit" was posted at dailycaller.com on July 26, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

- A video and an article by Cassandra Fairbanks titled "Shock Video: Brawl Breaks Out at Trump's Star on Hollywood Blvd; Youth Pastor Assaulted and Robbed for Wearing MAGA Gear" were posted at thegatewaypundit.com on July 27, 2018.

- An article titled "Watergate Figure John Dean Warns Trump: 'I Don't Think It Is Boding Well for the President' " was posted at huffpost.com on July 27, 2018.

- An article by Jeff Crouser titled "The Media Are Obsessed With Trump's Downfall" was posted at townhall.com on July 28, 2018.

- An article by Greg Farrell titled "Forget Collusion; Conspiracy's the Watchword in Mueller's Filings" was posted at bloomberg.com on Aug. 1, 2018.

- An article by Kimberley Richards titled "Obama Announces [81] Democrat Endorsements for 2018 Midterm Election" was posted at independent.co.uk on Aug. 1, 2018.

- An article by Brady Kenyon titled "Study: Sen Sanders' Medicare for All Act Projected to Cost \$32.6 Trillion" was posted at cnsnews.com on July 31, 2018.

News about the media

- An article by Mollie Hemingway titled "Media Gaslighting Can't Hide Fact Trump Campaign Was Spied On" was posted at thefederalist.com on July 26, 2018.

- An article by Matt Vespa titled "CNN Gets Slapped With Reality Asking About the Last Time a President Sided With America's Enemies [Iran]" was posted at townhall.com on July 27, 2018.

- An article titled "Don Lemon [of CNN] Unloads on Donald Trump Over His Incessant Lying" was posted at huffpost.com on July 28, 2018.

- An article by Laretta Brown titled "Joy Behar Says Photo of Al Franken Groping Woman Was a 'Sophomoric Joke' and He's a 'Gentleman' " was posted at townhall.com on Aug. 1, 2018.

General interest

- An article by Dede Hayes titled "Disney and Fox Shareholders Give Historic Merger Votes of Approval" was posted at [deadline.com](#) on July 27, 2018.
- An article by Larry Elder (a black conservative) titled "Anne Hathaway is Making 'Race Relations' Worse" was posted at [townhall.com](#) on Aug. 2, 2018.



A video and an article by Alfred Ng titled "Shadow Banning: What It Is And What It Isn't" (with a subtitle "Let's Shed Some Light on the Subject and on What's Happening on Twitter") were posted at [cnet.com](#) on July 26, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

There's a shadow of a doubt.

On Thursday [July 26] morning, President Donald Trump called out Twitter, accusing the social network of shadow banning prominent Republicans. The reaction came after *Vice News* reported that Twitter wasn't autopopulating Republicans in its drop-down search box.

But that's not shadow banning—it's a bug, according to Twitter.

"We do not shadow ban," Twitter said in a blog post Thursday. "You are always able to see the tweets from accounts you follow (although you may have to do more work to find them, like go directly to their profile)."

"We are aware that some accounts are not automatically populating in our search box, and [we're] shipping a change to address this," a Twitter spokesperson said earlier in the day. "The profiles, tweets and discussions about these accounts do appear when you search for them. To be clear, our behavioral ranking doesn't make judgments based on political views or the substance of tweets."

Thursday's presidential backlash against Twitter is the latest in a series of accusations lawmakers have made regarding social networks and censorship. The House Judiciary Committee has had two hearings on the subject, in July and April, with Republican lawmakers asking representatives from Twitter, Google and Facebook if the platforms were purposely silencing conservative voices.

The subject has come up before. In January during a Senate hearing Sen. Ted Cruz, a Republican from Texas, asked Twitter's policy director, Carlos Monje, if the social network practices shadow banning. Monje said no, and Twitter has said at multiple hearings on Capitol Hill that it doesn't shadow ban.

Most recently, during a hearing on July 18, Twitter's global lead for public policy strategy, Nick Pickles, told lawmakers, "Some critics have described the sum of all of this work as a banning of conservative voices. Let me make clear to the committee today that these claims are unfounded and false."

What is shadow banning?

Shadow banning isn't a new concept; it's frequently used in forums and on other social networks as an alternative to banning someone outright.

Instead of kicking someone off, shadow bans make a person's post visible only to the user who created it. The idea is to protect others from harmful content while eventually prompting the shadow-banned user to voluntarily leave the forum due to a lack of engagement.

If you outright ban a user, the thinking goes, the person is aware of it and will likely just set up another account and continue the offending behavior.

Shadow banning was Reddit's only form of banning for years and was used by the site until November 2015.

The practice is similar to what Facebook does with misinformation. The social network told reporters on July 11 that instead of completely banning pages behind hoaxes and misinformation, it would rather demote their posts so fewer people see them.

Shadow banning is typically used to stop bots and trolls, said Zack Allen, director of threat operations at ZeroFox, a company that focuses on social media security.

"This can be effective in combating bots where 'bot herders' who maintain these accounts don't necessarily know whether or not their bots are actually being seen by other people," he said.

Is what's happening on Twitter shadow banning?

No.

You can still see posts from the Republicans named in the *Vice News* article, including Republican Party Chairwoman Ronna McDaniel and Rep. Matt Gaetz of Florida.

The White House, McDaniel and Gaetz didn't respond to requests for comment.

Your Twitter account may not autopopulate in searches, but that doesn't mean you've been shadow banned.

Twitter's moderators aren't actively taking measures against accounts and blocking them so that only these users can see their own tweets, the company says.

The search results bug involves an error with Twitter's algorithm, the social network's head of product, Kayvon Beykpour, said in a series of tweets Wednesday [July 25].

Twitter's behavior signals caused the mistakes with autosuggestions, Beykpour explained.

"Our usage of the behavior signals within search was causing this to happen & making search results seem inaccurate," he said in a tweet Wednesday. "We're making a change today that will improve this."



“Eye on the World” comment: The following three articles were posted in 2017.



Looking back to 2017, here is an article by Garrett Sloane titled “Advertisers Can Now Target YouTube Ads Based on People’s Google Search Histories” that was posted at adage.com on Jan. 20, 2017.

Google is going to let advertisers target YouTube ads based on people’s search histories, giving brands a whole new perspective into the consumer mindset.

On Friday [Jan. 20, 2017], Google announced updates to its YouTube offering for advertisers, including a promise of new measurement tools to help marketers understand their campaigns. But it was the introduction of search data into the targeting of YouTube video spots that most intrigued advertisers.

Brands could start to consider pushing video ads to YouTube viewers who recently searched for a retail product, travel destination or movie show time.

“There has been targeting on YouTube based on what videos people watch there,” said one top advertising exec, speaking on condition of anonymity because of a close relationship with Google. “Now, for anyone logged in, their search history can be applied to targeting on YouTube. There’s some interesting possibilities there, and it greatly expands the audience advertisers could reach.”

Google’s search data is considered among the most powerful information for guiding advertising, but Google has kept it under tight wraps, careful when applying it toward ads outside the search experience.

Google faces extra scrutiny from regulators and privacy advocates when it comes to collecting consumer data and applying it to its ad products.

For years, the company kept a wall between search and other ad products, but increased competition from Facebook has made that commitment impractical.

Google declined to comment for this story, but did post a blog statement on Friday.

Google users can turn off ads personalization in their settings.

“As more viewership on YouTube shifts to mobile, we’re making it easier for advertisers to deliver more relevant, useful ads across screens,” Diya Jolly, YouTube’s director of product management, said in the blog post. “Now, information from activity associated with users’ Google accounts (such as demographic information and past searches) may be used to influence the ads those users see on YouTube.”

Ms. Jolly described how someone searching for a winter coat could then see an ad in YouTube from a retailer.

Google said that more than 50% of YouTube video is viewed on mobile devices.

Google also revealed that it was working on a “cloud-based measurement solution” over the next year, to give advertisers more information into how their campaigns perform but balancing that with consumer privacy.

The measurement development appears to be a nod to the advertising uproar over the past few months, in which brands have begun to question the accuracy of the numbers coming out of the platforms like YouTube and Facebook.

“With this new solution, advertisers will have access to more detailed insights from their YouTube campaigns across devices, so they can better understand the impact of their campaigns on their highest-value customers,” Ms. Jolly’s blog post said. “For instance, a car manufacturer could get a rich understanding of how YouTube ads across devices influenced a specific audience (like previous SUV buyers).”



Looking back to 2017, here is an article by Selena Larson titled “Google Will No Longer Read Your Emails to Tailor Ads” that was posted at cnn.com on June 23, 2017.

A major change is coming to Gmail. Google will no longer scan the contents of your emails to serve up personalized ads.

Privacy advocates have long criticized Google’s practice of using email data to tailor advertising, but now the company is putting an end to the method.

Google (GOOG) announced the change in a blog post on Friday [June 23, 2017]. It will go into effect later this year.

The move is in line with Google’s existing G Suite Gmail service for businesses, which doesn’t scan email data for personalized ads. Now its free Gmail service will have the same rules.

But this doesn’t mean you won’t see targeted ads in Gmail. Instead, they’ll be personalized with information gleaned from other sources. For example, Google collects data about you based on the YouTube videos you watch or the searches you make.

It’s possible to find out what kind of data Google uses for targeted ads by visiting its advertising settings page while logged into your account. The company also previously allowed users to opt out of targeted ads based on data via the same page.

Google confirmed it will still analyze emails for reasons other than ad targeting.

Google’s scans content, including email, for purposes other than advertising, and it will still need to. Its terms of service says it analyzes content for custom search results and spam and malware detection. In the blog post, Google

also called out its anti-spam, anti-phishing, and Smart Reply features for Gmail—all of which require the company to analyze email content.



Looking back to 2017, here are excerpts from an article by Masha Maksimava titled “Google’s Personalized Search Explained: How Personalization Works” was posted at link-assistant.com on Aug. 22, 2017.

As Google’s search results grow increasingly personalized, SEOs [Search Engine Optimizations] are growing increasingly indignant. Tracking rankings—one of the main SEO KPIs [Key Performance Indicator]—accurately has become a challenge with location, previous searches, and browser history affecting the results users get.

The concept of accuracy itself has become somewhat vague: if there are as many SERP [Search Engine Results Pages] variations as there are locations, which one should you consider “accurate”?

Even worse: with so many personalization factors stepping in, you may not be aware that your ranking data is skewed, influenced by some kind of personalization you didn’t take into account. Could you be making the wrong decisions based on the wrong data?

In this post, I’ll look at the different ways Google personalizes search results, their impact on SEO, and tips to ensure that personalization doesn’t falsify your ranking data. But before we roll, let’s figure out what exactly personalized search is.

What’s personalized search?

Personalized search results are the results a user sees in a search engine that aren’t just based on the traditional ranking factors (such as the relevance of the web pages to the search term or their authority), but also on the information that the search engine has about the user at the given time, such as their location, search history, demographics, or interests.

Although widely debated, the purpose of personalized search is to increase the relevance of the results for the particular user.

Both Google and Bing (and hence Yahoo, too) are personalizing their search results, but Google seems to be doing it for a larger share of searches. Back in 2011, a small experiment showed that over 50% of Google searches were being personalized; that number has likely only gone up since.

What are the factors that affect personalization?

1. Location

It shouldn’t come as a surprise that Google knows the searcher’s location and uses it in a big part of the searches we make. What may be more surprising

is the preciseness and diligence Google tracks this with. If you have location tracking turned on your mobile device, go on and prepare to be surprised.

If you are not connected to Google via a mobile device, it will figure out where you are from your IP address. This may not be as precise, but it'll still give Google grounds to tailor search results to your location.

HOW IT WORKS: Physical businesses and places closest to the searcher are displayed in the local pack and higher up in the organic results.

For the most part, location data affects searches that imply that the user is looking for a physical place. It is thus a major factor for local businesses. Searchers within the same city, standing just a few miles away from each other, will often see different results for the same search term, especially in the local pack.

2. Search and browsing history

Your previous searches, the search results you clicked on, and your browser history affect how Google will personalize search results for you in the future. These details let Google understand what your interests are and tailor your search experience to them.

HOW IT WORKS: Google creates a personalized profile for every searcher based on their browsing history, search history, and SERP clicks, and subsequently alters the search results we see based on our interests.

Let me illustrate this with an example. In a clean browser, I did a search for "kafka" and got this:

As you see, most of the results I got are about Apache Kafka. Next, I clicked through some of the results that were about Franz Kafka, the novelist, and dwelled on them. After that, I ran a search for "kafka" again:

Interestingly, the organic results didn't change much—but the Knowledge Graph panel did. By now, Google must have decided I'm more interested in novelists than in building software.

3. Social media

When you create a Google+ account, you give away a lot of demographic data on yourself, such as your age, gender, interests, and friends. This information, along with your search and browser history, form your so-called "personalized profile" that Google uses to adjust the SERPs to your interests.

HOW IT WORKS: Google may add social media posts from your connections to the search results, push results endorsed by your connections higher up the SERP, and subtly tailor the search results you get to your profile.

If you have a G+ profile and are logged in to your Google account in your browser, the search results you see may prominently show content shared by your friends among the page 1 results. Let me give you an example. I just searched for something as I was logged out of my Google account:

Nothing special, huh? A moment later, I logged back in and here's what I got:

The result from Google+ comes from Awario, one of my connections on the network. Interestingly, Google also shows a LinkedIn post which wasn't there when I was logged out of Google.

4. Device

In 2017, Google's SERPs on desktop and mobile devices have grown so different that it's probably fairer to call Google mobile a distinct search engine in its own right—one with its own set of ranking factors.

HOW IT WORKS: Pages are ranked differently on mobile and desktop devices, and search queries are also interpreted differently.

While authority and relevance signals appear to be largely the same for both Google desktop and Google mobile, one major difference in the algorithm is the importance of mobile friendliness.

The Mobile algo update has removed pages not optimized for smartphones from the mobile search results completely (or at least down-ranked them significantly), while pushing mobile-friendly pages higher up in the SERPs.

With over half of Google queries coming from mobile devices, and the mobile-first index on its way, you've got to be optimizing your site for mobile as much, if not more, as you are for desktop.

5. Other Google products you use

Many of Google's search features (think featured snippets, travel boxes, Knowledge Graph panels) are intended to provide the information the searcher is looking for right on the search results page, so that we don't have to click through to the search results.

One such feature is also a type of personalization. Namely, it's Google's use of information it has about you from the other Google products—Gmail, Google Calendar, Google Play, Google Maps, etc.—among the organic search results. This means you can use Google the search engine not only to find new information, but also to remind you of some information that's between you and Google.

Ask Google when your flight is, the name of the hotel you're staying, and what not—and it'll happily tell you:

While this likely doesn't impact SEO much (yet), it's an interesting trend towards Google's development into something much bigger than a search engine.

Bottom line

Personalized search means there is no consistent search experience across users, locations, and devices. It's still crucial to track your keywords, but you need to realize that it is not giving you the exact picture every searcher sees.

This is why it's important to keep tracking rankings across different locations (particularly if you're doing SEO for a physical business) and devices, and

amplify your content marketing efforts and social media presence to win placements in the personalized SERPs.

That was my overview of personalized search, its SEO implications, and tips on increasing the accuracy of your rank tracking in 2017.



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.”