

Eye on the World

Nov. 2, 2019

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. 2, 2019.

Compiled by Dave Haver

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 Simon Tisdall titled "About 41% of the Global Population Are Under 24; And They're Angry" was posted at theguardian.com on Oct. 26, 2019. Following are excerpts of the article.

Aspate of large-scale street protests around the world, from Chile and Hong Kong to Lebanon and Barcelona, is fuelling a search for common denominators and collective causes.

Are we entering a new age of global revolution? Or is it foolish to try to link anger in India over the price of onions to pro-democracy demonstrations in Russia?

Each country's protests differ in detail. But recent upheavals do appear to share one key factor: youth. In most cases, younger people are at the forefront of calls for change. The uprising that unexpectedly swept away Sudan's ancien regime this year was essentially generational in nature.

In one sense, this is unsurprising. Wordsworth expressed the eternal appeal of revolt for the young in The Prelude, a poem applauding the French Revolution. "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive, But to be young was very Heaven!" he declared. Wordsworth was 19 years old when the Bastille was stormed.

Yet while younger people, in any era, are predisposed to shake up the established order, extreme demographic, social and political imbalances are inten-

sifying present-day pressures. It is as if the unprecedented environmental traumas experienced by the natural world are being matched by similarly exceptional stresses in human society.

There are more young people than ever before.

About 41% of the global population of 7.7 billion is aged 24 or under.

In Africa, 41% is under 15.

In Asia and Latin America (where 65% of the world's people live), it's 25%.

In developed countries, imbalances tilt the other way. While 16% of Europeans are under 15, about 18%, double the world average, are over 65.

Most of these young people have reached, or will reach, adulthood in a world scarred by the 2008 financial crash. Recession, stagnant or falling living standards, and austerity programmes delivered from on high have shaped their experience.

As a result, many current protests are rooted in shared grievances about economic inequality and jobs.

In Tunisia, birthplace of the failed 2011 Arab spring, and more recently in neighbouring Algeria, street protests were led by unemployed young people and students angry about price and tax rises—and, more broadly, about broken reform promises. Chile and Iraq faced similar upheavals last week.

This global phenomenon of unfulfilled youthful aspirations is producing political timebombs.

Each month in India, one million people turn 18 and can register to vote.

In the Middle East and North Africa, an estimated 27 million youngsters will enter the workforce in the next five years. Any government, elected or not, that fails to provide jobs, decent wages and housing faces big trouble.

Numbers aside, the younger generations have something else that their elders lacked—they're connected. More people than ever before have access to education. They are healthier. They appear less bound by social conventions and religion. They are mutually aware. And their expectations are higher.

That's because, thanks to social media, the ubiquity of English as a common tongue, and the internet's globalisation and democratisation of information, younger people from all backgrounds and locations are more open to alternative life choices, more attuned to "universal" rights and norms such as free speech or a living wage—and less prepared to accept their denial.

Political unrest deriving from such rapid social evolution is everywhere. Lebanon's "WhatsApp revolution" is a perfect example. Yet some protests, such as those in Hong Kong and Catalonia, are overtly political from the very start.

Young Hong Kongers face familiar problems over scarce jobs and high rents. But by taking on China's authoritarian regime, they have assumed pole position in

a struggle against autocratic “strongman” rulers everywhere. Their campaign has international resonance, which is why China’s President Xi Jinping fears it.

It is difficult, if not perverse, to watch protesters risking torture and death by challenging Egypt’s dictator, Abdel Fattah el-Sisi, and not relate their daring both to Hong Kong and, say, to Kashmiris’ efforts to throw off the yoke imposed by another “strongman”, India’s Narendra Modi.

When Palestinian youths taunt the Israel Defence Forces with flags and stones, are they not part of the same global fight for democratic self-determination, basic freedoms and human rights espoused by young Muscovites opposing Vladimir Putin’s cruel kleptocracy?

In this sea of protest, a common factor is the increased willingness of undemocratic regimes, ruling elites and wealthy oligarchies to use force to crush threats to their power— while hypocritically condemning protester violence.

Repression is often justified in the name of fighting terrorism, as in Hong Kong. Other culprits include Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Myanmar and Nicaragua.

Another negative is the perceived, growing readiness of democratically elected governments, notably in the US and Europe, to lie, manipulate and disinform. Distrust of politicians, and resulting public alienation, is the common ground on which stand France’s “gilets jaunes”, Czech anti-corruption marchers and Extinction Rebellion. As William Hazlitt, the 18th-century essayist and celebrated mocker of Wordsworth might have said, disbelief is the new spirit of the age.

Perhaps these protests will one day merge into a joined-up global revolt against injustice, inequality, environmental ruin and oppressive powers-that-be.

Meanwhile, spare a thought for a different type of protest—the one you never hear about and what that may entail. The stifling silence that hangs over North Korea’s gulag, China’s Xinjiang and Tibet regions, and dark, hidden places inside Syria, Eritrea, Iran and Azerbaijan could yet descend on us all. What helps protect us is the noisy, life-affirming dissent of the young.



“Eye on the World” comment: Following are the headlines of 10 articles that discuss the Hong Kong controversy with regard to the hypocrisy of the NBA in general and to LeBron James in specific. (Although players have been quick to criticize Donald Trump, they have been reluctant to criticize China.)

■ An article by Mike Riggs titled “The NBA Cares More About Making Money in Mainland China Than Supporting Freedom in Hong Kong” was posted at reason.com on Oct. 7, 2019.

■ Looking back to 2018, an article by Chris Chavez titled “Fox News’ Laura Ingraham: LeBron Should ‘Shut Up and Dribble’ After Criticism of President Trump” was posted at si.com on Feb. 16, 2018.

- Looking back to 2018, an article by Matt Ellentuck titled “LeBron James Sharply Rebukes FOX News Host [Laura Ingraham]: ‘I Will Not Shut Up and Dribble’ ” was posted at sbnation.com on Feb. 17, 2018.
- Looking back to 2018, an article by Nick Schwartz titled “10 Times LeBron James Stood Up to Donald Trump” was posted at usatoday.com on Aug. 4, 2018.
- An article titled “NBA’s China Business Interests Clash With Free Speech in Hong Kong Tweet Controversy” was posted at pbs.org on Oct. 7, 2019.
- An article by Matt Philbin titled “Fox Sports’ [Jason] Whitlock: NBA ‘Strangling’ on It’s Own China ‘Hypocrisy’ ” was posted at newsbusters.org on Oct. 9, 2019.
- An article by Katie Pavlich titled “Jason Whitlock: Let’s Be Real, NBA Players and Coaches Think Americans Are the Bad Guys” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 10, 2019.
- An article by Hunter Felt titled “Are NBA Stars and Coaches Hypocrites for Not Speaking Out on China?” was posted at theguardian.com on Oct. 10, 2019.
- An article by Sam Clench titled “NBA’s \$4 Billion Nightmare: How One Tweet [by Houston Rockets General Manager Daryl Morey] Sparked a Controversy Spanning Two Global Superpowers” was posted at news.com.au on Oct. 12, 2019.
- An article titled “Americans Support Rockets GM’s [Daryl Morey’s] Hong Kong Tweet, Say LeBron [James] Acted From Financial Interest: Poll” was posted at foxnews.com on Oct. 25, 2019.



An article by Sumantra Maitra titled “Why Haven’t We Heard a Peep From Islamic Powers About China Brutalizing 1 Million Muslims?” was posted at thefederalist.com on Oct. 30, 2019. Following is the article.

Anyone observing academia from within would know that most of the research coming out of a majority of social science departments is meaningless and irrelevant. It’s a self-referential racket that squanders money on bureaucratic nonsense and on research subjects completely dissociated with normal life and policy.

Had it not been so, right now there would be scores of scholarships and funding to find out the causality behind a single puzzling phenomenon: What explains otherwise virulent, hyper-activist, and volatile Islamic countries and jihadist groups being completely subservient to China?

It is, of course, unthinkable that India, the United Kingdom, the United States, Israel, Russia, or any European Union country would get away with what China is doing without a response from Islamic countries. After all, China is routinely, systematically, and violently attacking the Islamic countries’ fellow religious practitioners.

Islamic states and civil society are not otherwise shy about showing their displeasure and have resorted on other policy priorities to collective action via proxy forces, demonstrations, and active funding of jihadist groups.

China has trade and military ties with all the major Islamic states, with major investments in Pakistan, Central Asia, Iran, and the Middle East.

So how did China manage to earn the subservience, when more than 1 million Muslims are interned in Chinese concentration camps?

And what does that mean for Western policy that we couldn't manage that feat through continuous appeasement?

The West is in too deep with China

China has compromised and infiltrated Western big corporates and universities. For decades since the end of the Second World War, in the West among both libertarians and conservatives, the market has been worshiped as something larger than the nation-state, and now that the market has decided China's money is more important than Western social cohesion, the fault lines are increasingly becoming prominent.

As Jim Antle recently wrote in *The American Conservative*, this is the modern metaphorical version of the proverbial corporatists selling the rope to Lenin by which he plans to hang them. But China should ideally shock both liberals and leftists as well and align them with conservatives.

As Matthew Walther wrote, the barbarism in China is incomparable and unprecedented but should ideally bring the left and right together. The fact that it doesn't shows how compromised the situation is.

Walther writes: "I cannot believe I am typing this about a man who eight years ago said he would be walking on Mars by now, but Newt Gingrich is absolutely right. Our leaders are not prepared to deal with China.

"Not only do they lack the cunning and the willpower—they lack the requisite bargaining tools. We are in too deep, and China knows it. Any concession we could possibly demand of them will require a corresponding one that we are unable to grant.

"Besides, it is not clear to me that a substantial number of Americans particularly wants to see our relations with China change. We are happy to buy cheap water bottles and Halloween decorations and licensed cartoon merchandise and mobile phones. We want our movies shown in Chinese theaters and our sports leagues to have large Chinese fan bases. From our home in this consumer paradise hell looks impossibly remote."

Very well. That's on us to fix.

But what explains the muted reaction from the Islamic world?

This is an important question. While for liberals and neoconservatives every two-penny authoritarian looks like the next Adolf Hitler, only one great power that we know of is actively running concentration camps, where reportedly more than 1

million people are enslaved with no rights or freedom, women are being raped, and Mengeleian experiments are being conducted on live human subjects.

Now, as with any news this gruesome, there is always a need for caution on how much to believe and what to ignore. But no smoke can exist without some fire, and if even a quarter of the news coming out of dissidents is true, the reality is horrific.

Why are Islamic leaders silent?

The strangest part is the deadly silence from Islamic leaders. Naturally, this leads to a few questions.

Are the Islamic countries afraid of China more than they are of the West?

Is that because they worry about losing Chinese investment, or is that because they know that if they provoke China to the point of a war, Chinese military will not follow human rights rules during engagement?

It is unlikely that Chinese military in a war situation would follow the careful “minimal-civilian-casualty” mode of warfare or counterinsurgency the West currently practices.

Is that a deterrent?

From Pakistan, to Iran, to Saudi Arabia, to Turkey, all the leading Islamic powers are silent about literally millions of their fellow religious practitioners being brutalized, as are the countless jihadist groups from Indonesia to Iraq.

■ This could mean only one thing: that the Islamic states and jihadist groups are more afraid of China than they are of anyone else.

Consider any other power—the EU, the U.S., the U.K., Russia, India, or Israel—acting like China, and imagine what the reaction would be.

Where are the mass protests?

Where are the flag burnings?

Where are the embassy attacks?

Where are the jihadist bombings of Chinese economic interests in Africa and elsewhere?

That question as to why there aren't any needs to be probed for strictly strategic reasons.

What did the Chinese manage to do that we couldn't, after billions in aid, hundreds of thousands of refugees resettled, and humanitarian wars?

For liberals, neoconservatives, or Trotskyists, and anyone else who prefers values more than interests, the answer is always more universalism and internationalism.

Tyranny and despotism need to be confronted forcefully at every juncture, even to the point of overstressing militarily and financially. National conservatives and realists, for example, believe in narrow realpolitik. To them, interests matter more, and only when interests are threatened.

China's rise should trouble liberals and conservatives

In one current case, however, everyone should agree that the rise of China should concern both conservative-realists and liberals.

Liberals should be worried about human rights in Hong Kong, which Ben Domenech chronicled here, as well as the influence of Chinese authoritarianism within Western institutions.

Conservative realists should be worried that China is a growing peer rival great power with hegemonic aspirations in Asia, a growing navy, and powerful research in AI and genetics unhindered by gender-diversity nonsense.

China is a power determined to hollow out the West from within. This is something the Soviets couldn't do due to their economic model. One shudders to think, however, how much manufacturing the Western corporate sector then would have funneled to cheap Russian labor to hollow out heartland England and America, had the autarkic Soviets been more like globally integrated state-capitalist China.

Even for the sake of academic and strategic inquiry, both liberals and conservatives should focus on trying to find the answer to the question—What is the Chinese secret strategy through which they conquered the entire Islamic world and managed to earn its submissive obedience without firing a single shot or losing a single life in futile humanitarian wars, such as the ones fought with blood and treasure, since Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 1990s?



An article by Ben Shapiro titled "The J Street Democrats" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 30, 2019. Following is the article.

This week, four of the top candidates for the 2020 Democratic presidential nomination—Pete Buttigieg, Amy Klobuchar, Julian Castro and Bernie Sanders—gathered at the J Street Conference to explain the following.

- Why the United States ought to pressure the state of Israel to make concessions to terrorists.
- Why the Obama administration was correct to appease the Iranian regime.
- Why American Jews ought to value the opinions of Bernie Sanders over those of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on the future of Jewish safety.

Two other top Democrats—Elizabeth Warren and Joe Biden—sent video messages in support of the group.

By contrast, when the American Israel Public Affairs Committee held its annual conference in March, not a single Democratic presidential candidate showed up. The Democrats are, by and large, simply too ashamed to stand with an actual pro-Israel group, although prominent congressional leaders still show up to mouth nostrums about bipartisan support for Israel.

But the heart of the Democratic Party has moved against Israel. Reasons?

- Israel is economically successful, while its enemies are not.
- Israel is liberal, while its enemies are not.
- Israel is the tip of the spear of Western civilization in an area known for its tribalism and brutality.

This means that according to the radical left, Israel is an exploitative country hell-bent on domination, despite its lack of territorial ambition—Israel has signed over large swaths of land won through military victory to geopolitical enemies, and offered much more repeatedly.

So the Democrats built up and gave credence to J Street, a Trojan horse group dedicated to undermining American support for Israel and justifying left-wing hatred of the Jewish state. J Street was founded by Clinton operative Jeremy Ben-Ami and Israeli far-left political figure Daniel Levy in late 2007. One of its chief sources of funding—a source obscured in the early years by its founders—was anti-Israel radical George Soros.

The media quickly began treating J Street as a legitimate representative of mainstream Jewish opinion on Israel, and so did Democrats, particularly in the anti-Israel Obama administration.

Rather than having to deal with those troublesome actually pro-Israel voices at AIPAC, it was easier to bring in a few ringers from J Street to pretend that advocating for negotiations with Hamas represented an acceptable opinion in the pro-Israel community.

And those sorts of positions routinely crop up at J Street.

J Street repeatedly urged the Obama administration to abstain from anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations. Proponents of the anti-Semitic Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement have found comfort at their events.

J Street was an adamant backer of Barack Obama's Iran deal when the pro-Israel community unanimously opposed it.

J Street has refused to condemn a government deal between the Palestinian Authority and Hamas and has even undermined Israeli self-defense in conflicts with Hamas.

On campus, J Street regularly hosts groups dedicated to smearing the Israel Defense Forces.

So it was no wonder that Bernie Sanders arrived at the J Street conference and quickly suggested aid to Israel be redirected to the Gaza Strip, run by Hamas, to the cheers of attendees.

It was no surprise when Buttigieg suggested that the Iran deal correctly ignored Iran's terrorist funding and ballistic missile testing, while also sug-

gesting that America reconsider aid to Israel if Israel continues to build in disputed areas of Judea and Samaria.

It was no shock when Julian Castro pledged to open an embassy in East Jerusalem for the Palestinians—despite the fact that no solution has been negotiated with regard to the final status of Jerusalem.

Leaders in the Democratic Party may maintain that their anti-Israel turn is due to Benjamin Netanyahu. Those who understand Israeli politics know better.

There is wide consensus in Israel that no negotiation can be expected with Hamas, Islamic jihadis or the Palestinian Authority— those negotiations have ended in blood too many times.

Absent a peace partner, there can be no peace. Democrats must know this. But they'd prefer to blind themselves to that knowledge—and use J Street to cover their tracks.



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

-
- An article titled "Did Israel Stealth F-35s Do the Unthinkable: Fly Over Iran?" was posted at nationalinterest.org on Oct. 27, 2019.
 - An article by Kelvin Chan titled "Hong Kong Protesters, Police in Halloween Standoff" was posted at apnews.com on Oct. 31, 2019.
 - An article by Jeremy Bowen titled "Is a New Arab Spring Unfolding in the Middle East?" was posted at bbc.com on Oct. 29, 2019.
 - An article by Eustance Huang titled "A 'Growing Club' of 'Very Powerful Countries' Is Steering Away From Using the Dollar" was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 30, 2019.
 - A Reuters article titled "New Russian Submarine Test Fires Intercontinental Missile for First Time" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 30, 2019.
 - An article by David Reid titled "UK Lawmakers Agree to Hold Dec. 12 Election in Bid to Resolve Brexit Paralysis" was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 29, 2019.
 - An article by Chris Tomlinson titled "Statistics Show Paris Violent Crime and Robberies Surging" was posted at breitbart.com on Oct. 30, 2019.
 - An article titled "Australians Could Soon Be Forced to Scan Their Faces Before Watching Porn Online Under Sweeping New Proposals" was posted at dailymail.co.uk on Oct. 28, 2019.
 - A Reuters article titled "Over 40 Skulls Found at Altar in Den of Mexico Cartel Suspects" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 28, 2019.



An article by David Harsanyi titled “Democrats Keep Changing The Rules Of Impeachment” was posted at thefederalist.com on Oct. 9, 2019. Following is the article.

When Barack Obama’s Attorney General Eric Holder ignored congressional subpoenas in an investigation into a scandal featuring a body count, White House Spokesperson Dan Pfeiffer argued that administration officials had no duty to participate in what amounted to “political theater rather than legitimate congressional oversight.”

So does the White House get to decide what constitutes a legitimate congressional investigation? Or is it only Democrats who make this determination?

Since Pfeiffer now argues that an administration that ignores congressional subpoenas is functioning “above the law”—surely an impeachable offense—I can only imagine the latter.

Now, impeachment is political option that should be dusted off far more frequently. It’s a shame House Republicans never used this remedy during the scandal-plagued Obama years. The country, though, needs some consistent standards, or all we have is theater.

For instance, knowing that the Republican-controlled Senate is unlikely to remove the president over his reckless call with Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi is doing her best to maximize the political impact of a nebulous “inquiry.”

Part of this political effort means delaying a full House vote, which would likely result in the judiciary committee laying out ground rules and procedures moving forward. This was the bipartisan process used during both Clinton and Nixon sagas.

Now we have a new set of rules.

Perhaps Pelosi is looking to solidify a vote total, or maybe she’s trying to protect members in swing districts, or, most likely, she’s waiting for the most politically opportune time to move forward. All of that is her prerogative.

They are also political considerations, despite all the distraught coverage, not decisions predicated on protecting the integrity of process or Congress or the Constitution. Let’s face it, the notion that progressives are concerned about process is risible.

The non-vote, however, allows the House Intelligence Committee to shower subpoenas on the White House and create the impression, through the innuendo of activity, that Trump’s call with Zelensky was not merely a high crime (highly debatable) but the tip of widespread conspiracy (less debatable).

The non-vote allows hyper-partisans like Rep. Adam Schiff to keep testimony secret when useful, selectively sharing useful snippets of evidence with media allies who then dutifully curate all the leaks into a useful political narrative.

After two years, and dozens of misleading stories fueling Russia collusion coverage, former special counsel Robert Mueller ultimately debunked Schiff's core contention. With Ukraine, the congressman only needs to propel his production into November 2020.

Pelosi's delay also allows Democrats to shield the name of the intelligence whistleblower. I bet Linda Tripp wishes she had been so lucky. No, this isn't a criminal trial, but you suspect many voters who are okay with a hypothetical impeachment would regard the act of facing an accuser a matter of fundamental fairness.

Even if the name isn't shared with the public, it should be shared with congressional Republicans. There's every reason to be wary of politically motivated players in the government.

House Democrats can gin-up the melodrama, suggesting the person, facing moral danger, testify from a remote location with an obscured appearance and voice like a Mafia informant.

But as the *Wall Street Journal* editorial board points out: "The whistleblower statute is intended to protect individuals against reprisal at work. It isn't supposed to provide immunity from public scrutiny about claims aimed at ousting a President. We wonder if the goal here is to protect the whistleblower or prevent the American people from learning something that might cast doubt on his accusations."

It's fair to wonder. Whistleblowing is an important tool of good government. Yet not all whistleblowers are chaste do-gooders.

We know that this one met with Schiff's office for guidance before filing his report (although we still don't know how helpful the congressman was) and that Schiff lied about that meeting.

The whistleblower also reportedly had "some type of professional relationship" with a 2020 Democratic Party candidate that could, potentially, benefit from an impeachment.

None of these factors mean the whistleblower's contentions should be summarily dismissed, but they're all pertinent.

What if, for instance, we learn that the whistleblower worked for Joe Biden?

Most media have decreed that any questions about the Biden's family extraordinarily fortuitous foreign business dealings are nothing but conspiracies, even though those charges are at the center of the phone call that is the current impetus for impeachment. Seems pertinent.

It also seems likely we are going to find all this out. At some point, Pelosi will have to turn the key. Considering the potential backlash for inaction, it seems unthinkable at this point that she won't. And Trump, like Pelosi, will be making his own political considerations.

Because though it might be a great surprise to those covering the impeachment story, history didn't begin in 2016, and the executive and legislative branches have always been at war.

Simply because Democrats keep changing the rules doesn't mean Republicans have to play along.



An article by Tristan Justice titled "The Rules of the Democrat-Backed Impeachment Inquiry Are Stacked Against Trump" was posted at thefederalist.com on Oct. 31, 2019. Following is the article.

House Democrats rubber-stamped an ad hoc anti-Trump investigation Thursday aimed at overturning the results of the 2016 election after the spectacular failure of the grand Russian collusion hoax collapsing earlier this year.

The text of the resolution lays the framework for the official impeachment proceedings going forward led by House Intelligence Committee Chairman Adam Schiff, D-Calif., who has been operating an illegitimate process since Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., announced the beginning an investigation in September.

Despite Democrat claims that the resolution would mean an open and transparent process, House members are still holding hearings in secret even after its passage.

The Democrat passed rules for impeachment also bar Republican lawmakers from calling witnesses or subpoenaing evidence without prior approval from Democrats. Members of the minority party were granted these rights in both the Nixon and the Clinton impeachment proceedings.

Schiff, whose credibility was shattered by his peddling of the Russian conspiracy theory for the last three years, has run an unfair process from the start.

Behind closed doors, Schiff interviewed witnesses and selectively leaked parts of their testimonies to frame the president while Trump's legal counsel has been barred from participating, denying the president rights to due process.

On Wednesday, House Minority Whip Steve Scalise, R-La., exposed Schiff for directing witnesses testifying not to answer questions asked by Republican members.

"He's directing witnesses not to answer questions that he doesn't want the witness to answer if they're asked by Republicans," Scalise told reporters on Capitol Hill. "He's not cut off one Democrat. He's not interrupted one Democrat and told a witness not to answer Democrat members' questions but today he started telling witnesses not to answer questions by certain Republicans."

Pelosi opened the investigation in September after an anonymous "whistleblower" filed a complaint accusing Trump of conspiring with the Ukrainian president to investigate political opponents. While the complaint was marked "credible" and "urgent" by the intelligence community inspector general, it was not given those ratings by the Department of National Intelligence.

The identity of the whistleblower was revealed Wednesday to be a 33-year-old former intelligence official who worked in the Trump White House as a holdover from the Obama administration.

According to Real Clear Investigations, which first reported the identity of the whistleblower, the complainant worked with a DNC operative to peddle the Russian collusion hoax in addition to working under former Vice President Joe Biden and former CIA Director John Brennan.

The whistleblower's complaint regarding the now infamous July phone call between Trump and President Volodymyr Zelensky alleges a quid pro quo offered by the president to his Ukrainian counterpart, threatening to withhold military aid in exchange for investigating the corruption related to Biden's son's energy company, Burisma.

Hunter Biden served on the board of the Ukrainian energy company raking in \$50,000 a month despite having no prior experience in the industry. In an interview with ABC News, Hunter Biden admitted to practicing "poor judgement."

While serving as a senator from Delaware, Joe Biden reportedly reached out to federal agencies discreetly to discuss matters that his son's firm was lobbying for, according to records uncovered by the Washington Examiner.

The complaint now at the heart of the Democratic impeachment efforts has been both corroborated and contradicted by witnesses testifying in secret.

On Thursday, the latest testimony came from a former National Security Counsel official who served under Trump, Tim Morrison, who testified before the House that he was not worried that anything in the phone call between the two world leaders was illegal, according to remarks obtained by The Federalist.

"I want to be clear, I was not concerned that anything illegal was discussed," said Morrison, who was the NSC senior director for European affairs. "I have no reason to believe the Ukrainians had any knowledge of the [military funding] review until August 28, 2019," which was the day that Schiff claimed that Trump had withheld funding to the eastern European nation as part of a quid pro quo.

Morrison also contradicted key elements of William Taylor's leaked testimony, who serves in the U.S. embassy in Kiev, Ukraine for the State Department. Morrison said despite Taylor's comments before the committee, that a meeting between Morrison and the Ukrainian National Security advisor never met at a private hotel.

Morrison also undercut Taylor's testimony that U.S. ambassador to Ukraine Gordon Sondland requested a public announcement of an investigation into Burisma from the Ukrainian president.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Gun Grabbers Misleading Us" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 30, 2019. Following is the article.

Gun control did not become politically acceptable until the Gun Control Act of 1968 signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson. The law's primary focus was to regulate commerce in firearms by prohibiting interstate firearms transfers except among licensed manufacturers, dealers and importers.

Today's gun control advocates have gone much further, calling for an outright ban of what they call assault rifles such as the AR-15. By the way, AR stands for ArmaLite Rifle, which is manufactured by Colt Manufacturing Co. As for being a military assault weapon, our soldiers would be laughed off the battlefield carrying AR-15s.

Let's look at some FBI statistics on homicide and then you can decide how many homicides would be prevented by a ban on rifles.

The FBI lists murder victims by weapon from 2014 to 2018 in their 2018 report on Crime in the United States.

- It turns out that slightly over 2% (297) out of a total of 14,123 homicides were committed with rifles.
- A total of 1,515 or 11% of homicides were committed by knives.
- Four hundred and forty-three people were murdered with a hammer, club or some other bludgeoning instrument.
- Six hundred seventy-two people were murdered by a hand, foot or fist.
- Handguns accounted for the most murders—6,603.

What these statistics point out clearly is that the so-called assault weapons ban and mandatory buyback plan that 2020 Democratic presidential hopeful Beto O'Rourke and others call for, will do little or nothing to bring down homicides. More homicides could be prevented by advocating for knife control, hammer control and feet and fist control.

Gun controllers' belief that "easy" gun availability is our problem ignores U.S. history. Guns were far more readily available yesteryear. One could mail order a gun from Sears or walk into a hardware store or a pawnshop to make a purchase. With truly easy gun availability throughout our history, there was nowhere near the mayhem and mass murder that we see today.

Here's my question to all those who want restrictions placed on gun sales: Were the firearms of yesteryear better behaved than those same firearms are today?

That's really a silly question; guns are inanimate objects and have no capacity to act. Our problem is a widespread decline in moral values that has nothing to do with guns. That decline includes disrespect for those in authority, disrespect for oneself, little accountability for anti-social behavior and a scuttling of religious teachings that reinforce moral values.

Let's examine some elements of this decline.

If any American who passed away before 1960 were to return to today's America, they would not believe the kind of personal behavior acceptable today.

They wouldn't believe that youngsters could get away with cursing at and assaulting teachers.

They wouldn't believe that cities such as Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis and Baltimore hire hundreds of school police officers and that in some schools, students must go through metal detectors.

During my own primary and secondary schooling in Philadelphia, from 1942 to 1954, the only time we saw a policeman in school was during an assembly period where we had to listen to a boring lecture from Officer Friendly on safety. Our ancestors also wouldn't believe that we're now debating whether teachers should be armed.

Americans who call for stricter and stricter gun control know that getting rid of rifles will do little or nothing for the nation's homicide rate. Their calls for more restrictive gun laws are part of a larger strategy to outlaw gun ownership altogether. You have to wonder what these people have in store for us when they've eliminated our means to defend ourselves.

Venezuela dictator Nicolas Maduro banned private gun ownership in 2012. The result is that Venezuelans had no way to protect themselves from criminals and government troops who preyed upon them.

After Fidel Castro's demand for gun confiscation, he said, "Armas para que?" ("Guns, for what?") Cubans later found out.



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "Sucking Up to China" was posted at patriotpост.us on Oct. 26, 2019. Following are excerpts of the article.

This isn't the first time in history that Americans and others who should know better have been cheerleaders, waving their pom-poms on behalf of a dictatorship. During the 30s and 40s and, in some cases, on into the 50s, people like George Bernard Shaw, Charles Lindbergh, Lillian Hellman, Henry Ford, H.L. Mencken and Dalton Trumbo, destroyed their reputations by praising the likes of Adolph Hitler, Benito Mussolini and/or Joseph Stalin. Only time will tell if the same fate will befall the assorted creeps who, today, are genuflecting to the Chinese tyrants.

The reprobates in those earlier decades would point to Mussolini's making the Italian trains run on time, Hitler's returning a sense of national pride to Germany and Stalin's turning Russia from a land of serfs into a worker's paradise. Deep down, I have always suspected that what they admired most about these political gangsters was their brutality. I believe there is a streak of the sadomasochistic in the psychological make up of people who admire the likes of Fidel Castro, Che Guevara and Xi Jinping, men who don't have to put things to a vote, who have the power to murder on a whim. It's a power they devoutly wish they themselves possessed.

Today, those huckstering on behalf of China don't even bother trying to come up with positive-sounding rationales for their craven behavior. It's enough that

China has over a billion potential customers for electronic devices, movies and basketball. The bottom line is all that truly matters to bottom-feeders.

■ Amazon, Facebook and Google

Although the folks who run Amazon, Facebook and Google, are the loudest voices, and certainly the richest people, accusing President Trump of being a dictator, they have no trouble at all prostrating themselves to the actual tyrants running China.

Google, which refuses to cooperate in any way with the U.S. military, is only too happy to oblige China by providing that government with facial recognition technology and Artificial Intelligence and everything else the despots need in order to keep the Chinese people in chains.

Things have gotten so bad in the Silicon Valley that hundreds of employees at Google have petitioned the company to stop working with the Chinese military to oppress its citizens. And keep in mind, these employees are the same people who despise Donald Trump. But that doesn't mean they hate America and want to play any role in propping up a dictatorship 8,000 miles away.

■ Project Dragonfly

As reported in *The New American*, Google research scientist Jack Poulson resigned in protest over Project Dragonfly, a search engine that would enable the Communist regime to monitor, censor and surveil its citizens.

■ The Good Censor

A leaked 85-page Google briefing entitled "The Good Censor" confirms that Google, Facebook and Twitter control "the majority of online conversations" and have adopted a "shift towards censorship."

■ Peter Thiel of PayPal

One of the few titans on Silicon Valley, billionaire Peter Thiel, founder of PayPal, who is a conservative and supports Donald Trump, has actually dared to use the word "treasonous" when referring to Google's relationship with China.

It's not just the geeky technocrats who have sided with China, just as it wasn't just the New York and Hollywood intelligentsia who ballyhooed on behalf of the Soviet Union. As William F. Jasper writes: "People like David Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger and George Soros, have been at the forefront when it came to boosting China's military, economy and technology, for decades."

■ Targeting conservatives

We all know that even before Lois Lerner and the IRS started targeting conservative groups and individuals, the major tech companies were knocking conservatives off their supposedly neutral platforms.

As if all that's not reason enough for Congress to break up the Silicon Valley monopolies, a senior Google engineer, Dr. Greg Coppola, has blown the whistle on the industry's alleged lack of political bias.

When Google CEO Sundar Pichai told a congressional committee last year that his company's algorithms were politically unbiased, Coppola called his boss's claim "ridiculous." He added: "Everyone who supports anything other than the Democrats, anyone who's pro-Trump or in any way deviates from what CNN and the *New York Times* are pushing, knows how bad it is."

He concluded with this dire warning: "Are we going to just let the biggest tech companies decide who wins every election from now on?"

■ United Nations folly

Apparently, the United Nations is so thick-headed, they are beyond the point where they can even be embarrassed. When I heard recently that Venezuela had been selected to join the UN's Human Rights Council, I was taken slightly aback. But then I checked to see which other countries were represented and was reassured to find that Venezuela would not feel out of place.

It would be joining a group that already included the likes of Pakistan, Cuba, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan and China. Come to think of it, Venezuela might just decide it's slumming in that sort of company.

■ China is a cash cow

Having had China on my mind a great deal recently, it occurred to me that liberals have been thrown into a maelstrom they could never have anticipated. On the one hand, the technocrats, professional basketball players and Hollywood celebrities, who view China as the world's largest cash cow, have to make a concerted effort not only to ignore the fact that China is a dictatorship that murders its dissidents, bullies the people of Hong Kong and gobbled up Tibet, but is far and away the major polluter in the world and, for good measure, boasts a great big beautiful wall.

And unlike Trump's version, which is solely intended to keep uninvited foreigners out, China's serves a double purpose by also, like the Berlin Wall, keeping its own people in.

■ Climate change and gun control

It's fortunate that those who have been leading in the campaigns for legislation pushing climate change and dis-arming law-abiding Americans are either young twerps like David Hogg and Greta Thunberg or creepy adults like Beto O'Rourke, Michael Bloomberg, Kirsten Gillibrand, Bob Menendez, Donna Shalala, Ayanna Pressley, Peter King and Amy Klobuchar.

■ Those pushing impeachment

Come to think of it, it's nothing less than a godsend that those leading the call for Trump's impeachment are as gruesome a lot as Maxine Waters, Ilhan Omar, Jerry Nadler, Rashida Tlaib, A O-C, Adam Schiff and Nancy Pelosi; and that the gang looking to replace him are as despicable as Bernie Sanders, Kamala Harris, Elizabeth Warren, Joe Biden, Julián Castro, Cory Booker and Peter Buttigieg.



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "Gnomes in the News" was posted at patriotpост.us on Oct. 28, 2019. Following are excerpts of the article.

Inasmuch as Barack Obama recently endorsed Justin Trudeau in his bid for re-election as Canada's prime minister, I would suggest that Trudeau pack his bags and leave the key under the mat for his opponent.

■ Obama's endorsements were not helpful

After all, when it comes to getting his choices elected, Obama is about 0-20 so far. As recently as 2018, he struck out with Bill Nelson, Andrew Gillum and Stacey Abrams. Whereas King Midas had the golden touch, Obama has the touch of bubonic plague.

■ Did Obama meddle in a foreign election?

By the way, does this qualify as American meddling in foreign elections, even if not to the same extent as in 2015, when President Obama sent his crew over to Israel with the specific task of helping Yitzhak Herzog defeat Bibi Netanyahu?

Feel free to add Mr. Herzog to the list of Obama's failures even if Barack didn't personally fly over to speak on his behalf. The man is toxic even when 5,000 miles away.

■ Influenced Erdogan

I was happy to hear that V.P. Pence and Secretary of State Pompeo were able to persuade Yeccep Erdogan to comply with Trump's reasonable request that Turkey not commit genocide twice in a century.

■ Where was NATO?

On the other hand, why does it always fall on the U.S. to deal with the loons in the Middle East? What the heck are our alleged allies in NATO, including Germany, France, Spain, Italy and the United Kingdom, doing? I mean, aside from bad-mouthing President Trump. They're all a lot closer to the Middle East than we are.

■ Bloomberg entering the race?

Just as the Democrats seemed to be on the verge of deep-sixing a number of contenders before the next debate, it appears that Michael Bloomberg just might be tossing his beanie in the race. Be still, my heart.

Every billionaire needs a hobby, apparently. But I fail to see what he thinks he's bringing to the party. We know he hates guns, but apparently not as much as Beto O'Rourke, who has vowed to confiscate them.

Bloomberg worries himself sick over climate change, but not as much as Tom Steyer, who has apparently thought about nothing else for the past 10 years.

He's Jewish, which I suppose counts for something in certain circles, but we already have Bernie Sanders checking that box. Speaking of Sanders, does

he ever not sound like he's delivering an angry anti-capitalism speech to his comrades in the Politburo?

Getting back to the other obnoxious New Yorker, Bloomberg is short; even shorter, I wager, than his claim to be 5 foot 8. And whereas I would, for obvious reasons, count his lack of height a plus, it's a fact that people nearly always vote for the taller of the two candidates. The height difference will be accentuated when during the presidential debate, Donald Trump, at 6 foot 3, will tower over the diminutive Bloomberg. Of course Bloomberg can try to disguise the height differential, but he would then risk falling and breaking something while trying to navigate on his 7-10 inch heels.

■ Huge payday for Hunter

When asked if he thought he would have been named to serve on the board of a Ukrainian energy company and paid a million dollars a year to do so if his name wasn't Biden, Joe's son Hunter said: "I'm not sure...I'm not sure. Probably not."

Others have mocked him, but I thought his words and his delivery were extremely droll. I couldn't imagine a British actor in an Oscar Wilde drawing room comedy doing better.

Here's a middle-aged fellow who knew nothing about the energy business and couldn't have found Ukraine on a map, suggesting that he just might have lucked out even with a different last name.

And I suppose he's right, if his name had been, say, Hunter Obama.

■ LeBron James kowtows to police state

Lebron James, a prominent basketball player, was one of those who took exception to Daryl Morey, general manager of the Houston Rockets, voicing his support of the freedom-seeking demonstrators in Hong Kong. As Lebron put it: "Yes, we have free speech, but there can be consequences – financially, politically, morally and spiritually."

It's worth remembering that Mr. James, whose claim to the moral high ground is based on his ability to dunk a basketball, was one of the prime movers when it came to pulling the NBA All Star game out of Charlotte, North Carolina, because he was so offended that the state wouldn't allow its transgenders (all three of them) to decide for themselves which public bathrooms to use.

But he's just fine with kowtowing to a police state.

You might think that a guy who makes \$50 million-a-year just in endorsements could afford not to grovel to fascists. But, as with the bosses at Facebook, Google and Amazon, who make even more money, you'd be wrong.

Sometimes it seems like it's the wealthiest people who are the greediest. They're like 500-pound gluttons who can never bring themselves to leave the table.

■ Governors, not owners

If the players in the NBA behave like spoiled brats, you can blame their employers. All the players had to do was whine that they objected to the owners being called owners because it harkened back to the plantation days, and the owners agreed to use the term "governors."

So, now we have human giraffes earning upwards of \$10 million-a-year comparing themselves to slaves who picked cotton in the scorching sun in exchange for room, board and an occasional whipping.

To find something equally obscene, you have to go to Hollywood where women who have never starred in a single hit film whine because they're paid less than Robert Downey, who only appears in multi-million dollar blockbusters.

■ Criticize Trump, but not China

As bad as the folks in the NBA and Hollywood are, what is there to say about those in Congress who brought out their crying towels over the Kurds because they could use it to bash Trump, but fail to say a single word on behalf of the folks in Hong Kong waving American flags in the face of armed Chinese soldiers?



"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.

Deficit

- An article by Thomas Franck titled "Federal Deficit Increases 26% to \$984 Billion for Fiscal 2019, Highest in 7 Years" was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 25, 2019.
- An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled "Federal Income Taxes and Federal Spending Both Set Records in FY19" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 28, 2019.
- An article by Jordain Carney titled "Senate Rejects [Rand] Paul Effort to Cut Spending" was posted at thehill.com on Oct. 28, 2019.

Finances

- An article titled "California Governor Signs Bill Limiting Oil, Gas Development" was posted at apnews.com on Oct. 12, 2019.
- An article by Thomas Franck titled "US GDP Rose a Better-Than-Expected 1.9% in the Third Quarter As Consumers Continued to Spend" was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 30, 2019.
- An article by Catherine Garcia titled "Trump Celebrates 1.9 Percent GDP Growth; He Blasted the Exact Same Number Under Obama" was posted at theweek.com on Oct. 30, 2019.

Trade war

■ A Reuters article by Gabriel Crossley titled "China's Factory Activity Shrinks for Sixth Month As Trade War Clouds Outlook" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 30, 2019.

Green New Deal

■ An article by Julio Rosas titled "'Why Don't You Practice What You Preach?': Piers Morgan Grills Climate Activist's Hypocritical Lifestyle" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 10, 2019.

■ Looking back to September, an article by Media Matters Staff titled "Sebastian Gorka and Michelle Malkin Warn That 'Soros-Allied Organizations' Are Working Toward 'Demographic Conquest' " was posted at mediamatters.org on Sept. 12, 2019.

■ An article by Melanie Arter titled "[Rand] Paul: Young People Want 'Scandinavian Socialism,' But It's Welfare, and Middle Class Paid for It" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 10, 2019.

■ An article by Ann Coulter titled "We, Too, Can Be a Failed Latin American State" was posted at anncoulter.com on Oct. 23, 2019.

■ An article by Morgan Gstalter titled "7 in 10 Millennials Say They Would Vote for a Socialist: Poll" was posted at thehill.com on Oct. 28, 2019.

■ An article by Michael W. Chapman titled "Sen. [Rand] Paul: Nobody in Media Challenges AOC, Sanders for Backing Ideas of Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 29, 2019.

■ An article by Alexandra Marvar titled "The US City [Kingston, N.Y.] Preparing Itself for the Collapse of Capitalism" was posted at theguardian.com on Oct. 31, 2019.

Illegal immigration

■ An article titled "Libya Coast Guard Intercepts Dozens of Europe-Bound Migrants" was posted at apnews.com on Oct. 28, 2019.

Comments about weapons

■ An article by Zachary Halaschak titled "NBA Coach Steve Kerr Compares Gun Ushers in US to Human Rights Abuses in China" was posted at washing-tonexaminer.com on Oct. 11, 2019.

■ An article by Chrissy Clark titled "NBA's Steve Kerr Compares Communist China to Owning An AR-15" was posted at thefederalist.com on Oct. 11, 2019.

Comments about Trump support

■ An article titled "Judge Jeanine: US Intelligence Agencies Are Trying to Take Out President Trump" was posted at foxnews.com on Oct. 11, 2019.

■ An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "[Nikki] Haley Recalls Serving With Some Who Tried to Undermine Trump; 'What's at Stake Is the Constitution' " was posted at [cnsnews.com](https://www.cnsnews.com) on Oct. 30, 2019.

Comments about Trump opposition

■ An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Hillary Clinton Says 'Maybe There Does Need to Be a Rematch' Against Trump" was posted at [cnsnews.com](https://www.cnsnews.com) on Oct. 9, 2019.

■ An article by Tucker Higgins titled "Billionaire George Soros Says Elizabeth Warren 'Is the Most Qualified to Be President' " was posted at [cnn.com](https://www.cnn.com) on Oct. 25, 2019.

■ An article by Joe Schoffstall titled "Soros Group [Open Society Policy Center] Eclipses \$70 Million Spent on Lobbying Since Trump Took Office" was posted at [freebeacon.com](https://www.freebeacon.com) on Oct. 24, 2019.

■ Looking back to July, an article by Peter Hasson titled "Democrats Denied Transgender Athletes Have Advantages in Women Sports; Science Says They're Wrong" was posted at [dailycaller.com](https://www.dailycaller.com) on July 25, 2019.

■ Looking back to August, an article by Peter Hasson titled "Biologically Male D1 Runner [From the University of Montana] Switches to Women's Team for Senior Year" was posted at [dailycaller.com](https://www.dailycaller.com) on Aug. 28, 2019.

■ An article by Peter Hasson titled "Biologically Male Runner [From the University of Montana] Named [Big Sky] Conference Female Athlete of the Week" was posted at [dailycaller.com](https://www.dailycaller.com) on Oct. 25, 2019.

■ An article by Melanie Arter titled "Sen. Amy Klobuchar Supports Recognizing '3rd Gender Markers' on a Federal Level" was posted at [cnsnews.com](https://www.cnsnews.com) on Oct. 11, 2019.

■ An article by Tyler Pager titled "Joe Biden in Danger of Humiliating Loss in Iowa, Top Democrats Warn" was posted at [yahoo.com](https://www.yahoo.com) on Oct. 29, 2019.

■ An article titled "Marc Thiessen Questions Whether Joe Biden Would Have Given Order to Get Al-Baghdadi [Since He Was Apparently the Only Member of Obama's National Security Team That Opposed the Mission to Kill Usama Bin Laden]" was posted at [foxnews.com](https://www.foxnews.com) on Oct. 29, 2019.

■ An article by Leah Barkoukis titled "Elizabeth Warren Releases \$115 Trillion Plan to Combat 'Environmental Racism' " was posted at [townhall.com](https://www.townhall.com) on Oct. 10, 2019.

■ An article titled "Warren Admits Universal Medicare Would Result in Two Million Lost Jobs" was posted at [nationalview.com](https://www.nationalview.com) on Oct. 31, 2019.

■ An article by Tim O'Donnell titled "Bernie Sanders Differentiates Himself From Warren, Says He's the Only Candidate Willing to Stand Up to Corporate Elite" was posted at [yahoo.com](https://www.yahoo.com) on Oct. 13, 2019.

■ An article by Timothy Meads titled "AOC Says She Didn't Recognize Her 'Inherent Value' As a Human Until She Heard About Bernie Sanders" was posted at [townhall.com](https://www.townhall.com) on Oct. 31, 2019.

- An article by Eugene Daniels and Holly Otterbein titled "The Unexpected Threat Emerging Against Bernie: Andrew Yang" was posted at politico.com on Oct. 28, 2019.
- An article titled "Mayors for Pete: Buttigieg Hunts for Support in City Halls" was posted at apnews.com on Oct. 30, 2019.
- An article by Clint Watts titled "Tulsi Gabbard and Hillary Clinton's 'Russian Asset' Spat Resurfaces Problematic Assertions [Claiming Gabbard Advances Putin's Agenda]" was posted at nbcnews.com on Oct. 23, 2019.
- An article by Dareh Gregorian, Monica Alba and Maura Barrett titled "Hillary Clinton Suggests Republicans Are Grooming Tulsi Gabbard for Third-Party Run" was posted at nbcnews.com on Oct. 24, 2019.
- An article titled "Bruce Springsteen: President Trump 'Doesn't Have a Grasp' on What It Means to Be American" was posted at cbsnews.com on Oct. 24, 2019.
- An article titled "Trump Gave a Speech at a Historically Black College [Benedict College in Columbia, S.C.], and Most Students Were Asked to Stay In-sider Their Dorms" was posted at time.com on Oct. 26, 2019.
- An article by Rachel Frazin titled "Chicago Mayor [Lori Lightfoot] Slams Trump Visit to City: 'Insulting, Ignorant Buffoonery' " was posted at thehill.com on Oct. 29, 2019.
- An article by Ted Johnson titled "Pete Buttigieg Tells New Yorker Fest 'Nothing Good' Would Come From a Mike Pence Presidency" was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 13, 2019.

Kamala Harris

- An article by Christopher Cadelago and Scott Bland titled "Kamala Harris to Slash Staff, Restructure Campaign As She Hemorrhages Cash" was posted at politico.com on Oct. 30, 2019.

Robert Francis (Beto) O'Rourke

- An article by Amanda Blanco titled "Beto O'Rourke Visits Newtown, Meets With Gun Control Activists" was posted at courant.com on Oct. 30, 2019.

News about the media

- An article by Reed Richardson titled "[Rachel] Maddow Scorches NBC Bosses Over Accusations Execs Shielded Weinstein, Lauer: 'Very, Very Hard to Stomach' " was posted at mediaite.com on Oct. 25, 2019.
- A Reuters article titled "Barclay Family Puts Telegraph Newspapers Up for Sale" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 26, 2019.

General interest

- An article titled "Most Deepfakes [Video Manipulation or Fabrication With Artificial Intelligence] Are Porn [Faces of Hollywood Actresses Over Other

People], and They're Multiplying Fast [in Politics]" was posted at wired.com on Oct. 7, 2019.

■ An article by Maggie Miller titled "Senate Passes Legislation to Combat 'Deepfake' Videos" was posted at thehill.com on Oct. 25, 2019.



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."