

Eye on the World

July 7, 2018

This compilation of material for "Eye on the World" is presented as a service to the Churches of God. The views stated in the material are those of the writers or sources quoted by the writers, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Church of God Big Sandy. The following articles were posted at churchofgodbigandy.com for the weekend of July 7, 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 Cortney O'Brien titled "Merkel Finally Agrees to Tighten Up Immigration Policies" was posted at townhall.com on July 3, 2018. Following is the article.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel has been criticized for adopting a much too relaxed policy on immigration. Her open doors agenda has allowed for upwards of a million refugees to stream into her country since 2015.

Some claim the policy was the precursor to violence on the streets of Berlin and Cologne, particularly on New Year's Day 2016. Thousands of men, some claiming to be asylum seeking refugees, were accused of raping and groping women during the festivities.

In December 2016, an Afghan migrant was given a life sentence for killing a 19-year-old German student.

Merkel, who has been in power for 13 years, is suddenly reversing her immigration policy in the hopes of keeping her government together, according to new reports.

Her unpopular policy was a large reason why her party, the Christian Democratic Union, crashed and burned in last September's elections. This week, she has agreed to build border camps for asylum seekers and to tighten the border with Austria.

"It would establish camps, called 'transit centers,' at points along the border. Newly arriving migrants would be screened in the centers, and any determined to have already applied for asylum elsewhere in the European Union would be turned back."

Her turnaround was prompted by her Interior Minister, Horst Seehofer, who has demanded that migrants at the border must have papers before advancing past the German welcome mat. Officials, he said, must also block refugees if they have already registered in another European country.

"The security of our country begins on our borders," Merkel conceded to reporters on Monday.



An article titled "Leaders of Germany, Hungary Trade Barbs on Migration" was posted at townhall.com on July 5, 2018. Following is the article.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel and Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban traded barbs Thursday on the issue of migration, underlining the split within the entire European Union over how to deal with people seeking refuge or a better life on the continent.

Speaking at a joint news conference after their meeting in Berlin, Merkel said despite recent moves by EU nations to clamp down on asylum-seekers moving across Europe's open borders, she wants to ensure they are treated with "humanity" and the continent isn't turned into a "fortress" Europe.

"The problem I see, and where (our) difference lies, is that we must always remember and never forget that this is about human beings," Merkel told reporters.

"Europe can't detach itself from hardship and suffering," she said, adding that illegal migration can only be stopped if there are legal avenues by which people can come to the continent to work and study.

Merkel described Hungary's stance as "a problem" during the testy 27-minute news conference that saw the leaders repeatedly rebut each other's comments.

"Germany and Hungary see the world differently," said Orban, one of the strongest critics of Merkel's migration policy since 2015, when thousands poured into Europe every day.

While he expressed a willingness to talk, Orban said his position hadn't changed over the past three years.

"We only know one solution: close the borders," he said, adding that if Europe offers support to refugees, it will be taken as an invitation.

"If people can come, they will come," he said.

He noted that that Hungary has deployed 8,000 police and soldiers to prevent migrants from entering the bloc through its southern border.

"We think it's unfair that Germany often accuses us of a lack of solidarity," Orban said.

Even though the number of migrants entering Europe this year is down sharply from the past few years, the issue of migration has strained Merkel's governing coalition and divided the 28-nation EU in general.

In the last month Italy and Malta have refused to take in migrants rescued at sea by aid groups, and Merkel has had to agree with her conservative allies to turn back asylum-seekers who've registered in another of the bloc's nations.

Orban made clear that he believes asylum-seekers who register in Hungary must have come through Greece or Bulgaria first, and his country therefore won't feel obliged to take them if they are turned back by Germany.

Migrants are supposed to be returned to where they first entered the EU and applied for asylum, but those regulations have been largely unenforced.

German Interior Minister Horst Seehofer, who has pushed Merkel to take a harder line against migrants, said a new plan to establish migrant detention centers envisions sending people directly back to where they first entered the EU—primarily Greece and Italy.

Speaking after talks with Austrian Chancellor Sebastian Kurz in Vienna, Seehofer said he expects "very difficult talks" with Italy and Greece on the issue.

The interior ministers of Austria, Germany and Italy will talk in the city of Innsbruck next week about the issue, Kurz said.

Later in the evening, representatives of Merkel's conservative bloc and junior coalition partner Social Democrats meeting in Berlin agreed to streamline asylum procedures and to bring a revised immigration law before the Cabinet this year, said Andrea Nahles, the head of the Social Democrats.

Seehofer sought to allay concerns from Nahles' party of large migrant camps on the borders, assuring that the so-called transfer centers he wants to establish "would have no barbed wire or the like," and would be set up in existing police stations that would deal with the cases of only a handful of migrants a day.

Italian Interior Minister Matteo Salvini said if Italy were to enter an agreement, existing accords for migrants to be distributed throughout the EU fairly must be respected.

"Before taking back not one asylum-seeker in Italy, we'll wait until the other countries take the tens of thousands who should have been already taken with the relocation" accords, Salvini told reporters in Rome.

He added that before any asylum-seekers are returned to Italy, "we want clear commitments on men, means and money to protect the external borders" of the EU.



An article titled “Mexican Leader to Invite Trump to Inauguration, Signals Shift on Venezuela” was posted at cnbc.com on July 5, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Mexico’s President-elect Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador said on Thursday he would invite U.S. President Donald Trump to his Dec. 1 inauguration, as the leftist leader signaled a potential shift in Mexican policy toward Venezuela.

Lopez Obrador, who won a landslide election victory on Sunday, said he would invite Trump along with Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and other heads of state to his swearing in.

Replying to a question about the approach his government would take to the crisis in socialist-led Venezuela, Lopez Obrador said he would adopt a policy of “non-intervention.”

Non-intervention in the affairs of other states is a bedrock of Mexico’s foreign policy. But the government of outgoing President Enrique Pena Nieto has spoken out strongly against Venezuelan leader Nicolas Maduro for what it sees as his undemocratic practices, siding closely with the United States and seeking votes against the OPEC nation in diplomatic forums.

Trump and former Mexico City Mayor Lopez Obrador spoke by telephone on Monday, discussing immigration and the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Relations between the two will be closely watched because Trump has regularly criticized Mexico.



“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 Anna Ahronheim titled “IDF Deploys Iron Dome Batteries in the South” was posted at jpost.com on July 5, 2018.

■ An article by Katie Pavlich titled “Did Obama Grant Thousands of Iranians Citizenship As Part of the Iran Deal?” was posted at townhall.com on July 2, 2018.

■ An article by Sam Levin titled “Is Facebook a Publisher? In Public It Says No, But in Court It Says Yes” was posted at theguardian.com on July 3, 2018.

■ A Reuters article by David Lawder and Elias Glenn titled “Trump Says U.S. Tariffs Could Be Applied to Chinese Goods Worth \$500 Billion” was posted at reuters.com on July 4, 2018.

- An article by Heather Scott titled “Trade Wars: Trump Loads Decisive Volley Against China” was posted at yahoo.com on July 5, 2018.
- A Reuters article by Henning Gloystein titled “Oil Dips in Nervous Markets in U.S.; China on Brink of Trade War” was posted at cnbc.com on July 5, 2018.
- An article by Weizhen Tan titled “U.S.–China Tariffs: ‘The First Shots to the Trade War Are About to Be Fired’ ” was posted at cnbc.com on July 5, 2018.



An article titled “The Liberal Stampede to ‘Abolish ICE’ ” was posted at cns-news.com on July 3, 2018. Following is the article.

“No Borders! No Nations! No Deportations!” “Abolish ICE!”

Before last week, these were the mindless slogans of an infantile left, seen on signs at rallies to abolish ICE, the agency that arrests and deports criminal aliens who have no right to be in our country.

By last week, however, “Abolish ICE!” was no longer the exclusive slogan of the unhinged left. National Democrats were signing on.

Before his defeat in New York’s 14th Congressional District, Joe Crowley, fourth-ranked Democrat in the House, called ICE a “fascist” organization.

After Crowley’s rout by a 28-year-old socialist who called for killing the agency, Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand, D-N.Y., declared ICE to be “a cruel deportation force (that) we need to abolish.”

Cynthia Nixon, a candidate for governor of New York, described ICE as a “terrorist organization . . . terrorizing people who are coming to this country . . . We need to abolish ICE.”

A star of “Sex and the City” castigated the men and women of ICE as terrorists at St. Paul and St. Andrew United Methodist Church in Manhattan. One wonders what the pastor thought of this Christian message.

Friday, New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio joined the clamor: “We should abolish ICE.” Over the weekend, Sen. Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass., signed on:

“President Trump seems to think that the only way to have immigration rule is to rip parents from their family (and) treat rape victims and refugees like terrorists and to put children in cages.”

What ICE does is “ugly” and “wrong,” said Warren.

“We need to rebuild our immigration system from top to bottom starting by replacing ICE with something that reflects our morality.”

Wisconsin Democratic Congressman Mark Pocan plans to introduce legislation to do exactly that—abolish ICE.

President Donald Trump describes this latest liberal campaign as social and political insanity: "You get rid of ICE you're going to have a country that you're going to be afraid to walk out of your house."

What is going on here?

Democrats, having just gone through the worst week in memory for progressives, are in imminent danger of losing it altogether.

Last week, the Supreme Court ruled that not only is the Trump travel ban constitutional, government unions have no right to extract "agency fees" from workers who do not wish to support the union.

Such fees violate the First Amendment rights of government workers not to promote policies or ideas in which they disbelieve.

Then came word that Justice Anthony Kennedy, the "swing vote" on the Supreme Court who was crucial to the decisions that established abortion, homosexuality and same-sex marriage as constitutional rights, will be stepping down.

And Trump informed the press that he would announce Kennedy's successor on July 9, to be drawn from a list of 20 jurists and legal scholars, all of whom have been vetted by the Federalist Society.

Panic ensued.

"I'm scared. You're scared. We're all scared," says Warren in a video her campaign has released.

On Bill Maher's show, leftist film director Michael Moore called for a million citizens to surround the Capitol to prevent a vote on Kennedy's successor. How Moore's million-man march proposes to get into Mitch McConnell's Senate chamber was left unexplained.

At a fundraiser in Berkeley, California, Barack Obama tried to calm his terrified minions: "All these people that are out here kvetching and wringing their hands and stressed and anxious and constantly watching cable tv and howling at the moon, 'What are we going to do?' Their hair is falling out."

But liberal elites making fools of themselves is a less serious matter than the savage slanders Democrats are hurling at the 20,000 men and women of ICE who are daily protecting us and our country.

ICE, after all, was established to prevent another 9/11, when real terrorists, some of whom had overstayed their visas, massacred 3,000 innocent people, most of them Americans.

This vilification of ICE, writes Deputy Director Thomas D. Homan, represents both an injustice and an act of ingratitude:

"Since September 2016, ICE has arrested nearly 5,000 criminal aliens in New York—individuals with a criminal conviction in addition to their violation of immigrant laws. Many of these arrests were conducted at large in the community

which ICE is increasingly forced to do due to sanctuary policies in the state that prevent us from taking custody of criminal aliens in the secure confines of a jail.

“Governor (Andrew Cuomo) supports these policies at the expense of the safety of the very same communities he took an oath to protect.”

Whatever one may think of Trump’s policy of “zero tolerance” of immigrants who break into our country, for elites to smear the 20,000 men and women who risk their lives to keep us safe, as “terrorists” and “fascists,” is an especially egregious form of liberal ingratitude.

What is it in the DNA of the left that it is always ready to enlist in any new war on cops?

The issue of 2018: Should we, or should we not, abolish ICE and embrace the progressive alternative of open borders?



An article by Carl Jackson titled “Mitch McConnell Didn’t Steal Obama’s SCOTUS Pick, Ginsburg Did” was posted at townhall.com on July 2, 2018. Following is the article.

I’ve got great news for pro-choice feminists like Whoopi Goldberg. Supreme Court justices don’t perform enemas or abortions, they simply interpret law.

Sadly, when you rely on your values, morals, and worth to be affirmed by feelings, like-minded peers, and government regulation rather than by God and objective truth, it’s no wonder the left goes crazy when they can’t appoint a ruler to validate their worldview.

There are three questions to address leading up to President Trump’s replacement of outgoing Justice Anthony Kennedy:

1. What’s the proper function of a Supreme Court justice?
2. Who’s to blame for President Obama’s so-called “stolen pick” of Merrick Garland?
3. Why is the left so obsessed with Anthony Kennedy’s replacement to a point they’ll protest in the streets?

The hysterics we witnessed last week from the left in response to Kennedy’s retirement announcement is due to their fundamental misunderstanding of the role Supreme Court justices play in the U.S. Democrats wrongly believe that SCOTUS justices are placed on the bench to write or rewrite law as they see fit - a practice known as “judicial activism.” However, judges that subscribe to this philosophy do no favors to the cause of freedom in America. They circumvent the will of the people by cancelling out the votes of our elected representatives in Congress. Rather than a government of, for, and

by the people, judicial activists give us a government of, for, and by the elites. This ultimately tears the nation apart rather than brings us together.

Constitutional conservatives on the other hand rightly believe that Supreme Court justices are appointed to the bench to interpret and apply the laws of the land fairly as originally intended by our forefathers. That way no one person or group gets special treatment under the law. According to Article 3 Section 2 of the Constitution, the Supreme Court also has "appellate jurisdiction as to law and fact" when the lower courts get a case wrong. The exception being "under such regulations as the Congress shall make." In other words, it isn't the role of Supreme Court justices to write law; that's the role of our legislators in Congress.

Secondly, if anyone is to blame for President Obama's so-called "stolen pick" after the death of Justice Antonin Scalia, it's Ruth Bader Ginsburg. She could've retired during Obama's presidency. That would've given him the chance to pick a justice that shared his judicial philosophy for at least a generation. Instead, Obama was left to political gamesmanship by nominating a judge in Merrick Garland, during a presidential election cycle mind you, that never stood a chance of being appointed given the fact that Republicans were the ruling party in the Senate, which, of course, has the power to advise and consent when it comes to SCOTUS appointments. Don't be fooled, Obama didn't want a wishy-washy moderate like Merrick Garland appointed to the highest court in the land any more than conservatives did. What he wanted was another political issue that he hoped would motivate voters to get out and vote for Hillary Clinton. It didn't work.

Additionally, it should come as no surprise to anyone that the GOP, which will likely increase their numbers in the Senate after the midterms, want to replace Justice Kennedy with an originalist judge. It's the next pick I'd be concerned about were I on the left.

Lastly, to bring this column full circle, the left's obsession over Kennedy's retirement can largely be attributed to the civics education (or lack thereof) our high school and college kids are receiving. It's becoming increasingly difficult to find college kids that know we have three branches of government, let alone recognize their separate but equal functions. When you're taught by professors you admire that government is the solution to America's problems rather than the individual, it's no wonder Democrats throw a hissy-fit when they lose at the ballot box or don't get their SCOTUS pick.

We can't allow liberals to reshape the Constitution through judicial fiat. We do so at our own peril. It's impossible to remain a free society when citizens don't understand how their own government works. That leaves conservatives no other option than to defeat leftists at the ballot box. We're either going to be a nation that understands our government derives its power by the consent of the governed, as outlined by the Declaration of Independence. Or, we'll become a nation where our rights are determined by those in government. It really is that simple.



An article by Ryan Bomberger titled "When Liberals Who Identify As 'Christian' Defend Roe" was posted at townhall.com on July 3, 2018. Following is the article.

So if you repeat the exact same propaganda as Planned Parenthood, are you really #prolife?

Author, and former evangelical, Rachel Held Evans seems to think so. The liberal, who identifies as a Christian, decided to tweet a long diatribe defending Roe in light of Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy's retirement.

It didn't go well (see my video takedown here). Her eugenics-laden screed of pro-abortion talking points resorted to calling pro-lifers, who support Trump, racists who oppress people of color.

Yawn. Doesn't it get tiring using the same lame accusations?

She is the typical liberal abortion apologist. They love their "complex nuances." Yet their lies are simple to identify. I'll highlight her top 5 pathetic defenses of keeping the violence of Roe legal.

1. Conviction Versus Condition

Evans first claims that "I'm prolife by conviction, though my views on the legalities of abortion are complex, ever-evolving, and detailed elsewhere."

Convictions rooted in immutable truths don't shift with every political wind or triggered feeling. Of course we've never heard this line before—"I'm personally against _____, but I don't think it should be legislated."

If slavery abolitionists chose to embrace that same chasm between morality and political action, the 13th Amendment wouldn't exist.

Roe is not freedom, for anyone. It is oppression, no matter what nuance you try to spin.

2. Clueless about Prolife Movement

Evans reveals her complete ignorance about the prolife movement by charging us with only valuing hypothetical "white, blue-eyed, motherless babies."

Eugenicists idealize certain babies ("wanted," wealthy, mostly white). The Pro-life movement defends and values unborn human children and the parents who procreate them. The prolife movement cares for mother and child . . . and father (which Evans never mentions in her entire thread). I guess her own child deserves a father, but others . . . not so much.

She clearly hasn't been tuned into anything going on in the Pro-life movement. Have you seen any of our campaigns?

TooManyAborted.com?

WhatAbortionReallyIs.com?

More evidence of this is her bizarre assertion that pregnancy care centers merely “give out free diapers.” These donor-funded pregnancy help centers provide far more care than Planned Parenthood does for mothers.

And all of their services are free, which include free pregnancy tests, parenting classes, material assistance (furniture, maternity/baby clothes, toys, and yes, diapers, which are a huge expense).

Many run maternity homes (Planned Parenthood operates none of them). Some offer life coaching, STD testing/treatment, mentors for fathers, GED completion classes, free prenatal care, gynecological services, adoption services, even marriage support and job training. Many partner with local resources that, together, help provide a holistic approach to meeting needs.

3. Lack of Access . . . to the Truth.

Evans is just empty on facts. Although she acknowledges abortion rates are up to 5 times higher in the black community, she blames this on pro-lifers, you know, because conservative oppression. She doesn't call out an industry that kills millions and disproportionately targets poor minorities—but the people that fight an evil industry.

What's more systemic and more racist than more black babies being aborted than born alive?

In 2014, for every 1,000 black babies born alive, there were 1,101 aborted (currently 1,039 are aborted).

Contrary to Evans's claims, Hispanics are more impoverished than blacks in NYC (24% versus 21.5%) and are less insured (17% versus 10.5%) yet have half the abortion rate.

When Planned Parenthood tweets that black women are better off having an abortionist kill their child than giving birth—yes, real systemic racism.

4. Bogus Charges of Oppression

I've worked in poor black communities many of my adult years as a community volunteer, a mentor, and leader. People from across the political spectrum work with the broken, the hurting, the poor.

I'm so tired of those who regurgitate this easy and unoriginal lie that “prolifers/conservatives don't care about people after they're born.”

Many just don't happen to think that welfare is an effective solution to communities ravaged by poverty, violence, drugs, and fatherlessness.

“Safety net” programs often don't make situations safe. Evans—who is a white married woman with a father for their child—apparently thinks that government is a good substitute for actual fathers.

The welfare state couldn't exist, by the way, if both political parties didn't legislate it into existence and continually vote to sustain it. Our government is to provide for the general welfare of its people, not excessively provide welfare.

Political power requires dependency, just like liberalism requires an abundance of victimhood. Newsflash—the War on Poverty and its billions haven't ended poverty. On the 50th anniversary of the “unconditional” War on Poverty, \$22 trillion spent hasn't resulted in the change that progressives claimed America would see.

Welfare shouldn't be a destination but a temporary place for those in need to get the necessary support in order to help better their current situation and be freed from a life of dependency.

5. Elevation, Not Elimination

Evans deleted her thread on defending Roe. She claims others have misrepresented her views. No. We haven't misrepresented her views. She misrepresented Christianity.

As a pro-life factivist, it is not my job to tackle every issue of (real) injustice. It's not feasibly possible.

As Christians, who are part of the body of Christ that specialize in different areas, we are called to work collectively to “speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, ensure justice for those being crushed” and to “speak up for the poor and the helpless and see that they get justice.”

It doesn't say repeat the lies of an industry that kills the image of God 2,500 times a day in our country. It doesn't say stand with those who celebrate the shedding of innocent blood as a “right.”

What the Bible I know says about any circumstance, humanly planned or unplanned, is that “I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me.”

Truth. It's immutable. It's not that complex. And it's the only thing that brings freedom.



An article by Sarah Jones titled “Bernie Sanders is Not the Left” (with a subtitle “His Refusal to Endorse ICE's Abolition is the Latest Evidence That He's Not the Politician That Many Believe Him to Be”) was posted at newrepublic.com on June 26, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

When CNN's Jake Tapper asked Bernie Sanders on Sunday [June 24] if he wants to abolish the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, the senator was uncharacteristically vague.

Bernie Sanders: “I think that what we need is to create policies which deal with immigration in a rational way. And a rational way is not locking children

up in detention centers or separating them from their mothers. What we need is Trump to sit down with members of Congress and work on a rational program which deals with this serious issue."

Sanders wasn't the only potential 2020 presidential candidate on Sunday to refuse to endorse the abolition of ICE.

Senator Kamala Harris of California on *Meet the Press*: "There's no question that we've got to critically reexamine ICE and its role, and the way that it is being administered, and the work it is doing. And we need to probably think about starting from scratch."

But Sanders's reticence was more surprising to his supporters and other liberals.

■ "Come on man!" wrote *Splinter* news editor Jack Mirkinson. "Let's hope that the next person who gets the chance asks him why he is still taking such a weak and morally timid position on ICE."

■ Jeremy Scahill, co-founder of *The Intercept*, wrote that "Sanders is choosing to be on the wrong side of history on this issue."

Created in 2003 by President George W. Bush, ICE has become increasingly unpopular among Democrats as evidence of its abuses continues to grow.

Congressman Earl Blumenauer, who voted against the agency's creation, wrote in a Medium post on Sunday that it's time to "abolish ICE and start over."

On Monday, Congressman Mark Pocan of Wisconsin formally introduced legislation to disband the agency.

Insurgent left-wing candidates like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who challenged Congressman Joe Crowley, campaigned on the issue.

Ocasio-Cortez belongs to a cohort of Democratic candidates who have positions in common with Sanders: Medicare for All, free higher education, and a \$15 minimum wage.

But by seeming to support ICE's continued existence, Sanders has put a wedge between himself and those seeking to pick up the torch he carried in 2016. In the process, he's undermining his position as the nation's most prominent left-wing politician.

It is not always clear how Sanders views his role in American politics today.

Is he a presidential hopeful?

The leader of a political movement?

Both are possible, but absent any announcement about his plans for 2020, we are left only with evidence that Sanders does hope to influence American politics on a long-term basis.

His wife, Jane O'Meara Sanders, is now head of the Sanders Institute, a progressive think tank; and Sanders himself has hit the campaign trail for a few

chosen candidates.

But while Sanders still draws a crowd, his endorsements don't carry as much weight as left-leaning voters may hope.

"If his policy agenda has caught on widely among Democratic candidates, and succeeded in moving the party to the left, Mr. Sanders himself has struggled so far to expand his political base and propel his personal allies to victory in Democratic primaries," *The New York Times* reported on Sunday, noting that Sanders "has endorsed only a handful of candidates in contested primaries, and three of them have recently lost difficult races."

And fewer than 50 percent of the more than 80 candidates endorsed by Our Revolution, the advocacy group founded by Sanders campaign veterans, have won their primaries, the article noted.

These failures can't all be attributed to Sanders himself or to the policy positions he promotes. Candidates to the left of the Democratic mainstream still face significant structural obstacles to victory.

Their campaigns rely on small donors, often by design, and they face skepticism from the party they hope to represent. Sanders and his supporters have helped push the Democrats to the left, but the party has yet to truly embrace its left flank.

There isn't much evidence that it will, at least not under current leadership. In April, *The Intercept* published an audio clip of Minority Whip Steny Hoyer urging a left-wing candidate to drop out of his Pennsylvania race.

Left-wing critics subsequently complained that the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee consistently intervenes against left-leaning candidates, many of whom happen to be people of color. "If they're going to expand their map, they need to look at candidates of color," Quentin James, founder of the Collective PAC, told Vox in May. "I think the Democratic Party gets it, but we've got to stay on them to ensure the results we want to see are happening now."

Sanders could be a source of consistent, left-wing pressure on party leadership, whether or not he runs in 2020. If he intends to build a lasting political movement out of the remnants of his last presidential campaign, he'll need to become an effective counterweight to the mainstream Democratic Party.

But based on his ICE comments and the uneven results of his campaign efforts, Sanders no longer seems like such a sure figurehead for disgruntled Democratic voters.

In fact, despite his sudden popularity in 2015, Sanders has never been a figurehead to everyone in the American left.

His primary bid did draw the support of many leftists, but leftist voters in the United States aren't spoiled for options—or at least they weren't when Sanders launched his long-shot bid for president. That's changing now, and it's putting Sanders's politics in perspective. He does not occupy the left-most band of the spectrum.

It's certainly true that Sanders is to the left of most Democrats. But contrary to how he's often portrayed in the media, he is not a doctrinaire leftist.

His principal benefit to the left has been to mainstream certain beliefs—namely, that access to health care, education, and living wages are rights, not luxuries. But Sanders is not a revolutionary.

His views aren't even entirely consistent with democratic socialism, the political tradition he claims. It's one thing to call for breaking up the big banks, and quite another to call for the nationalization of private industries.

Sanders is mostly an accurate diagnostician of American problems, and his prescriptions are simple ones: Tax the rich, expand health care, and pay people enough to feed their families.

Sanders points out cracks in the order of things, but seeks to patch up the cracks rather than change the order itself. That's a renovation, not a revolution.



An article by Walter Williams titled "College Destruction of Black Students" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on July 4, 2018. Following is the article.

Amy Wax, a University of Pennsylvania law professor, has come under attack and scathing criticism because she dared criticize the school's racial preferences program.

In an interview with Brown University economist Glenn Loury, discussing affirmative action, Wax mentioned how racial preferences hinder the ability of blacks to succeed academically by admitting them into schools at which they are in over their heads academically.

At Penn's seventh-ranked law school, Wax said, she doesn't think that she has ever seen a black law student graduate in the top quarter of his class, and "rarely" is a black student in the top half.

That got her into deep trouble.

Penn students and faculty members charged her with racism. Penn Law School Dean Ted Ruger stripped Wax of her duty of teaching her mandatory first-year class on civil procedures. I'm guessing that Penn's law faculty members know Wax's statement is true but think it was something best left unsaid in today's racially charged climate.

Ruger might have refuted Wax's claim. He surely has access to student records. He might have listed the number of black law students who were valedictorians and graduated in the top 10 percent of their class. He rightfully chose not to—so as to not provide evidence for Wax's claim.

One study suggests that Wax is absolutely right about academic mismatch. In the early 1990s, the Law School Admission Council collected 27,000 law student records, representing nearly 90 percent of accredited law schools. The study found that after the first year, 51 percent of black law students ranked in the bottom tenth of their class, compared with 5 percent of white students.

Two-thirds of black students were in the bottom fifth of their class. Only 10 percent of blacks were in the top half of their class. Twenty-two percent of black students in the LSAC database hadn't passed the bar exam after five attempts, compared with 3 percent of white test takers.

The University of Pennsylvania controversy highlights something very important to black people and the nation. The K-12 education that most blacks receive is grossly fraudulent. Most predominately black schools are costly yet grossly inferior to predominately white schools and are in cities where blacks hold considerable political power, such as Baltimore, Detroit, Chicago and Philadelphia.

In these and other cities, it's not uncommon for there to be high schools where less than 17 percent of the students test proficient in reading, and often not a single student in such schools tests proficient in math. Nonetheless, many receive high school diplomas.

It's inconceivable that college administrators are unaware that they are admitting students who are ill-prepared and have difficulty performing at the college level. There's no way that four or five years of college can repair the academic damage done to black students throughout their 13 years of primary and secondary education.

Partial proof is black student performance at the postgraduate level, such as in law school. Their disadvantage is exaggerated when they are admitted to prestigious Ivy League law schools.

It's as if you asked a trainer to teach you how to box and the first fight he got you was with Anthony Joshua or Floyd Mayweather. You might have the potential to ultimately be a good boxer, but you're going to get your brains beaten out before you learn how to bob and weave.

The fact that black students have low class rankings at such high-powered law schools as Penn doesn't mean that they are stupid or uneducable. It means that they've been admitted to schools where they are in over their heads.

To admit these students makes white liberals feel better about themselves. It also helps support the jobs of black and white university personnel in charge of diversity and inclusion.

The question for black people is whether we can afford to have the best of our youngsters demeaned, degraded and possibly destroyed to make white liberals feel better about themselves.

You might ask, "Williams, without affirmative action, what would the University of Pennsylvania Law School do about diversity and inclusion?"

I'd say that's Penn's problem.



"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 Joe Eskenazi titled "Dollar Stores Are Thriving—But Are They Ripping Off Poor People?" was posted at yahoo.com on June 28, 2018.
- An article by Matt Vespa titled "Trump's Economy's Second Quarter Growth Projected to Hit 4.1 Percent" was posted at townhall.com on July 5, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- An article by Haris Alic titled "Sanders Faces Rebuke Over Refusal to Support Abolishing ICE" was posted at freebeacon.com on June 29, 2018.
- An article by Justin Carissimo titled "Thousands Protest Trump Immigration Policies Across U.S." was posted at cbsnews.com on June 30, 2018.
- An article titled "Immigration Rights Protesters Holding Rally at Richmond ICE Facility" was posted at abc7news.com on June 30, 2018.
- An article by Andrew Sharp titled "Police Make Almost 30 Arrests in ICE Protests in Philadelphia" was posted at delawareonline.com on July 3, 2018.
- An article by Katie Utehs titled "Activists Hold 'Block ICE' Block Party Protest on 4th of July in San Francisco" was posted at abc7news.com on July 4, 2018.
- An article by Linda Xu titled "Amber Heard Told People to Hide Their Nannies From ICE Checkpoints in Hollywood, and Twitter Isn't Having It" was posted at thewrap.com on July 3, 2018.
- An article by Susan Jones titled "HHS Secretary: No Confusion at Border; DNA Tests Under Way to Match Kids With Parents" was posted at cnsnews.com on July 5, 2018.

Comments about weapons

- An article by Larry Elder titled "Trump Blamed for [Shooting] Death of Reporters; Did Media Blame Obama for Cop Killers?" was posted at townhall.com on July 5, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

- An article by Jon Levine titled "Marco Rubio: Anti-Trump Republicans Would Rather Side With POTUS Than 'Media That Never Cuts Him a Break' " was posted at yahoo.com on June 28, 2018.

- An article by Heron Greenesmith titled "Justice Kennedy Chose to Let Trump Pick His Replacement; That's His Legacy" was posted at yahoo.com on June 28, 2018.
- An article by Laretta Brown titled "Walmart Pulls Anti-Trump 'Impeach 45' Shirts From Website Following Boycott" was posted at townhall.com on July 4, 2018.
- An article by Susan Jones titled "AG Sessions Rescinds 24 More Obama-Era 'Guidance Documents' That Circumvented Rule-Making Process" was posted at cnsnews.com on July 5, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

- An article by Sylvan Lane titled "Maxine Waters is Done With 'Nice Guy Politics' " was posted at thehill.com on July 3, 2018.
- MSNBC Host [Nicole Wallace] Cheers After Hearing a Recession Could Hurt the Trump Presidency" was posted at townhall.com on July 3, 2018.
- An article by Chris Strohm titled "Mueller Taps More Prosecutors to Help With Growing Probe" was posted at bloomberg.com on July 5, 2018.
- An article by Cal Thomas titled "Trump Supporters Compared to Cultists" was posted at townhall.com on July 5, 2018.
- An article by Susan Jones titled "Rep. Ted Lieu [D-Calif.]: ICE Agents 'Terrorize' Communities" was posted at cnsnews.com on July 5, 2018.

News about the media

- An article by Matt Vespa titled "See Ya! ABC News' Brian Ross to Depart Network After Botching Trump-Russia Story" was posted at townhall.com on July 2, 2018.
- An article by Tom Blumer titled "Interviewing Dem Congressman, CNN's Jim Acosta Grovels: 'I Have to Ask . . . Forgive Me' " was posted at newsbusters.org on July 4, 2018.
- An article by Nicholas Fondacaro titled "What Manhunt? ABC, NBC Ignore Search for Illegals Accused of Raping Teen" was posted at newsbusters.org on July 5, 2018.

General interest

- An article by Renae Reints titled "Hawaii to Become First in the World to Ban Sunscreens Harmful to the Environment" was posted at yahoo.com on July 2, 2018.



An article by Ann Coulter titled "Happy Fourth of July, You Wonderful Country" was posted at anncoulter.com on July 2, 2018. Following is the article.

It has become fashionable to equate the French and American Revolutions, but they share absolutely nothing beyond the word "revolution." The American Revolution was a movement based on ideas, painstakingly argued by serious men in the process of creating what would become the freest, most prosperous nation in the history of the world. (Until Democrats decided to give it away to the Third World.)

The French Revolution was a revolt of the mob. It was the primogenitor of the horrors of the Bolshevik Revolution, Hitler's storm troopers, Mao's Cultural Revolution, Pol Pot's slaughter and America's periodic mob uprisings, from Shays' Rebellion to the current attacks on White House employees and Trump supporters.

The French Revolution is the godless antithesis to the founding of America.

One rather important difference is that Americans did win freedom with their revolution and created a self-governing republic. France's revolution consisted of pointless, bestial savagery, followed by another monarchy, followed by Napoleon's dictatorship and then finally something resembling an actual republic 80 years later.

Both revolutions are said to have come from the ideas of Enlightenment thinkers, the American Revolution influenced by the writings of John Locke and the French Revolution informed by the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. This is like saying presidents Reagan and Obama both drew on the ideas of 20th-century economists—Reagan on the writings of Milton Friedman and Obama on the writings of Paul Krugman.

Locke was concerned with private property rights. His idea was that the government should allow men to protect their property in courts of law, in lieu of each man being his own judge and executioner. Rousseau saw the government as the vessel to implement the "general will" and create a new man. Through power, the government would "force men to be free."

As historian Ralph Hancock summarized the theories of the French revolutionaries, they had no respect for humanity "except that which they proposed to create." To liberate man, they would "reconstruct his very humanity to meet the demands of the general will."

Liberals dearly wish our Founding Fathers were more like the godless French peasants, skipping around with human heads on pikes. But alas, our Founding Fathers were God-fearing descendants of Puritans and Presbyterians. (And one Catholic!) King George denounced the American Revolution as "a Presbyterian war."

As Stephen Waldman writes in his definitive book on the subject, "Founding Faith," the American Revolution was "powerfully shaped by the Great Awakening," an evangelical revival in the Colonies in the early 1700s, led by famous Puritan theologian Jonathan Edwards, among others. Aaron Burr, the third vice president of the United States, was Edwards' grandson.

There are books of Christian sermons endorsing the revolution. The barbaric attacks on the church by the French revolutionaries would later appall Americans and British alike, even before the bloodletting began.

Americans celebrate the Fourth of July, the date our written demand for independence from Britain was released to the world.

The French celebrate Bastille Day, a day when a thousand armed Parisians stormed the Bastille and savagely murdered a half-dozen guards, defacing their corpses and sticking their heads on pikes—all in order to seize arms and gunpowder for more such tumults. It would be as if this country had a national holiday to celebrate the Ferguson riots.

Among the most famous quotes from the American Revolution is Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death!" Among the most famous quotes from the French Revolution is the Jacobins' "Fraternity or death!" Or, as Jacobin Sebastien Nicolas de Chamfort satirized it: "Be my brother or I'll kill you."

Our revolutionary symbol is the Liberty Bell, rung to summon the citizens of Philadelphia to a public reading of the just-adopted Declaration of Independence.

The symbol of the French Revolution is the "National Razor"—the guillotine.

Of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, all died of natural causes in old age, with the exception of Button Gwinnett of Georgia, who was shot in a duel unrelated to the revolution.

Only one other founding father died of unnatural causes: Alexander Hamilton, who did not sign the Declaration of Independence. He died in a duel with Burr because as a Christian, Hamilton deemed it a greater sin to kill another man than to be killed. Before the duel, Hamilton vowed in writing not to shoot Burr.

President after president of our new nation died peacefully for 75 years, right up until Abraham Lincoln was assassinated in 1865.

Meanwhile, all the leaders of the French Revolution died violently, guillotine by guillotine.

The Fourth of July also marks the death of two of our greatest Founding Fathers, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, who died on the same day, exactly 50 years after the Declaration of Independence was signed.

We made it for nearly another 200 years. And then, for some reason, the Democrats decided to give our country away to the rest of the world.



An article by Michelle Malkin titled "The Reason for the Season: Happy Independence Day" was posted at michellemalkin.com on July 4, 2018. Following is the article.

As my annual public service reminder of the reason for the season, I'm reprinting the Declaration of Independence in its entirety. The transcription comes via the National Archives.

IN CONGRESS, July 4, 1776.

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America,

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.

Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government.

The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States.

To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavoured to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harrass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighbouring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so

as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavoured to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our Brittish brethren.

We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us.

We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here.

We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence.

They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity.

We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the

rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do.

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

The 56 signatures on the Declaration appear in the positions indicated:

Column 1

Georgia:

Button Gwinnett

Lyman Hall

George Walton

Column 2

North Carolina:

William Hooper

Joseph Hewes

John Penn

South Carolina:

Edward Rutledge

Thomas Heyward, Jr.

Thomas Lynch, Jr.

Arthur Middleton

Column 3

Massachusetts:

John Hancock

Maryland:

Samuel Chase

William Paca

Thomas Stone

Charles Carroll of Carrollton

Virginia:

George Wythe

Richard Henry Lee

Thomas Jefferson

Benjamin Harrison

Thomas Nelson, Jr.

Francis Lightfoot Lee

Carter Braxton

Column 4

Pennsylvania:

Robert Morris

Benjamin Rush

Benjamin Franklin

John Morton

George Clymer

James Smith

George Taylor

James Wilson

George Ross

Delaware:

Caesar Rodney

George Read

Thomas McKean

Column 5

New York:

William Floyd

Philip Livingston

Francis Lewis

Lewis Morris

New Jersey:

Richard Stockton

John Witherspoon

Francis Hopkinson

John Hart

Abraham Clark

Column 6

New Hampshire:

Josiah Bartlett

William Whipple

Massachusetts:

Samuel Adams

John Adams

Robert Treat Paine

Elbridge Gerry

Rhode Island:

Stephen Hopkins

William Ellery

Connecticut:

Roger Sherman

Samuel Huntington

William Williams

Oliver Wolcott

New Hampshire:

Matthew Thornton



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.”