

Eye on the World

Nov. 3, 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 Nov. 3, 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 Marlow Stern titled “How the Secret Service Foiled An Assassination Plot Against Trump by ISIS” was posted at thedailybeast.com on Oct. 12, 2018. Following is the article.

In November 1996, President Clinton visited Manila for the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum. Protests raged in the streets, with American flags being burned, so local police closed down many roads, allowing the Secret Service to chart a specific route for the president’s motorcade. As the president and members of his cabinet traveled from their hotel to the first venue of the day, “There was intelligence that came in, and we at the last minute decided to change the motorcade route,” a former Secret Service agent recalls. “It was determined that al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden had placed a bomb along the route in anticipation of the motorcade coming that way.”

Bin Laden had indeed placed a bomb under a bridge, and just before the president’s motorcade was due to cross it, the Secret Service rerouted the vehicle down a side road. President Clinton (codenames “Eagle”) was safe.

Twenty-one years later, there was a plot against President Trump’s life in Manila—a shocking fact revealed in *United States Secret Service: On the Front Line*, a two-hour special airing on the National Geographic Channel Sunday night that—for the first time—provides viewers with a behind-the-

scenes glimpse of the workings of the Secret Service, and the complex measures they take to protect the president of the United States.

President Trump (codename “Mogul”) was due to arrive in the bustling city to meet with Philippine President Rodrigo Duterte and other South Asian leaders at the ASEAN 50 summit in November 2017.

Chad Ragan, a special agent in the Presidential Protective Division, was the Secret Service agent in charge for the trip.

Audrey Gibson, a special agent in the Protective Intelligence & Assessment Division (aka “The Bubble”), served as his eyes and ears.

The Secret Service comprises four main teams.

- Protective Intelligence
- Uniformed Division
- Protective Operations
- Investigations

The Protective Operations team includes those in the “inner circle,” standing steps from POTUS, and special ops, such as countersnipers and the K-9 explosive detection unit.

Protective Intelligence analyzes threats against the president, both on and offline.

The Uniformed Division guards the White House or anywhere POTUS goes.

And Investigations monitors the motives of people who make threats against the president.

“There is credible information that an incident could occur during ASEAN,” says Special Agent Gibson, leading the Secret Service’s personnel brief in Manila.

Pointing to a map of ISIS and ISIS-affiliated threat actors, she adds, “As of this week, the Philippines has escalated to a critical threat level.”

(Days before the president’s visit, ISIS issued a series of threats—via video—that featured a picture of the president filled with bullets, and a message urging jihadists to “lie in wait” and “ambush” POTUS in the Philippines.)

Prior to President Trump’s arrival on Air Force One, a PID agent informs Special Agent Gibson that he’s come across a credible threat against POTUS—in the form of a tweet reading, “Gonna be in Manila the same time as Trump . . . I’ll take one for the team lads,” accompanied by a mugshot of Lee Harvey Oswald.

And on his Instagram, they find a photo of the male suspect wielding a copy of the book *How to Kill: The Definitive History of the Assassin*. The PID agents then track his IP address and discover that the man is indeed located in downtown Manila, kilometers away from the president’s hotel, and his social media posts reveal that he is traveling in the direction of the president’s hotel. They continue to monitor him.

“With social media, there’s software that can scroll through all of [the threats] at a much faster rate than any human can do it, so in some regards it makes it easier. But the bread and butter of what we do is the human element—and the people that work the mission—and that’s never going to change,” Special Agent Gibson tells *The Daily Beast*.

If that weren’t enough, Special Agent Gibson and her team learn that an ISIS operative is somewhere in downtown Manila, and is targeting President Trump. And 20 minutes before touchdown, the Secret Service still isn’t sure where the ISIS operative is. “What is going on proactively to track this guy down?” Special Agent Ragan is seen shouting into a phone. “I need an update. Now.”

Special Agent Gibson and her fellow PIC agents soon track down the ISIS operative to Luneta Park, about a mile north of the president’s hotel, where the suspect is reportedly convening with “an associate.”

They inform Special Agent Ragan, who then informs the Philippine National Police (PNP), whose officers swarm the park and apprehend the suspects. Crisis averted.

“It doesn’t matter if you like the person that’s in office, it doesn’t matter if you don’t like the person that’s in office—the bottom line is you’re not protecting that person, you’re protecting the office and what it stands for.”

“With technology, that was one of the things that was a blessing for us, because we were able to know that he was moving close to us, where he was, and track him. That was a huge piece of stopping the threat,” Special Agent Ragan tells me.

He adds, “Of course, we had a lot of help from the locals—and that’s an essential key to it that can’t be understated, is how great these foreign governments are, or even locals. If we go to Topeka, Kansas, the local law enforcement is such a help. We get so much support from the host committee, or the host country.”

Special Agent Ragan, who also worked in the Secret Service’s Presidential Protective Division under President Obama, maintains that despite his high volume of travel and large family, things aren’t any more difficult protecting President Trump.

“They travel quite a bit, but in terms of the mission, the scope, all of that, it really has no impact,” he tells *The Daily Beast*. “I think there’s an inherent uniqueness to any time you’re dealing with presidential children.

With Barron, there’s a unique aspect that was the same thing with the Obama girls, which is them going to school and trying to let them be children. And with the adults, especially with this family, they are very wealthy, they do have means, they do travel, but the template for us stays the same. Whether we’re going commercial or we’re going private, the template stays the same.”

While the Secret Service agents are incredibly tight-lipped, refusing to discuss whether they’ve received more threats against President Trump than they did against President Obama, or whether they find ex-Secret Service agent turning right-wing pundit Dan Bongino’s self-serving partisanship off-

putting, they do agree that it's "incredibly important" that Secret Service agents remain non-partisan while they're on the clock.

"It's sad, just as an American, how partisan everything is," Special Agent Ragan says. "That being said, it doesn't matter if you like the person that's in office, it doesn't matter if you don't like the person that's in office—the bottom line is you're not protecting that person, you're protecting the office and what it stands for. We all believe that. Even though we're U.S. citizens, have opinions, and talk them over at dinner with our friends or whatnot, work is work. You believe in the mission and the office of the presidency, and that's one reason that we are able to rise above the politics of it all, because we're going to protect a Democrat as much as we're going to protect a Republican as much as we're going to protect an Independent or Green Party member."

In addition NatGeo's *United States Secret Service: On the Front Line*, Special Agents Ragan and Gibson both say that if you want a good idea of what life is like as a member of the Secret Service, watch the film *Guarding Tess*, starring the inimitable Nicolas Cage.

"If you're wanting a movie to really know what it's like to work as a member of the Secret Service on a daily basis, watch *Guarding Tess*," says Special Agent Ragan. "There's a lot of truth to that. They're guarding the first lady and there's a lot of tedium, and that's a big part of what the job is. There's a lot of standing around, a lot of waiting, a lot of hoping that nothing bad happens, but then you've gotta be prepared if it does."



An article by Ziad Reslan titled "Egypt and Thailand: When the Military Turns Against Free Speech" was posted at techcrunch.com on Oct. 21, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Wael Abbas, a human rights activist focused on police brutality in Egypt has been under arrest since May on charges of spreading fake news and "mis-using social media."

Andy Hall, a labor rights researcher, has been fighting charges under Thailand's computer crime laws because of a report published online that identified abuses of migrant workers.

You wouldn't normally mention Egypt and Thailand in the same breath. But both countries underwent military coups within the last five years, and even among the many oppressive regimes in the world, they are going to extra lengths today to prosecute free speech.

Abbas and Hall are just two examples of hundreds of recent prosecutions.

In 2017 alone, Egyptian security forces arrested at least 240 people based on online posts.

Three years after the coup, Thai authorities had charged more than 105 people just for posting comments deemed offensive to the monarchy.

To be clear, neither country has ever been a bastion of free speech.

- Thailand has been ranked “not free” seven out of the eight years that political-rights nonprofit Freedom House has published its Freedom on the Net Report.

- Egypt’s score has steadily declined since the height of the Arab Spring, going from “partly free” to “not free” in the last three years.

Sanja Kelly has been with Freedom House for 14 years and has headed its Internet Freedom division since 2010. She tells me that what’s especially alarming is the extent to which authorities in both Egypt and Thailand have gone to silence online dissent.

Activists and dissidents may well anticipate persecution around the world, but today housewives, students and even tourists in Egypt and Thailand have become the target of prosecutions for as little as posting a video or responding to a private message on social media.

Over the last five years both Egypt and Thailand have experienced an unprecedented crackdown on internet freedom. “In 2015, the Egyptian government blocked only two websites. Today, they are blocking over 500,” Kelly explained. “The situation in Egypt and Thailand is now among the most repressive in the world.”

Egypt

Since El-Sisi seized power in 2013 in a coup, the Egyptian government has taken drastic steps to clamp down online. In its latest move, the government enacted a law in September that makes any social media user with more than 5,000 followers subject to regulation as a publisher.

So now in Egypt, if you have more than 5,000 Twitter followers, for example, you’re subject to the same regulations that the *New York Times* has on what it publishes.

It wasn’t always like this. Back in 2011, Facebook and Twitter were hailed as drivers behind the Arab Spring. The protests that resulted led to the toppling of Hosni Mubarak who had ruled the country for nearly 30 years. At their height, many journalists even started calling the protests the “Twitter uprising” and the “Facebook revolution.”

Kelly tells me that freedom on the internet in Egypt has been getting progressively worse since Sisi seized power. Even under Mubarak, the authorities were not as concerned with policing speech on the internet. But that has completely changed since 2013.

Kelly adds that the measures Egyptian authorities passed this year were intended to tighten their grip on social media and internet use even further. The result has been more and more Egyptians being arrested, with the authorities using a combination of laws to bring charges.

Thailand

Thailand has long been known for its strict application of its *lèse majesté* laws under which any criticism of the Thai king or his family can lead to years in jail. But since the 2014 military coup, the enforcement of these laws has gone into overdrive. The ruling military junta in Thailand has also beefed up computer crimes and defamation laws to make it all but impossible to express dissent online.

According to Human Rights Watch, since the coup in 2014, the junta has ramped up arrests under the 2007 Computer-Related Crime Act (CCA). Last year, the military amplified the 2007 law by providing grounds for the government to prosecute anything they designate as “false,” “partially false,” or “distorted” information, a determination that the government itself gets to make.

Even criticism of the changes to the law itself were outlawed, with the Thai Army Cyber Center warning that posting or sharing online commentary that criticizes the law could be considered false information and result in prosecution.

Kelly tells me that, while the CCA and *lèse majesté* laws have long been used to stifle online dissent, the amendments last year granted Thai authorities even broader powers. They closed down loopholes in earlier versions of the law, including allowing authorities to jail people for critical messages they receive on their phone even if they don't share them.

This means that if you get a Facebook message in Thailand today criticizing the royal family, then you are under an obligation to delete the message or face prosecution.

Andy Hall found himself in the middle of this progression towards heavier handed enforcement. A labor rights activist, Hall conducted research for a report for the group Finnwatch that found that the Natural Fruit Company, Thailand's largest producer of pineapples, mistreated its workers.

Hall then faced criminal prosecution under the CCA and cyber defamation laws for the report's publication online and for an interview he later gave to Al-Jazeera about the report.

Speaking to me from an undisclosed location, Hall tells me he has spent more than \$100,000 defending the criminal charges against him—mainly fundraised from supporters—and the better part of the last five years dealing with the charges and his appeals.

He admits things could have been much worse: “If I weren't a British citizen and my case hadn't gotten as much attention as it has, then I'm not sure I'd be around today to tell my story. Many Thai citizens have lost their lives doing similar work.”

Hall didn't set out to be a freedom of speech crusader, he had dropped out of his Ph.D. program in 2005 to move to Southeast Asia to become a labor rights investigator, only to find himself in the crosshairs of the country's defamation laws in 2013.

When he was first charged, the government asked him to make a public apology denouncing his research. When he refused, the prosecution continued with his passport being confiscated at one point to prevent him from leaving the country.

Now having taken refuge in a third country, Hall tells me that the actions of the government—especially its increased enforcement of cyber defamation laws over the last year—has bred fear among activists and has had a chilling effect on the work of human rights advocates in Thailand.

It's not just activists

According to Kelly, one especially worrying trend about Thailand and Egypt's increased prosecutions is that authorities have been increasingly willing to go after anyone they deem critical online, not just seasoned activists. Housewives, students and even tourists.

Just in September, a Lebanese tourist was arrested on her way out of Egypt for posting a ten-minute video on Facebook that had gone viral. In the video, she'd complained of sexual harassment she'd experienced while in the country. She was found guilty of deliberately spreading fake news and public indecency for just speaking out about what had been done to her. She now faces an eight year-sentence.

Over in Thailand, a housewife faced up to 15 years in prison for violating lèse-majesté laws because she had responded to a Facebook message critical of the government with one word, "ja" (roughly "yeah" in Thai). While a law student was sentenced to 2.5 years last year under the same laws for sharing a BBC article profiling the new Thai king.

Are Egypt and Thailand the worst offenders?

Even though Egypt and Thailand have rung alarm bells this year with the sheer number of prosecutions of online speech, they are still not the worst offenders against speech online.

- Kelly names Saudi Arabia, China, the UAE, North Korea, and Iran as just some examples of worse offenders.
- The difference, Kelly explains, is that the regimes in those countries have become extremely adept at fighting online dissent.

The fact that there may have been more prosecutions in Egypt and Thailand this year doesn't tell the whole story. People in the other countries that Kelly names have just given up on the ability to express dissent online.

China's clampdown doesn't even need to get to the user level—instead they have companies like Baidu and WeChat control and filter messages at the provider level before they're even published.

Egypt and Thailand are operating at a lower level of sophistication and have a strong and active civil society—which means people there still see a bigger opening and haven't become completely self-censoring.

The question then becomes, how long will it be before Thailand and Egypt turn into the next China or Saudi Arabia?

Will dictatorships be converging in their practices to stifle online speech?

Social media may have turned the world into a global village, but it seems that village is also enabling dictators on opposite ends of the globe to better learn from each other's repressive measures.



"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 Rob Taylor titled "China Rapidly Expands Detention Camps in Xinjiang Despite Criticism" was posted at wsj.com on Nov. 1, 2018.
 - A Reuters article by Susan Heavey and Joseph Campbell titled "Trump, Xi Upbeat on U.S.-China Trade Disputes Ahead of Meeting [End of November]" was posted at reuters.com on Nov. 1, 2018.
 - An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Criticism of Trump After Synagogue Massacre at Odds With the Opinions Jewish Israelis Have of Him" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 29, 2018.
 - An article by Michael W. Chapman titled "Brazil's New President is Pro-Life, Pro-Family and Strong Supporter of Israel" was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 1, 2018.
 - An article titled "Brazil to Move Embassy to Jerusalem, New President Bolsonaro Writes" was posted at jpost.com on Nov. 1, 2018.
 - An article titled "Netanyahu in Bulgaria: We Stand Together in the Struggle Against Terror" was posted at jpost.com on Nov. 1, 2018.
 - An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Pompeo Welcomes Danish Arrest As Another Iranian Terror Plot in Europe is Foiled" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 30, 2018.
 - An article by Gregory Katz titled "'Rage' Against Elite: Centrist Leaders Losing Europe's Favor" was posted at apnews.com on Oct. 30, 2018.
 - An article by James Carstensen titled "Merkel's Resignation As Party Head After Poor Election Results Stokes Speculation Over Political Shifts Ahead" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 30, 2018.
 - A Reuters article by Thomas Escritt titled "Merkel Looks to Africa to Cement a Legacy Shaped by Migration" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 30, 2018.

- An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Pakistan's Top Court Acquits First Christian Woman Sentenced to Death for 'Blaspheming' Mohammed" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- An article by Joe Pinkstone titled "Thousands of Swedes Are Getting Microchip IDs Inserted Into Their Hands to Swipe Into Homes, Offices, Concerts and Even to Access Social Media" was posted at dailymail.co.uk on Oct. 23, 2018.
- An article titled "Japan's Princess [Ayako] Surrenders Royal Title to Follow Her Heart Into Marriage With Normal Non-Royal Guy [Kei Moriya]" was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 30, 2018.
- An article by Benjamin Harvey titled "Erdogan Seizes on Saudi Murder As Chance to Upend Middle East" was posted at bloomberg.com on Oct. 23, 2018.
- An article by Bruce Riedel titled "After the Khashoggi Murder, Pakistan Shakes Down Weakened Saudi Prince for \$6 Billion" was posted at thedailybeast.com on Oct. 29, 2018.
- An article by Cortney O'Brien titled "Turkish Prosecutor Offers More Details Into Khashoggi Murder" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 31, 2018.



An article by Brent Bozell and Tim Graham titled "Journalists Stink As Discourse Cops" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 31, 2018. Following is the article.

The frightening exposure of pipe bombs being mailed to prominent Democrats and media outlets, followed by a horrific shooting in a synagogue in Pittsburgh, led to news networks lecturing, hour after hour, on the tone of our civic discourse.

Physicians, heal thyselfes.

These are not dispassionate observers of the national scene. These are leftist partisans and they are cynically using national tragedies to equate conservative speech—conservative thought—to violence.

In 1998, Eric Rudolph bombed an abortion clinic in Birmingham, killing a policeman. The media demanded that the pro-life movement condemn this violence. Pro-life leaders lined up before the cameras for humiliating we're-not-as-bad-as-this interviews.

In 1996, Ted Kaczynski, the Unabomber, was indicted for murdering three men with mail bombs. Authorities found Al Gore's book "Earth in the Balance" in Kaczynski's shack. No one in the media demanded Gore denounce this evil.

In 2009, Scott Roeder murdered late-term abortionist George Tiller in Kansas. Again pro-lifers were publicly shamed by the press.

In 2013, monstrous abortionist Kermit Gosnell was convicted of killing three babies born alive, along with one mother. No reporter suggested the pro-

abortion lobby bore any responsibility. No one condemned the agenda of NARAL, et cetera. Virtually no one bothered even “covering” the trial.

In June of 2017, a leftist kook shot at congressional Republicans holding a baseball practice, nearly killing House Majority Whip Steve Scalise.

Did the national media ask Bernie Sanders and Rachel Maddow (the shooter’s favorites) if they would disassociate themselves from the violence? Did they lecture liberals to cool their tweets?

Instead, “CBS Evening News” anchor Scott Pelley rudely told Scalise & Co. their wounds were self-inflicted: “It’s time to ask whether the attack on the United States Congress yesterday was foreseeable, predictable, and to some degree, self-inflicted.”

NBC’s Kristen Welker blamed both sides: “After one of the most violent presidential campaigns in recent history, questions tonight about whether the entire country bears some responsibility for an atmosphere that’s become increasingly heated.”

No one singled out the Democrats and their radicalized, even militant, rhetoric.

But now network anchors sit by stone-faced as Trump and conservatives are insulted in the worst way. MSNBC’s Steve Schmidt smears talk radio hosts and bloggers criticizing the media as having “blood on their hands.” MSNBC’s Eddie Glaude claims that Trump’s rhetoric on a caravan of migrants marching through Mexico “sets the stage for unimaginable cruelty”—that is, a synagogue shooting. But the shooter hated Trump.

CNN anchors and analysts alike have compared Trump to ISIS. After authorities caught pipe-bomb suspect Cesar Sayoc with a van covered in pro-Trump messaging, CNN anchor Jim Sciutto energetically found “parallels to lone wolf terrorist actors. ISIS folks, et cetera. You know, self-radicalized.”

Not to be outdone, CNN panelist Julia Ioffe claimed “this president has radicalized so many more people than ISIS ever did.”

So what happens if someone shoots at the president after all this abuse on “news” shows?

Big League Politics reported this week that there were no less than 179 active death threats on Twitter aimed at President Trump.

It’s time for journalists to interview themselves.



An article by Ben Shapiro titled “When We Broaden the Definition of Incitement, Freedom Suffers” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 31, 2018. Following is the article.

Over the past week, we've heard the media pitching one particular narrative nonstop: the story that President Donald Trump's rhetoric has resulted in increased violence. We heard it in the aftermath of a spate of attempted bombing attacks against Democratic targets by a Floridian nut job, and we heard it in the aftermath of a shooting attack on a Pittsburgh synagogue by an outspokenly anti-Trump white supremacist.

Is there truth to the charge?

To determine whether there is, we've first got to consider the question more broadly: When is speech related to violence?

It's obvious that speech is often related to action. We change how we think and see the world based on what other people say to us. We change our opinions. Our emotions can be soothed or our anger provoked. The entire purpose of political speech is to motivate people to believe and act in certain ways. It would be foolish and shortsighted to suggest, then, that over-the-top rhetoric and violent metaphor have no impact on the public discourse.

But we cannot equate all speech with incitement, obviously. To do so would be to destroy the entire rationale for free speech. If we can attribute the violence of a few to the speech of public figures, the only available solution would be to curtail speech. And we cannot base our standard for protected speech on those with eggshell skulls. If the craziest and most easily provoked among us become the standard, then free speech dies.

Thus, our legal system generally relies on a "reasonable person" standard when determining whether speech incites action. Courts of appeal have held that threats and incitement generally require that "a reasonable person would foresee that the statement would be interpreted by those to whom the maker communicates the statement as a serious expression of an intention to inflict bodily injury."

By this standard, none of President Trump's statements has come close to inciting either attempted bombings or shootings. The media's suggestions otherwise seem to equate speech with violence, making an argument for moral culpability that cannot be sustained.

But that doesn't mean that misuse of non-inciting free speech isn't damaging. It most certainly is.

Rhetoric that equates political opposition with murderers, traitors or enemies of the people tears away at the social fabric, the base-line trust we have for one another.

If our opponents are motivated by evil intent, then why bother conversing with them?

If they're deplorables on the one hand and globalists who intend to destroy the country on the other, how are we supposed to come together in civil ways?

The answer is that we won't. And every violent act merely tears us apart further as we seek to cast blame on those we think either inspired or supported the violent act. Lone evil actors can kill and maim. Only we, as a country,

can tear ourselves apart. And as we blame one another for the actions of non-reasonable actors, we're doing just that.



An article by Dennis Prager titled "The Pittsburgh Synagogue, Anti-Semitism and Trump" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 30, 2018. Following is the article.

All my life I have reminded fellow Jews in America that we are the luckiest Jews to have ever lived in a non-Jewish country. I know what I'm talking about. I wrote a book on anti-Semitism, taught Jewish history at Brooklyn College and fought anti-Semitism since I was 21, when Israel sent me into the Soviet Union to smuggle in Jewish religious items and smuggle out Jewish names.

Even after the massacre of 11 Jews in a Pittsburgh synagogue, this assessment remains true.

But the greatest massacre of Jews in American history is a unique American tragedy.

It is a tragedy in part because America has finally made the list of countries in which Jews were murdered for being Jews. While this was probably inevitable, given that 330 million people live in America, it is painful—equally for me as an American and as a Jew.

And second, while there is no difference between the murder of Christians at a church and the murder of Jews in a synagogue with regard to the loss of life and the suffering of loved ones, there is something unique about the murder of Jews for being Jews: Anti-Semitism is exterminationist. Anti-semites don't just want to persecute, enslave or expel Jews; they want to kill them all.

On Passover, Jews read the Haggadah, the ancient Jewish prayer book of the Passover Seder. In it are contained these words: "In every generation, they arise to annihilate us"—not "persecute" us; not "enslave" us; annihilate us.

So, when the murderer yelled, "All Jews must die," he encapsulated the uniqueness of anti-Semitism.

There is another unique aspect to anti-Semitism: It destroys every society in which it grows. The animating force within Adolf Hitler was Jew-hatred. More than anything else—desire for German "Lebensraum," hatred of Bolshevism, a view of Slavs as subhuman—it was anti-Semitism that invigorated him. Anti-Semitism was not a Nazi scapegoat; it was the Nazis' *raison d'être*.

The results of German anti-Semitism for Germans alone: more than 5 million dead, including half a million German civilians; 130,000 more civilians murdered by the Nazi regime; 12 million Germans expelled from East Europe, 2 million of whom died; innumerable rapes of German women; Germany divided in two for half a century—and the loss of a sense of self and reputation.

I have no idea if, outside the universities and the Israel-hating left, there has been an increase in anti-Semitism in America. I wish I could trust the Anti-Defamation League, other Jewish organizations and Jewish community newspapers. Sadly, only Jews on the left do, because most of these organizations have a left-wing, anti-Trump agenda.

Here's a perfect example.

The mainstream left-wing media, along with left-wing Jewish organizations and media, told us every day for months after Trump's election that anti-Semitism had greatly increased. They cited the great number of Jewish Community Centers that received bomb threats. It turned out, however, that about 90 percent of those threats were called in by a mentally disturbed American Jewish teenager living in Israel, and the other 10 percent were made by a black radical seeking to frame his ex-girlfriend. So, the claim eventually vanished from the news—with not one Jewish or non-Jewish organization or media outlet apologizing for crying anti-Semitic "fire" in a crowded theater.

The dishonest now have the Pittsburgh massacre to blame on Trump. But that's as big a falsehood as blaming Trump for the bomb threats. In reality, the Pittsburgh murderer criticized Trump for his close connections to Jews and Israel.

For Jews to blame the most pro-Israel president since Harry Truman—the only president with a Jewish child and Jewish grandchildren, moreover—for increasing anti-Semitism is another example of a truism this Jew has known all his life: Unlike Jewish liberals, who get most of their values from Judaism, Jewish leftists are ethnically Jewish but get their values from leftism.

The biggest increase in anti-Semitism in the last 10 or so years has come from the left. Just ask young Jews who wear yarmulkes or are vocally pro-Israel on most American college campuses. And this generation's threat of Jewish annihilation comes from Israel's Iranian and Arab enemies.

As a Jew who attends synagogue every Shabbat, and as an advocate for the carrying of concealed weapons, I fervently pray we will not need armed guards at American synagogues. America's uniqueness has been exemplified by the fact that Jews do not need armed guards in their synagogues.

May it always be so.

Even if you don't love Jews—if you only love America—you need to fight anti-Semites. As the Jews go, so goes the fate of the nation in which they live.



An article by Ann Coulter titled "The True History of Millstone Babies" was posted at anncoulter.com on Oct. 31, 2018. Following is the article.

Having mastered fake news, now the media are trying out a little fake history.

In the news business, new topics are always popping up, from the Logan Act and the emoluments clause to North Korea. The all-star panels rush to Wikipedia, so they can pretend to be experts on things they knew nothing about an hour earlier.

Such is the case today with “anchor babies” and “birthright citizenship.” People who know zilch about the history of the 14th Amendment are pontificating magnificently and completely falsely on the issue du jour.

If you’d like to be the smartest person at your next cocktail party by knowing the truth about the 14th Amendment, this is the column for you!

Of course the president can end the citizenship of “anchor babies” by executive order—for the simple reason that no Supreme Court or U.S. Congress has ever conferred such a right.

It’s just something everyone believes to be true.

How could anyone—even a not-very-bright person—imagine that granting citizenship to the children of illegal aliens is actually in our Constitution?

The first question would be: Why would they do that? It’s like being accused of robbing a homeless person. WHY WOULD I?

The Supreme Court has stated—repeatedly!—that the “main object” of the citizenship clause of the 14th Amendment “was to settle the question ... as to the citizenship of free negroes,” making them “citizens of the United States and of the state in which they reside.”

Democrats, the entire media and House Speaker Paul Ryan seem to have forgotten the Civil War. They believe that, immediately after a war that ended slavery, Americans rose up as one and demanded that the children of illegals be granted citizenship!

You know what’s really bothering me? If someone comes into the country illegally and has a kid, that kid should be an American citizen!

YOU MEAN THAT’S NOT ALREADY IN THE CONSTITUTION?

Give me a scenario—just one scenario—where the post-Civil War amendments would be intended to grant citizenship to the kids of Chinese ladies flying to birthing hospitals in California, or pregnant Latin Americans sneaking across the border in the back of flatbed trucks.

You can make it up. It doesn’t have to be a true scenario. Any scenario!

As the court has explained again and again and again:

“(N)o one can fail to be impressed with the one pervading purpose found in (the 13th, 14th and 15th) amendments, lying at the foundation of each, and without which none of them would have been even suggested; we mean the

freedom of the slave race, the security and firm establishment of that freedom, and the protection of the newly made freeman and citizen from the oppressions of those who had formerly exercised unlimited dominion over him."

That's why the amendment refers to people who are "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States "and of the state wherein they reside." For generations, African-Americans were domiciled in this country. The only reason they weren't citizens was because of slavery, which the country had just fought a civil war to end.

The 14th Amendment fixed that.

The amendment didn't even make Indians citizens. Why? Because it was about freed slaves. Sixteen years after the 14th Amendment was ratified, the Supreme Court held that an American Indian, John Elk, was not a citizen, despite having been born here.

Instead, Congress had to pass a separate law making Indians citizens, which it did, more than half a century after the adoption of the 14th Amendment. (It's easy to miss—the law is titled: "THE INDIAN CITIZENSHIP ACT OF 1924.") Why would such a law be necessary if simply being born in the U.S. was enough to confer citizenship?

Even today, the children of diplomats and foreign ministers are not granted citizenship on the basis of being born here.

President Trump, unlike his critics, honors black history by recognizing that the whole purpose of the Civil War amendments was to guarantee the rights of freed slaves.

But the left has always been bored with black people. If they start gassing on about "civil rights," you can be sure it will be about transgenders, the abortion ladies or illegal aliens. Liberals can never seem to remember the people whose ancestors were brought here as slaves, i.e., the only reason we even have civil rights laws.

Still, it requires breathtaking audacity to use the Civil War amendments to bring in cheap foreign labor, which drives down the wages of African-Americans—the very people the amendments were written to protect!

Whether the children born to legal immigrants are citizens is controversial enough. But at least there's a Supreme Court decision claiming that they are—*U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark*. That's "birthright citizenship."

It's something else entirely to claim that an illegal alien, subject to deportation, can drop a baby and suddenly claim to be the parent of a "citizen."

This crackpot notion was concocted by liberal zealot Justice William Brennan and slipped into a footnote as dicta in a 1982 case. "Dicta" means it was not the ruling of the court, just a random aside, with zero legal significance.

Left-wing activists seized on Brennan's aside and browbeat everyone into believing that anchor babies are part of our great constitutional heritage, emerging straight from the pen of James Madison.

No Supreme Court has ever held that children born to illegal aliens are citizens. No Congress has deliberated and decided to grant that right. It's a made-up right, grounded only in the smoke and mirrors around Justice Brennan's 1982 footnote.

Obviously, it would be better if Congress passed a law clearly stating that children born to illegals are not citizens. (Trump won't be president forever!) But until that happens, the president of the United States is not required to continue a ridiculous practice that has absolutely no basis in law.

It's often said that journalism is the first draft of history. As we now see, fake news is the first draft of fake history.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Price Gouging During a Natural Disaster" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 24, 2018. Following is the article.

Thirteen states—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia—have enacted laws to combat what is seen as price gouging in the wake of natural disasters.

Price gouging is legally defined as charging 10 to 25 percent more for something than you charged for it during the month before an emergency. Sellers convicted of price gouging face prison terms and fines.

Price gouging in the wake of natural disasters is often seen as evil exploitation by sellers to rip off desperate customers. Let's hold off on that conclusion until after you give thought to some very important questions. First let's see what we can agree upon.

When a natural disaster occurs or is anticipated, supply conditions change. There is going to be less of what people want and need.

Under such conditions, what actions are consistent with the public good?

My answer is that people should voluntarily use less of everything and waste nothing. That would include economizing on water, gasoline, food and anything else necessary for survival. How about an example?

Take the case of a hurricane like Florence. Let's assume that evacuation 200 miles or so inland would guarantee safety for North Carolinians. Say the Jones family's car has three-quarters of a tank of gas, more than enough to drive to safety. The Smith family's car has less than a quarter-tank of gas, which is not enough to drive away from danger. We can multiply this scenario by tens of thousands of families in the Joneses' condition and thousands of families in the Smiths' predicament.

Here's my question: Who should forgo purchasing gas in the storm-threatened area?

My answer would be all those people who have enough gas to drive to safety—people such as the Joneses. By not purchasing gas, they'd make more gas available for those who really need the gas in order to drive to safety, such as the Smiths. We might also ask how considerate and caring it would be to their fellow North Carolinians who desperately need gas for people who have enough to evacuate to purchase gas just to top off their tanks.

If people such as the Joneses won't consider the needs of their fellow man voluntarily, the North Carolina attorney general could station government officials at each gasoline station to determine who should be permitted to purchase gas.

You say, "Williams, it would be sheer lunacy for scarce state resources to be used that way, especially in the face of a natural disaster!" I think you're right.

Another method would be for the governor, mayors and church and community leaders to admonish North Carolinians to purchase gasoline only if they really need it. That way, plenty of gas would be available for those with nearly empty tanks.

You might say, "Come on, Williams. Aren't you being a bit naive thinking that would work?" You're probably right again.

What I think would make gas available to those who really need it are rising prices. Suppose the pre-hurricane price of gas was \$2.60 a gallon. As the hurricane approaches, dealers could let the price rise to \$4 a gallon. That would give families who have enough gas to evacuate incentive to voluntarily forgo purchasing gasoline. Their voluntary decision would make more gas available for people who desperately need it. By the way, gas available at \$4 a gallon seems more preferable than gas stations shut down because they have sold out of gas at \$2.60 a gallon.

You might reluctantly agree that allowing prices to rise during a natural disaster helps allocate resources, but that's not the intention of sellers who raise prices. They are in it for windfall profit.

I say: So what? It's what their actions accomplish that's important—namely, getting people to conserve during a natural disaster. Also, higher prices create incentives for suppliers of all kinds of goods—such as plywood, bottled water, generators and repair services—to pitch in to help to restore people's lives.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Democratic-Controlled House" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 31, 2018. Following is the article.

Democrats are hoping the coming election will give them a majority in the House of Representatives. Republicans and much of our nation dread that prospect.

My question is: What would a House majority mean for the Democrats? Let's look at it.

To control the House of Representatives, Democrats must win at least 218 seats, which many predict as being likely. To control the Senate, Democrats must win enough seats to get to 51, which many predict is unlikely. Let's say the Democrats do take the House. If they were to pass a measure that Republicans in both houses didn't like and President Donald Trump didn't like, either, he could use his veto pen.

To override Trump's veto, Democrats would need to meet the U.S. Constitution's requirement that they muster a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives (290 votes) and a two-thirds vote in the Senate (67 votes). Neither would be likely.

It's quite a challenge to override a presidential veto.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt was the veto king, with 635 vetoes. Only nine of them were overridden.

President Grover Cleveland vetoed 584 congressional measures and was overridden only seven times.

If the House Democrats were to do all that they promise to do and if President Trump were to marshal the guts of Presidents Roosevelt and Cleveland—both Democrats, I might add—the next two years would be a sight to behold.

But wait! Democrats are pushing for the elimination of the Electoral College and having presidents chosen by majority rule. Might they call for the same for all political decisions? That way, it would require only a simple majority vote, rather than two-thirds, to override a presidential veto.

The Founding Fathers had utter contempt for majority rule. They saw it as a form of tyranny. In addition to requiring a super majority to override a presidential veto, our Constitution has other anti-majority provisions. Proposing an amendment to the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote in each house of Congress or two-thirds of state legislatures to vote for it.

On top of that, it requires three-fourths of state legislatures for ratification of a constitutional amendment. Election of the president is done not by a majority popular vote, much to the disappointment of the left, but by the Electoral College.

Having two houses of Congress places another obstacle to majority rule. Fifty-one senators can block the wishes of 435 representatives and 49 senators. As mentioned earlier, our Constitution gives the president veto power to thwart the wishes of a majority in each house of Congress. It takes two-thirds in each house of Congress to override the president's veto.

■ The Founders recognized that we need government; however, they also recognized that the essence of government is force and that force is evil.

- To reduce the potential for evil, they thought government should be as small as possible.
- They intended for us to have a limited republican form of government wherein human rights precede government and there is rule of law. Ordinary citizens and government officials are accountable to the same laws.
- Government intervenes in civil society only to protect its citizens against force and fraud; it does not intervene in cases of peaceable, voluntary exchange.

By contrast, in a democracy, the majority rules either directly or through its elected representatives. The law is whatever the government deems it to be. Rights may be granted or taken away.

For those Americans who see majority rule as sacrosanct, ask yourselves how many of your life choices you would like settled by majority rule.

Would you want the kind of car you own to be decided through a democratic process?

What about decisions as to where you live, what clothes you purchase, what food you eat, what entertainment you enjoy and what wines you drink?

I'm sure that if anyone suggested that these decisions should be subject to a democratic process wherein majority rules, we would deem the person tyrannical.

James Madison wrote, "Democracies . . . have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "Consequential Elections" was posted at patriotpost.us on Oct. 27, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

As a rule, I don't donate to elections. This past month was the exception. I donated to a dozen candidates, eight of whom are running for the Senate, three for the House, and one for governor.

I don't recall ever donating to a gubernatorial candidate, but it would pain me if the [fellow] running in Florida, Andrew Gillum, who is to the left of Bernie Sanders, actually defeated Ron De Santis. The fact that Gillum is ahead in the polls is troubling, considering he favors open borders, eliminating ICE, and opposing the NRA. He also checks all the usual boxes when it comes to climate change, the illusionary unequal pay for women, and allowing felons to vote.

Perhaps Florida needs to build a couple of border walls, one to stop all those New York transplants from coming to Florida to die and another to stop Puerto Rico from gaining statehood of a sort by moving its entire population to the Sunshine State.

■ Google

Apparently, whereas Goldman Sachs and certain banks were regarded as too big to fail, Google is too big for the federal government to take on. The company's moguls have decided that whereas they'd find it morally unthinkable to cooperate with the Pentagon, as Tucker Carlson has often pointed out, they have no problem using their technology to finger real or potential dissidents for the vile Chinese government.

■ Saudi Arabia

Perhaps Sen. Lindsey Graham could stop kicking Saudi Arabia long enough to pay attention to China and its enablers, including Mitch McConnell and Dianne Feinstein.

Saudi Arabia, whether or not it assassinated journalist Jamal Khashoggi, is, unfortunately, the second-most trustworthy ally we have in the Middle East. It runs a very distant second to Israel, but it's way ahead of everybody else.

It sends a lot of business our way and it hates Iran nearly as much as we do.

■ Misleading identities

Someone sent me a photo of three deluded Democrats: Rachael Dolezal, a demented white woman who headed up a NAACP group by pretending to be black; Elizabeth Warren, who is whiter than white, but has for years claimed to be a Cherokee; and Robert Francis O'Rourke, a chucklehead running against Ted Cruz who has adopted "Beto" as his first name, that being a common Hispanic nickname for people named Roberto. I suspect if he were running in Massachusetts instead of Texas, he'd be running as Robert Francis O'Rourke and linking arms with priests and guys dressed as leprechauns in St. Patrick's Day parades and singing "Does Your Mother Come from Ireland?" at every bar in Boston.

■ Double standard

Just in case you haven't noticed how spooky Democrats have become, Mark Salvas, who had been the executive director of the party in Allegheny, Pennsylvania, was recently fired when the county board discovered that he had once said: "I stand for the flag and kneel for the cross."

Because the board regarded that as a slam against Colin Kaepernick, he was called a racist and his statement was deemed hate speech.

But when Maxine Waters tells her fans to confront Trump's Cabinet members in public places, Hillary Clinton insists that Republicans are so evil that they're not entitled to be treated civilly, and Eric Holder recommends kicking conservatives, that's merely speaking truth to power.

■ Socialists

The always reliable Penny Alfonso sent me a photo of G.I.'s wading ashore on D-Day with the caption: "Let's Go Kill Some Socialists . . . So Our Idiot Great-Grandkids Can Elect Socialists."

■ Federal Reserve

After I wrote disparagingly about the Federal Reserve, Brian Ginter wrote to let me know that the Fed is responsible for 11 of the past 12 recessions, due to gross mismanagement.

I replied: "In theory, like Socialism, it might sound to some ears like a pretty good idea. But it's been around for over a hundred years and it's been, again like Socialism, an unmitigated disaster. Reality has a way of blowing theories out of the water. Unfortunately, those on the Left tend to regard reality as an inconvenient nuisance and therefore choose to ignore it.

■ Guilty until proven innocent

Bob Hunt sent along a joke that, if not old, is certainly middle-aged. But because of recent events involving Brett Kavanaugh, it has taken on a new relevance.

The wedding ceremony had reached the point where the minister asked the gathering if anyone had reason to object to the joining of the bride and groom in holy matrimony.

At which point a beautiful woman holding a baby stood up at the rear of the church and started walking slowly up the aisle.

The witnesses gasped. The groom's jaw dropped and he stared in shock as the woman came closer.

Chaos ensued. The bride dropped her bouquet and ran crying from the church. The groom's mother fainted. The bride's father balled his hands into fists and began to cuss out his no longer future son-in-law.

Only the minister maintained his calm and quietly asked the woman: "Why have you come forward? What have you to say?"

"I just wanted to let you know we can't hear you in the back."

And that, as Mr. Hunt points out, illustrates what happens when people are considered guilty until proven innocent.



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "The Midterm IQ Test" was posted at patriotpost.us on Oct. 29, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

I really don't believe polls these days, but it's still disconcerting to hear that the House will probably be under the thumb of Nancy Pelosi starting in January.

I keep asking myself why anyone would vote for a Democrat. Is it really enough to just hate Donald Trump because he's boorish and tweets far too often? If that's the case, why don't these Never-Trumpers hate their own kids?

I'm serious. The kids, for the most part, haven't done anything in their entire lives, include cleaning up after themselves or uttering a single word of gratitude for their housing, food, clothing, and electronic gadgets.

Donald Trump, on the other hand, has:

1. Kick-started the comatose economy
2. Made the Europeans start paying for their defense
3. Got North Korea to stop firing missiles in Japan's direction
4. Got Mexico and Canada to revise our trade deals
5. Moved our embassy to Jerusalem
6. Tried valiantly to shut down our border to scofflaws, gangs, and drug smugglers
7. Cut our taxes and brought jobs back to America
8. Restarted essential industries, including steel, aluminum, oil, and coal
9. Placed two justices on the Supreme Court who take their marching orders from Jefferson, Adams, and Madison rather than from *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and the ACLU.

Knowing all that, what possible reason would anyone have for electing those who have sworn to stop the Trump revolution in its tracks? Could it be, as Trump often predicted, that some people have simply gotten tired of winning?

■ What about Farrakhan?

Although Twitter and Google have banished Alex Jones and other conservatives from their platforms in violation of their free speech mission statements, nobody has yet dared banish Louis Farrakhan for comparing Jews to termites.

In the wake of Farrakhan's disgusting comment, mouthpieces for Barack Obama and Keith Ellison have denied that either man has ever had a close relationship with the Chicago-based racist.

Even *The Washington Post* gave Ellison four Pinocchio's for that lie.

As for Obama, who pretty much owes his political career to Farrakhan, Pinocchio kicked him in the butt while chanting: "Liar, liar, pants on fire!"

■ Louisiana

The state of Louisiana is setting a good example for the rest of the country. Because Bank of America and Citicorp have both aligned themselves with those looking to abolish guns by refusing to offer loans to gun shop owners, the Bayou State has decided to exclude them from bidding on \$600 million worth of state bonds. Inasmuch as the two banks underwrote \$110 billion of municipal bonds in 2017, according to Patrick Krey, writing in *The New American*, Louisiana's gesture is a drop in the bucket. But it's still praise-worthy.

■ Boycotting cities

It also led me to wonder why, whenever a state or even just a city in a state does something that upsets liberals, they immediately announce a boycott. Then, before you know it, hundreds of groups announce they're moving their meetings and conventions somewhere else. Sometimes, the mere threat of a boycott and the potential loss of tourist dollars is enough to make the cities and states back off.

So how is it one never hears about groups of conservatives threatening to pull their conventions out of, say, sanctuary cities and states?

■ Hiding American connection

A friend of mine let me know he was disappointed with the movie "First Man," the story of Neil Armstrong.

I told him I was glad to hear I wouldn't be missing anything because I had already decided to avoid it. "It's enough that the director, Damian Chazelle, and the star, Ryan Gosling, had decided not to show the planting of the American flag on the Moon because they didn't want anyone to get the idea that just because an American president had decided to beat the Soviet Union to the Moon; American scientists and engineers had figured out how to do it; American astronauts had risked their lives to complete the mission; and American taxpayers had picked up the tab; it wasn't really about America and Americans.

"It's bad enough when a movie intentionally ignores well-documented history, but when you do it because a couple of Hollywood pinheads don't want to offend globalists, it's an abomination and I can only hope the movie crashes and burns at the box office."

■ Name change

Jerry Herrera felt that in light of her genealogical report, Trump might no longer be able to refer to Elizabeth Warren as Pocahontas but might have to change her nickname to Lie-a-watha.

I told him I didn't think Trump would have to change a thing. "After all, in Spanish, 'poca' means little....although not usually something as little as 1/1024th."



An article by Daniel Palazzolo titled "Will It Be a Blue Wave or a Whimper? Here's What the Evidence Says for the 2018 House Midterm Elections" was posted at theconversation.com on Oct. 30, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

"If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary," wrote James Madison in the Federalist Paper #51.

Lacking angels, Madison asserted that elections were one of the U.S. Constitution's checks on political power. "A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government," he wrote.

In midterm elections, historically, the people have followed through on Madison's expectations.

- Since 1900, the president's party has lost seats in the House in all but three of 29 midterm elections.
- Since 1950, the president's party has lost an average of 24 seats in midterm elections. That's one more than the 23 that Democrats, now in the minority, need to win majority control of the House in 2018.

Forecasts from the nation's most prominent election analysts suggest that historical patterns will likely hold true in this year's House elections. Republicans are bound to lose seats. But how many seats? And will the number be enough for Democrats to gain a House majority?

According to one view frequently reported by journalists and liberal commentators through September, large numbers of Republicans will be swept away by a blue wave, propelled by a resurgent mass of Democratic voters eager to check President Trump.

Other news accounts and commentary from conservatives have countered that the elections will end with a whimper; the wave will be averted by a strong economy and late-breaking campaign developments that inspire Republican voters.

How do we make sense of those two possibilities? As a political scientist, I draw from theories of congressional elections, models that forecast outcomes and expert analyses of current electoral trends. Reviewing these sources, I believe the odds favor a strong year for Democrats, but the extent of their gains is still in doubt.

Evidence for a wave

Let's begin with the wave, or at least a very decisive Democratic victory.

- Statistician Nate Silver recently estimated that Democrats have an 84.5 percent chance of winning the majority and are on track to win 39 seats.
- Political analyst Charlie Cook's latest analysis predicts a gain of 30 to 35 seats for Democrats.
- Another summary of four different studies by political scientists reveals that Democrats are likely to gain between 27 and 44 seats.
- In all cases, that's enough for Democrats to regain majority control of the House.

Those predictions are consistent with recent "wave" elections. Waves can occur when one party controls the White House and majorities in both the House and Senate, as Republicans do now. Since 1900, the president's party has lost seats in the House in all but three of 29 midterm elections.

In the midterms following presidential elections of 1992, 2004 and 2008, the party in control of government suffered well-above-average losses. For example, in 2010, after Barack Obama's historic victory, the Democrats lost a whopping 63 seats in the House.

Evidence for a whimper

Yet, some analysts warn that although Democrats will gain seats, who will control the House remains uncertain.

Kyle Klondik, managing editor of Sabato's Crystal Ball, concludes that "the [Democratic] party is close to winning the majority, but they do not have it put away."

Why would 2018 be a whimper rather than a wave? One reason is that the campaigns do not end in August or September, when analysts begin to make predictions. Late-breaking events could have a major impact.

For instance, Senator Majority Leader Mitch McConnell asserts that the Senate hearings of Judge Brett Kavanaugh fired up an otherwise sluggish base of Republican voters. If Republican voter turnout increases, Republicans will lose fewer seats.

In a recent column, political analyst Amy Walter pointed out that Democratic campaign messages focus on the health care, whereas Republicans have directed the attention of Republican voters to the "scary" prospect of a Democratic majority, including the election of Nancy Pelosi as speaker of the House.

Whatever happens, the party that wins a majority in 2018 will likely hold onto the House by one of the smallest margins in history—a fitting result for a closely divided nation.



"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 Alex Tanzi titled "Top 3% of U.S. Taxpayers Paid Majority of Income Tax in 2016" was posted at bloomberg.com on Oct. 16, 2018.
- An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "The UN Gets \$10 Billion a Year From US Taxpayers; Cuba Thinks That's Not Enough" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 25, 2018.
- An article by Phil LeBean titled "Auto Dealers See Slowing Sales, Sparking Fears That a Long-Expected Decline is Here" was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 23, 2018.
- An article by Prahant Gopal and Noah Buhayar titled "Boise and Reno Capitalize on the Californian Real Estate Exit" was posted at bloomberg.com on Oct. 23, 2018.

■ An article by Ben Miller titled “Whirlpool Demands Its Appliances Back From Sears” was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 30, 2018.

Illegal immigration

■ An article by John Burnett titled “After ICE Raid, a Shortage of Welders in Tigertown, Texas” was posted at npr.org on Oct. 19, 2018.

■ An article by Katie Pavlich titled “Obama Flashback: We Simply Cannot Allow People (Illegal Aliens) to Pour Into the United States” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 25, 2018.

■ An article by Beth Baumann titled “Caravan Riders Refuse Mexico’s Generous Offer, And They’re Still Heading to the U.S.” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 27, 2018.

■ An article by Beth Baumann titled “Tensions Rise When Mexican Federal Police Stop the Caravan at the Mexico-Guatemala Border” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 30, 2018.

■ An article by Katie Pavlich titled “Thousands of Armed U.S. Troops Will Be Deployed to the Border by Friday [Nov. 2]; Here’s What They Will Be Doing” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 29, 2018.

■ An article by Michelle Malkin titled “Yes, Unvetted Illegal Caravans Threaten Public Health” was posted at michellemalkin.com on Oct. 31, 2018.

■ An article by Hans Von Spakovsky titled “Trump is Right: Ending Birthright Citizenship is Constitutional” was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 1, 2018.

■ An article by Marc A. Thiessen titled “No, the President Cannot End Birthright Citizenship” was posted at washingtonpost.com on Oct. 30, 2018.

Comments about weapons

■ A Reuters article by John Foley titled “Exclusive: FedEx Drops NRA Deal [Discounts] by Snail-Mail [For Business Reasons]” was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 30, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

■ An article by Jeff Cox titled “Wages and Salaries Jump by 3.1%; Highest Level in a Decade” was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 31, 2018.

■ An article by Jeff Cox titled “‘Robust’ Jobs Market Sees Another 227,000 Hires in October” was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 31, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

■ An article titled “Once Sure of Red Wave, Trump Braces for Midterms” was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 31, 2018.

- An article by Jennifer Haberkorn titled "Unlikely Democratic House Candidates Are Gaining Momentum, Even in GOP Strongholds" was posted at latimes.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- An article by Brooke Singman titled "Pelosi Predicts Dems 'Will Win' the House, As Colbert Pleads Not to Jinx It" was posted at foxnews.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- An article by Susan Jones titled "Pelosi: Political Rhetoric Will Cool 'When We Win' Midterms" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- An article by Daniel Chaitin titled "Cook Political Report Outlook: Democrats Will Gain 30-40 Seats in House, Up From 25-35" was posted at washingtonexaminer.com on Nov. 1, 2018.
- An article by Timothy Meads titled "Anti-Trumper's Tweet About Killing Presidents Gets 17K Retweets, 44K Likes" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 26, 2018.
- An article by Matt Vespa titled "CNN Host [Dana Bash] on Bomb Scares: This is What You Get When Trump Gets the 'CNN Sucks' Chant Going" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 27, 2018.
- An article by Paul Crookston titled "CNN Panelist [Julia Ioffe]: Trump 'Has Radicalized So Many More People Than ISIS' " was posted at freebeacon.com on Oct. 29, 2018.
- An article by Beth Baumann titled "Chris Cuomo Says Trump is Using Language 'Propagated by Stalin and Used by Hitler' " was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- An article by Laretta Brown titled "Bernie Sanders Unleashed: Trump is the 'Most Racist, Sexist, Homophobic, Bigoted President in History' " was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- An article by Scott Simon titled "A President in Praise of Strongmen and Dictators" was posted at npr.org on Oct. 20, 2018.
- An article titled "The Obamas Might Make a TV Show About Disorder in the Trump Administration for Netflix" was posted at theweek.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- An article by Beth Baumann titled "Bloomberg Drops Millions on Three Races to Push Dems to Midterm Victory" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 27, 2018.
- An article by Beth Baumann titled "One GOP Mega-Donor [L. Brands CEO Leslie Wexner Had Given \$1.9 Million in Last Five Years] Left the Party And Now He's Dropping Money for Democrats" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 27, 2018.
- An article by Chesley B. "Sully" Sullenger III titled "We Saved 155 Lives on the Hudson; Now Let's Vote for Leaders Who'll Protect Us All" was posted at washingtonpost.com on Oct. 29, 2018.
- An article by Caitlyn Fitzpatrick titled "Ben & Jerry's Launches Anti-Trump Ice Cream Flavor to Support Equality" was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 30, 2018.

- An article by Bim Adewunmi titled "Oprah is Going to Georgia to Campaign With Stacey Abrams" was posted at buzzfeednews.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- A Reuters article titled "Jane Fonda, Amy Schumer Among Stars to Appear on U.S. Voter Telethon [Two-Hour 'Telethon for America' on Monday at 9:00 p.m. ET]" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- An article by Melanie Arter titled "Barbara Streisand 'Thinking About' Moving to Canada If Dems Don't Gain Control of the House" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 31, 2018.
- An article by Jordain Carney titled "Colorado Governor [John Hickenlooper] Says He's 'Leaning Strongly' Toward Presidential Run" was posted at thehill.com on Oct. 31, 2018.

News about the media

- An article by Kelly Weill, Will Sommer and Pilar Melendez titled "Cesar Sayoc Jr., Alleged Mail Bomber, Threatened Democrats on Twitter" was posted at thedailybeast.com on Oct. 26, 2018.
- An article by Corinne Weaver titled "Pro-Life Website Threatened by Web Provider for 'Hate' Speech" was posted at newsbusters.org on Oct. 30, 2018.
- An article titled "CNN Bashes Clinton and Democrats for Wanting It 'Both Ways' on Extreme Rhetoric" was posted at ntknetwork.com on Oct. 29, 2018.
- An article by Joe Concha titled "CNN [Don] Lemon Doubles Down: 'Evidence is Overwhelming' That White Men Are 'Biggest Terror Threat'" was posted at thehill.com on Nov. 1, 2018.

General interest

- An article by Salena Zito titled "Not About Left vs. Right, But Insider vs. Outsider" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 30, 2018.
- An article by Michael Liedtke titled "Google Employees Leave Work [From Tokyo, Singapore and London to New York, Seattle and San Francisco] to Protest Treatment of Women" was posted at islandpacket.com on Nov. 1, 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."