

Eye on the World

Nov. 10, 2018

This compilation of material for "Eye on the World" is presented as a service to the Churches of God. The views stated in the material are those of the writers or sources quoted by the writers, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Church of God Big Sandy. The following articles were posted at churchofgodbigandy.com for the weekend of Nov. 10, 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 Margi Murphy titled "Dozens of US Spies Killed After Iran and China Uncovered CIA Messaging Service Using Google" was posted at telegraph.co.uk on Nov. 3, 2018. Following is the article.

Dozens of American spies were killed in Iran and China after a flawed communications service that allowed foreign foes to see what the agents were up to using Google, official sources have claimed.

Between 2009 and 2013 the US Central Intelligence Agency suffered a "catastrophic" secret communications failure in a website used by officers and their field agents around the world to speak to each other, according to a report in Yahoo News, which heard from 11 former intelligence and government officials about the previously unreported disaster.

"We're still dealing with the fallout," said one former national security official. "Dozens of people around the world were killed because of this."

The internet-based communications platform was first used in the Middle East to communicate with soldiers in war zones and had not been intended for widespread use but due to its ease of use and efficacy, it was adopted by agents despite its lack of sophistication, the sources claimed.

Cracks only began to show when Iran, angered that the government under Barack Obama had discovered a secret Iranian nuclear weapon factory, went out with a fine tooth comb to find moles.

It discovered the existence of one of the websites used by US agents using Google. US officials believe that Iranian spies were able to use Google as a search tool to find secret CIA websites, unbeknown to those using them.

By 2011, Iran had infiltrated the CIA spy network and in May it announced that they had broken up a 30-strong ring of American spies.

Some informants were executed and others imprisoned as a result, the sources claimed.

This was corroborated by a report on ABC news at the time, which referred to a compromised communications system after a tip off from the CIA.

Meanwhile in China 30 agents working for the US were executed by the government after compromising the spy network using a similar means. Beijing had managed to break into a second temporary communications system, splintered from the initial platform and were able to see every single agent the CIA had placed in the country, the sources told Yahoo.

The sources said that it the general consensus was that that Iran and China had traded technical information with each other to form a two-pronged attack.

A CIA agent in Russia who was warned about the attacks were able to change communication channels before anyone was uncovered.

The government had already been warned about the hackability of the system by a defence contractor named John Reidy, whose job it was to hire human sources for the CIA in Iran. He alerted authorities in 2008. His official statement claimed that 70 percent of operations at the time may have been compromised already and that any agents using versions of the system were in danger.

"The design and maintenance of the system is flawed," he said.

Mr Reidy was later fired for "conflicts of interests." According to Yahoo's report, there is anger among the intelligence community that there has been no accountability for the failure, despite being discussed in a secret hearing at the House and Senate Intelligence committee. One former official claiming that "our biggest insider threat is our own institution."



An article by Tony Daniel titled "Six Questions About the Huge CIA Blunder That Allowed Enemies to Kill 70 U.S. Spies" was posted at thefederalist.com on Nov. 7, 2018. Following is the article.

More than 70 foreign nationals working as spies for the CIA in Iran and China were systematically identified and slaughtered in the past decade, due to a

ridiculously weak web-based system the CIA used to communicate with foreign assets it couldn't reach directly. This according to a devastating November 2 report in Yahoo News written by journalists Zach Dorfman and Jenna McLaughlin (center-left, but generally trustworthy).

Although the Iranian roll-up occurred in 2011, and the Chinese rout occurred from 2010 to 2012, the CIA did not remedy the root cause of the problem in its transient messaging scheme until 2013, when Yahoo reports teams of co-opted staffers worked around the clock to dismantle the compromised system.

Based on at least one analysis, it looks like a simple internet search using the command "InURL" and other readily available search tools revealed to Iranian and Chinese intelligence agencies a network of interconnected web sites that ultimately led back to CIA official servers.

Iranian intelligence appears to be the first to have discovered and used the easy exploit, so simple as to be hardly describable as a hack, then passed the methodology on to others.

What's more, it's been public knowledge for years that the CIA had ample warning that something was amiss as early as 2006.

Former CIA employee, then CIA contractor John Reidy had noticed agent compromises and pointed out the problem with the system to the agency at that time, ultimately taking his concerns to the CIA's internal security apparatus and the office of its inspector general. Reidy was subsequently transferred, had his clearance restricted, and ultimately fired from his next contractor position in what appears it may be an act of petty bureaucratic revenge.

Reidy did not let the matter go, but in an extraordinary (although heavily redacted) appeal of the case he'd initially laid before the CIA to the newly created Intelligence Community Inspector General's office, Reidy yet again detailed the problems he had identified, the assets he feared were blown and possibly killed, and the implications of both for future human intelligence source security. By that time, it was far too late.

The transient communication system the CIA used with its foreign assets was compromised sometime around 2010 by Iranian intelligence, Yahoo reports, perhaps by using a double agent who showed the Iranian Ministry of Intelligence an initial site.

This was likely the key that opened up the entire CIA communication system. According to an earlier report by Dorfman, Iran later shared their methodology with other intelligence agencies, including the Chinese Ministry of State Security.

Thus were large numbers of foreign nationals working for U.S. intelligence in both countries identified and killed from 2010 to 2012, and likely beyond. Iran claimed to have identified 42.

China hasn't been so bold, or so stupid, as to announce their success, but, according to a New York Times report, up to a dozen American assets were found, interrogated, and slain (other reports say it was more than two dozen assets).

These assets were perhaps confirmed as American spies for the Chinese Ministry of State Security by a separate success in either recruiting or stealing information from ex-CIA operations officer Jerry Chun Sing Lee, who was arrested by the FBI earlier this year. Lee allegedly had a list with Chinese assets' real names written down in a couple of notebooks he kept with him.

Lee might go to prison. The Iranian and Chinese nationals who aided America and got caught should have been so lucky. Both Iran and China are murderous regimes that do not merely jail outed spies, of course.

Some assets were exfiltrated by CIA operatives from Iran in the nick of time, according to the Yahoo report. There are no reports that any escaped from China, or lived.

Assets in Russia were reportedly protected from a similar purge by either the CIA having a different system in place or yet another last-minute emergency containment operation within the agency.

I am just a novelist who keeps up with intelligence matters and spycraft for my books, so my interest is that of an engaged amateur examining second-hand sources.

In fact, I am favorably disposed toward America's intelligence agencies, both military and civilian, which are filled with people who put their lives on the line to keep the country and the Western world safe and free.

News reports and analysis of intelligence matters are often rife with conspiracy thinking. Even when the news is genuine, there are agendas being pushed that someone outside the intelligence community has difficulty gauging due to necessary lack of background information.

What's more, I often find journalists and writers who specialize in intelligence reporting to be headcases and cranks who have somehow managed to don respectable garb.

Yet one can't encounter Dorfman and McLaughlin's major scoop with its revealing new information from 11 (probably disgusted and angry) former U.S. intelligence officials without being appalled at the ineptitude and arrogance the CIA displayed. Several questions immediately suggest themselves.

1. Have the specific problems been dealt with?

Considering the order of ineptitude on display, are there still exploitable copies of the web sites up on archive.org or elsewhere?

2. Are CIA foreign source communications actually fixed?

Have tried and true, centuries-old spycraft behaviors such as dead drops, brush passes, cypher pads, and the like been adapted and put in place in a modern setting?

How anybody can be stupid enough to place the personal identities of spies for the United States in an electronic directory in the first place beggars the

understanding. We don't need to know the exact details, but has this practice been nixed and something better put in place?

3. Who let this happen?

Although Reidy's reports were ignored during the Bush years, the real catastrophe got rolling during the Obama administration. As Michael Walsh points out at PJ Media, it played out under a carousel of changing directors. Walsh convincingly contends that administrative churn in an area the president disliked was a large reason for the failures.

Can we get an accounting, and maybe even an apology to the American people for screwing up so badly?

4. Is the CIA itself fixed?

This is an agency that seems lately given to fantasy and bureaucratic truculence, especially for its role in the idiotic Russia collusion imbroglio.

Did former director Mike Pompeo address any of these issues during his tenure?

Most of all, can we trust that current director and CIA lifer Gina Haspel has gotten rid of the fools who set up, maintained, and defended the horrific transient communication system, and gotten rid of the knaves who ignored and hounded the stalwart Reidy out of a job?

5. Who are the spies who were killed?

Might as well tell us now. Whatever was going to be compromised is already shot to pieces. Whether these folks did it for money, revenge, sex, love, or purity of heart and love of freedom, they were doing the citizens of the United States, and the people of the free world, a huge service, obviously risking their lives in the process.

Have their surviving families been protected?

Covertly rewarded with cash, tickets out, spots for their children in U.S. universities?

We should do them right and take care of this debacle American-style, with more than an anonymous star on some wall at Langley. It is a pity we could not keep our spies safe, but at least we should honor their ultimate sacrifice.

6. What was revealed to China and Iran when these spies were interrogated?

How and when is this catastrophic failure going to come back and haunt us? Because it will.



"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 Brent Bozell titled "Europe Suppresses Speech for Muslim 'Feelings' " was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 2, 2018.
 - An article titled "Mosques Seek Twitter Ban on Dutch Populist Geert Wilders" was posted at france24.com on Nov. 5, 2018.
 - An article titled "Bin Salman Launches Saudi Arabia's First Nuclear Plant Project" was posted at aljazeera.com on Nov. 5, 2018.
 - A Reuters article by Arshad Mohammed, Lesley Wroughton and Patricia Zengerle titled "U.S. Allows Eight Importers to Keep Buying Iran Oil for Now" was posted at reuters.com on Nov. 3, 2018.
 - An article titled "Iran President Rouhani Warns Country Faces 'War Situation' As He Vows to Bypass New US Sanctions" was posted at independent.co.uk on Nov. 5, 2018.
 - An article titled "Bolton Praises UAE for Support on Iran" was posted at newsmax.com on Nov. 6, 2018.
 - An article titled "Xi Jinping Vows to Open Up China to Trade and Makes Veiled Criticism of Donald Trump" was posted at independent.co.uk on Nov. 4, 2018.
 - An article by Charlie Moore titled "Journalist in Saudi Arabia 'Is Killed During Torture While in Custody of the Regime' After He Was Accused of Exposing Violations Committed by the Royal Family" was posted at daily-mail.co.uk on Nov. 7, 2018.
 - An article titled "Khashoggi's Body Was 'Dissolved' After Murder: Erdogan Advisor" was posted at yahoo.com on Nov. 2, 2018.
 - A Reuters article titled "Saudis Sent 'Clean-Up' Team to Turkey After Khashoggi Killing, Official Says" was posted at reuters.com on Nov. 5, 2018.



An article by Stephen Dinan titled "Another Kavanaugh Accuser Admits to Fabricating Rape Story" was posted at washingtontimes.com on Nov. 3, 2018. Following is the article.

One of Justice Brett M. Kavanaugh's accusers admitted this week that she made up her lurid tale of a backseat car rape, saying it "was a tactic" to try to derail the judge's confirmation to the Supreme Court.

Sen. Charles E. Grassley, chairman of the Judiciary Committee revealed the fraud in a letter to the FBI and Justice Department Friday, asking them to prosecute Judy Munro-Leighton for lying to and obstructing Congress.

Mr. Grassley said Ms. Munro-Leighton is a left-wing activist who hijacked another “Jane Doe” anonymous report about a backseat rape and claimed it as her own story, calling it a “vicious assault.”

“I am Jane Doe from Oceanside CA—Kavanaugh raped me,” Ms. Munro-Leighton wrote in an Oct. 3 email claiming to have been a victim of the judge.

Mr. Grassley’s investigators tried to reach her for a month but were unsuccessful until this week, when they spoke to her by phone and she confessed that she was not the original Jane Doe, and “did that as a way to grab attention.”

She admitted to the false allegation, and said she has actually never met Justice Kavanaugh.

“I was angry, and I sent it out,” she told investigators.

“In short, during the committee’s time-sensitive investigation of allegations against Judge Kavanaugh, Ms. Munro-Leighton submitted a fabricated allegation, which diverted committee resources,” Mr. Grassley wrote.

“When questioned by Committee investigators she admitted it was false, a ‘ploy,’ and a ‘tactic.’ She was opposed to Judge Kavanaugh’s confirmation.”

President Trump seized on the report Saturday, calling her “a vicious accuser.”

“What about the others? Where are the Dems on this?” he demanded via Twitter.

Mr. Grassley has previously asked the FBI to probe Julie Swetnick and her lawyer, anti-Trump crusader Michael Avenatti, for lying to Congress and obstructing. Ms. Swetnick had originally claimed to have been the victim of gang rapes involving Justice Kavanaugh during high school parties, saying she saw him and a friend spike punch to leave girls unable to resist. She later changed her story to say she saw Justice Kavanaugh and his friend near a punch bowl, and could not identify them as having actually been part of any rape.

None of the witnesses she told NBC could corroborate her story were able to do so.

Indeed, NBC found one woman who despite a sworn statement backing up Ms. Swetnick, told the network Mr. Avenatti was twisting her words.

Justice Kavanaugh’s confirmation process was delayed while the committee investigated a number of sexual assault and harassment claims, none of which have been corroborated by any public evidence to date.

He vehemently denied all of the claims.



“Eye on the World” comment: The following article was posted a day before the midterm elections. Since many news outlets have openly reported that the media is over 90 percent negative toward Donald Trump, this

factual information will give readers an opportunity to evaluate the results of the midterm election in the light of American history (as opposed to political agenda).



An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled “Biggest Midterm House Losses Since WWII: Obama 9-63), Truman (-55), Clinton (-54)” was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 5, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

In the post-World War II era, Presidents Barack Obama, Harry Truman and Bill Clinton saw the three biggest midterm election losses for their party in the House of Representatives, according to historical data published by the Clerk of the House.

In 2010, when Obama was in his first term and had signed the Obamacare law, the Democrats lost a net of 63 House seats.

In 1946, after Truman had succeeded the late Franklin Roosevelt (who died in April 1945) and real GDP was declining by 11.6 percent, the Democrats lost 55 seats.

In 1994, when Clinton was in his first term in which his signature proposal was Hillarycare (a “universal healthcare plan”), the Democrats lost 54 seats.

These losses exceeded the 48 seats the Republicans lost in the 1974 midterm, which took place three months after President Richard Nixon resigned because of the Watergate scandal and in a year when real GDP contracted by 0.5 percent.

When Dwight Eisenhower was president in 1958 and the economy contracted by 0.7 percent, the Republicans also lost 48 seats.

■ This chart ranks the 18 midterm elections since World War II by the number of House seats lost by the incumbent president’s party:

Year	President	Seats	Change
2010	Obama	-63	Lost majority
1946	Truman	-55	Lost majority
1994	Clinton	-54	Lost majority
1974	Nixon	-48	
1958	Eisenhower	-48	
1966	Johnson	-47	
2006	Bush II	-30	Lost majority
1950	Truman	-29	
1982	Reagon	-26	

1954 Eisenhower	-18	Lost majority
1978 Carter	-15	
2014 Obama	-12	
1970 Nixon	-12	
1990 Bush I	-8	
1986 Reagan	-5	
1962 Kennedy	-4	
1998 Clinton	+4	
2002 Bush II	+8	

President Lyndon Johnson saw the sixth worst post-World War II midterm in 1966, when he escalated U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War and American troops suffered 6,350 casualties.

Only two presidents since World War II have seen their party gain seats in a midterm election. In 2002, a year after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, when George W. Bush was president, the Republicans added 8 seats to their House majority.

In 1998, during Clinton's second term, when the Republicans controlled a majority of the House, and the annual unemployment rate and real annual GDP growth were both at 4.5 percent, the Democrats picked up 4 seats. That was not enough, however, to win back a majority of the House—which the Republicans held 223 to 211.

In the 18 midterm elections that have been held since World War II, the party of the sitting president has lost an average of approximately 26 House seats, according to the historical data published by the Clerk of the House.

After the average post-World War II midterm election, the president's party held about 201 House seats and the major opposition party held about 233.

Also during the post-World War II period, the average annual unemployment rate in a midterm election year has been 5.92 percent, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. At the same time, the average annual growth in real GDP in a midterm election year has been 1.97 percent.

In 2010, during Obama's first term, when the Democrats lost 63 House seats, the annual unemployment rate was 9.6 percent—although real GDP was growing at an annual rate of 2.6 percent.

President Obama that year signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, AKA Obamacare.

In 1911, Congress approved legislation increasing the number of House members from 391 to 435. There have been 26 midterm House elections since then, starting in 1914.

During those 26 midterm elections, the president's party has lost an average of 30 House seats.

In the 26 midterm elections since 1914, the only two elections in which an incumbent president's party lost more House seats than the 63 that Democrats lost in 2010, when Obama was president, were in 1922.

When Warren Harding was president in 1922, the Republicans lost 75 seats.

When Franklin Roosevelt was president in 1938, the Democrats lost 71 seats.

Only two first term presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt (+9) and George W. Bush (+8)—saw their party pick up seats in the House during the first midterm of their presidency.

The only other time since 1914 that an incumbent president's party has gained seats in the House was in 1998, in the middle of Bill Clinton's second term, when the Democrats gained 4 seats.

Senate information

From 1912 through 1956, there were 96 members of the U.S. Senate (two for each of 48 states). In 1958, that increased to 98; then, in 1960, to 100. In each midterm election, one-third of the Senate is up for election. In the 26 midterm elections since 1914, the president's party has lost, on average, approximately 4 seats.

The worst any president's party did in the Senate races in these 26 midterms was in 1958, when Dwight Eisenhower was president and the Republicans lost 13 seats. The best any president's party did was in 1934, when Franklin Roosevelt was president and the Democrats gained 10 seats.

In those 26 midterms, the president's party lost Senate seats in 19 midterms, broke even in one, and gained seats in six.

In addition to 1934, when the Democrats gained 10 seats, the Democrats gained 5 seats in 1914, when Woodrow Wilson was president, the Democrats gained 3 seats in 1962, when John Kennedy was president, the Republicans gained 2 seats in 1970 when Nixon was president, the Republicans gained 1 seat in 1982, when Reagan was president, and the Republicans gained 1 seat in 2002, when George W. Bush was president.

This chart ranks the 26 midterm elections since 1914 by the number of Senate seats lost by the incumbent president's party.

Year	President	Seats	Change
1958	Eisenhower	-13	
1946	Truman	-12	Lost majority
2014	Obama	-9	Lost majority
1994	Clinton	-9	Lost majority

1942 Roosevelt	-9	
1986 Reagan	-8	Lost majority
1930 Hoover	-8	
1922 Harding	-8	
2006 Bush II	-6	Lost majority
1950 Truman	-6	
1938 Roosevelt	-6	
1926 Coolidge	-6	
1918 Wilson	-6	Lost majority
1974 Nixon	-5	
2010 Obama	-4	
1966 Johnson	-4	
1978 Carter	-3	
1990 Bush I	-1	
1954 Eisenhower	-1	Lost majority
1998 Clinton	0	
2002 Bush II	+1	Gain majority
1982 Reagan	+1	
1970 Nixon	+2	
1962 Kennedy	+3	
1914 Wilson	+5	
1934 Roosevelt	+10	



An article by Soo Rin Kim titled "Election by the Numbers: Voter Turnout, Flipped Seats, Female Winners, Spending" was posted at abcnews.com on Nov. 7, 2018. Following is the article.

Bottom line, elections are about how many votes candidates get, but other numbers can also tell us a lot about the trends that make up the two-year election cycle.

Here are five of the most memorable from this election:

1. 113 million people voted

About 113 million Americans are estimated to have come out to exercise their right to vote on this election, according to an initial turnout estimate from Edison Research. That's 49 percent of the total population eligible to vote, a record for a midterm election in the U.S.

2. 38 percent Democrats, 32 percent Republicans, 30 independents

Democrats account for 38 percent of voters in preliminary exit poll results so far, while Republicans made up 32 percent and 30 percent responded as independent. This compares with 36-37-27 percent in 2014 and 37-33-29 in 2016.

3. 33 flipped seats

According to ABC News' projections, 30 House seats have changed color so far, with Democrats flipping 29 Republican-held seats blue and Republicans flipping one Democrat-held seat.

Fourteen of those seats came from districts Hillary Clinton won in 2016. Of 25 Republicans running in Hillary's districts, only three have been able to defend their seats so far, and eight seats in California and Washington are still too close to determine.

Republicans have managed to pick up at least three seats in the Senate, including in Indiana, North Dakota and Missouri. Three races in Montana, Florida and Arizona have not been called yet, but Republicans are leading in all three. A runoff will be held in Mississippi.

Despite the president's party's strong reaffirmation of the Senate control, the voter count shows that Democrats lead the Senate popular vote by more than 9 million as of early Wednesday morning, with many more still outstanding in California and Washington, where both candidates are Democrats.

This again brings up a growing government-reform movement within some Democratic party circles to re-design the Senate to be more proportionally representative, a call that resurfaced following the Kavanaugh vote, in which senators opposing confirmation represented a larger portion of the U.S. population.

In statewide elections, Democrats flipped at least seven governorships from red to blue Tuesday night.

4. 110 female winners

It was a historic night for female candidates, with a record number of women elected to Congress.

According to ABC News' projections, at least 98 women will join the House of Representatives, with 84 Democrats and 14 Republicans, and 12 will join the Senate, 10 of whom will be Democrats and two are Republicans.

Tuesday's big win for women comes as an unprecedented number of women ran and won for the first time.

Of the 98 female winners in the lower chamber, 42 were non-white women, including Michigan Democrat Rashida Tlaib and Minnesota Democrat Ilhan Omar, who will be the first Muslim-American women in Congress. In the upper chamber, Hawaii Democrat Mazie Hirono was the only non-white woman of the 12 female winners.

5. \$5.2 billion spent

The historic election came with record-breaking spending in the election cycle.

According to an analysis of Federal Election Commission data by the Center for Responsive Politics, the total amount of money spent on federal races in this election cycle is expected to reach \$5.2 billion, a 35 percent increase from the 2014 midterms.

This includes spending from candidate campaigns party committees and more than 3,200 outside groups, including super PACs and political nonprofits, which have reported spending at least \$1.3 billion, a 60 percent increase from 2014.

A straggler Senate race between Democrat Bill Nelson and Rick Scott in Florida, still too close to be called, turned out to be the most expensive congressional race this election, bringing in more than \$181 million from candidate campaigns and outside groups.

The most expensive House race came from a California district with high percentage of immigrant population. A race still too close to call, candidates, including Democrat Gil Cisneros and Republican Young Kim, have spent \$21 million throughout the election cycle, and outside groups have \$14 million.



An article by Laura Hollis titled "Nine Takeaways From the Midterms" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 8, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

The much-anticipated "most-important-midterm-election-in-our-lifetime" is over. Democrats have a narrow majority in the U.S. House of Representatives, and Republicans have slightly increased their majority in the U.S. Senate.

What did we learn?

1. Midterms get turnout.

File this under "the old rules don't apply." All across the country, poll watchers reported that early voting was breaking records.

According to CBS News, approximately 113 million people—49 percent of eligible voters—voted in the 2018 midterm elections.

This broke turnout records going back to 1966 (and before that, to 1914). That's an incredible statistic, and it defies the conventional wisdom that people only care about presidential elections. Not anymore.

2. Political alliances are changing.

The nation is changing and allegiances are shifting to issues and away from pure identity politics. It's unclear whether our national press understands this. Beltway politicians ignore it at their peril.

3. The GOP can thank Brett Kavanaugh and Lindsey Graham for the U.S. Senate.

Senate Democrats wayyyyy overplayed their hand with the smear campaign against Supreme Court nominee (now Associate Justice) Brett Kavanaugh. The abuse of Senate confirmation procedures, glaring holes in Christine Ford's testimony; salacious, unsubstantiated (and now even recanted) allegations; and protesters' outrageous behavior shocked the country.

As it turns out, Americans still believe in the U.S. Constitution, the rule of law and the presumption of innocence.

There is no question that the Kavanaugh hearings galvanized voters. And Lindsey Graham's justified outrage (helped by the rational yet passionate speech of centrist Maine senator Susan Collins) sealed the deal.

4. Trump has long coattails.

Love him or hate him (and there doesn't seem to be much in between), there's no denying that President Trump has more stamina than any president in modern memory. Nor have there been many presidents who have stumped to this extent for party pols in midterm races.

From March until the early part of this past week, Trump held nearly 50 campaign rallies—and in the days before the election, multiple rallies in multiple states on the same day. (It's also worth noting that Trump seemed to focus his rally efforts on states with critical Senate and gubernatorial races rather than House races.)

He was instrumental in the GOP victories in Florida, Indiana, Texas, Ohio, Tennessee, Missouri and North Dakota. (At this writing, Arizona's senate race and Georgia's governor's race are leaning GOP but still undeclared.) He boosted Michigan U.S. Senate candidate John James into the national spotlight. He is a force to be reckoned with.

5. Loss of the House can be laid at the feet of intransigent Republicans.

It's been said before but bears repeating: When voters gave Republicans control of the House in 2010 (which then-President Obama described as an electoral "shellacking"), they complained that they needed the Senate.

When voters gave the GOP control of the Senate in 2014, they complained that they needed the White House.

When Trump became president in 2016, a significant number of Republicans pouted and said in effect, "This isn't the Republican we wanted."

At every turn, rather than doing the job voters sent them to Congress to do, Republicans made excuses for their inertia and capitulated to the consistently hostile media.

In a critical midterm election year, nearly 30 House Republicans announced their retirement, leaving many of their seats vulnerable. This was part swallowing the "Blue Wave" propaganda that the press spread and part a #NeverTrumper tantrum: Better to lose their jobs (and the House) than have to work with Trump. Nice job, guys.

And while we're on the subject ...

6. No, it's not "Trump's Republican Party."

But what Trump has done is show Republicans how to stop being so good at losing—and start fighting back and winning.

Those who think life was better when the GOP curried favor with the press and rolled over on issue after issue have either stepped down or lost. But that's their fault, not Trump's.

Voters had been signaling for years, before Trump arrived on the scene that they wanted a robust GOP that would fight for conservative causes. Old guard Republicans wouldn't do it. Trump will. Enough said.

7. Trump won't be chastened by 2018. And he shouldn't be.

It's still the economy, stupid. Americans can see past bluster and nonsense, and results matter more than pretty words.

The press swooned for eight years over Obama's soaring rhetoric (which evaporated off-teleprompter). But when it came to results, Obama's policies—Obamacare is a perfect example—hurt rather than helped people.

Forced to choose, millions of Americans prefer someone perhaps less polished who delivers.

8. Americans have a lot to be proud of.

The American system of government works—still, after 242 years. People exercised their right to vote in record numbers.

Those running for office were very diverse and included more females, as well as Muslim, gay, black, Hispanic and Asian candidates. The willingness and ability to meaningfully participate in the process of governance is a worthy attribute of the American public.

But . . .

9. The cultural divide is not going away.

The heated political debates, impassioned electorate and divided Congress are symptomatic of the fundamental differences about the future direction of the country.

In truth, those debates cannot be resolved in Congress—or in government in general—which is, as the saying goes, downstream of culture. It is up to us as Americans, and not our elected representatives, to find ways to resolve those differences.



An article by Monica Showalter titled “Biggest Loser at Midterms? Barack Obama” was posted at americanthinker.com on Nov. 7, 2018. Following are excerpts from the article.

The midterms weren’t a blue wave, but they weren’t shark fin soup for Republicans either, given that they lost the House by a small margin.

That said, the big loser who stands out here is hard-campaigning President Obama, the guy who thought he was the star of the Democratic Party and who, throwing the tradition of former presidents staying aloof from politics out the window, campaigned hard, long, and loud, for Democrats in this midterm. Turns out the ones he fought the hardest for lost.

First, he did some easy ones and those candidates marched right through, Obama or no Obama:

Tim Kaine of Virginia and Joe Manchin of West Virginia for the Senate, Jennifer Wexton of Virginia for the House. J.B. Pritzker for the Illinois governorship. A couple of minor leaguers for the House in Illinois as tag-alongs.

Kaine and Pritzker, given their ties to the Obama administration, were probably favors repaid, and they ran in blue states, anyway, as did the Illinois pickups. Manchin, meanwhile, was primarily re-elected on his Kavanaugh vote, so Obama was likely irrelevant.

But then there were the midterm campaigns that weren’t gimmes, some very high profile, and high media-exposure ones: Joe Donnelly of Indiana for Senate. Bill Nelson of Florida for Senate. Andrew Gillum of Florida for governor. Stacey Abrams of Georgia for governor.

Those were the ones Obama went hoarse campaigning for, yelling and waving his arms, voice cracking, speeches described as fiery, telling voters to vote for these guys or die. With Gillum in particular, racial appeals were a factor and Obama’s presence was supposed to help. Gillum had a big media buildup about being a first black governor of Florida as an argument to draw votes, and he later cried racism to fend off corruption allegations. Adding

Obama to campaign was obviously part of the appeal. This time, the race-politics identity card simply failed.

And Obama? What did he get? Zilch. Zip. Zero. Nada. The voters rather noticeably rejected the ex-president's appeal for votes. Been there, done that.

A prized and coveted Obama endorsement, or campaign stop, obviously isn't the election winner in a tight race it used to be. In fact, with these midterms, when it matters, Obama's a bust. The lesson here that Democrats will surely notice is that it's largely useless.

Obama will be not be easy to get off the stage, given his love for the lime-light. But I suspect we will be hearing a lot less about Obama on the campaign trail, except in the easiest of races, as the reality of what happened among Democrats starts to sink in.



An article by Ann Coulter titled "Whipped" was posted at anncoulter.com on Nov. 7, 2018. Following is the article.

Two years of non-stop campaigning, denouncing and doxing—and all the Resistance has to show for it is a House majority smaller than the one Republicans currently have and a net loss of three Senate seats? (Thank you, Justice Brett Kavanaugh!)

Democratic leaders may try saying, "THIS IS JUST WHAT WE WANTED! We wanted to be down by three Senate seats." But I think their voters are saying, We were hoping for more of a rebuke.

The media exhausted itself on this election! Can they go back to that level of hysteria today?

President Clinton lost 54 House seats and eight Senate seats in his first midterm, as voters responded to Hillary's attempt to socialize health care. President Obama lost 63 House seats and six Senate seats in his first midterm, as voters responded to the Democrats' successful party-line vote to socialize health care.

America's response to Trump's first two years? Republicans lost fewer than 40 House seats and gained Senate seats. (Again: Thank you, Justice Kavanaugh.)

And that was with more than 40 House Republicans being spooked into retiring rather than go down to certain defeat in what the media convinced them would be a big blue wave.

It's always a bad idea to give Democrats control of any part of government. You don't want those guys running a lemonade stand.

But—wow—are there silver linings!

First, all the worst Republican House members were defeated, such as cheap labor advocate Kevin Yoder of Kansas and Florida's Rep. Carlos Curbelo, a second-generation immigrant who goes around calling his fellow Republicans white supremacists. (Alleged white supremacist Steve King won and Curbelo lost—hahahahaha!)

As the movie character Ninotchka said of Stalin's reign of terror: "The last mass trials were a great success! There are going to be fewer but better Russians."

Second, the main accomplishment of the Resistance in the first midterm was to help Trump win his re-election bid.

Even voters skeptical about Trump will embrace him after two minutes, let alone two years, of watching Speaker Nancy Pelosi run the House, Rep. Maxine Waters chair the House Financial Services Committee, Rep. Jerry Nadler head the Judiciary Committee—and Rep. Adam Schiff run around issuing subpoenas all over town.

How about Rep. Alcee Hastings, an impeached and convicted bribe-taker? His seniority surely requires giving him a committee chairmanship!

Is Pelosi going to discriminate against Hastings just because he's a proud black man? Right now, Pelosi is trying to determine which committee chairmanship requires no honesty whatsoever.

If you were hoping the Democrats would seize this opportunity to make utter fools of themselves—impeachment hearings, resurrecting the Kavanaugh gang rape claims, and Russia, Russia, Russia—I've got good news! That's exactly what their base is demanding. I promise you, Maxine Waters is not going to say, "Don't worry, guys. I'll be keeping a very low profile."

Voters will be pleading, Couldn't we get an infrastructure bill? Will you please do something about all these criminal aliens in my sanctuary city? And the Democrats will be carrying on about Trump's taxes.

The Senate math was on Republicans' side, but countering that were several GOP retirements. Republicans not only held the Senate with a bigger margin . . . but now with no Jeff Flake, John McCain or Bob Corker!

The only GOP senator to lose his re-election was Dean Heller of Nevada. That makes him the fourth Republican who supported Marco Rubio's 2013 amnesty bill to lose his seat. Inasmuch as about 85 percent of incumbent senators win re-election, at least for the past quarter-century, this is quite an accomplishment!

Mercifully, of the 14 GOP traitors who voted for Rubio's amnesty, only six remain in office. Four were beaten, three retired one step ahead of the guillotine and one took the easy way out by dying.

Which raises the question: What exactly was Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell's plan for victory? Hope a Supreme Court justice retired and that the Democrats would accuse our nominee of gang rape?

The Republicans' stunning Senate victories resulted from nothing they did. These are the guys who ran like little girls from Trump's campaign promises on immigration. Republicans didn't even bother forcing Democrats to cast wildly unpopular votes on the wall, sanctuary cities or anchor babies. In fact, Republicans did very little of interest to any voters.

The one and only reason Republicans picked up Senate seats in a midterm election is the utter derangement of the Resistance, which—by complete happenstance—was recently put on display when Democrats got the bright idea to viciously slander a sweet nerd like Brett Kavanaugh.

As Trump is accused of the foulest treason over the next two years, he might want to remember Kavanaugh.

You think having MSNBC gloat over your tax returns and Robert Mueller accusing you of collusion with Russia is outrageous? I imagine it was also unpleasant to be accused from every media outlet of gang rape. But Justice Kavanaugh and his family soldiered on, winning the nomination—and winning three Senate seats for the GOP.

Just remember, Mr. President, every time Adam Schiff appears on TV, the RNC should be sending a receipt to the Democrats.



An article by John Horvat II titled "Caravans' Advances Have Evoked Two Vastly Differing Visions for America" was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 7, 2018. Following is the article.

As three human caravans snake their way through Mexico, two different visions of America emerge.

■ The first vision can be represented by several metaphors that reflect a materialistic, mechanical mindset.

Thus, some see America as a giant shareholding company in which immigrants, legal or otherwise, are seen from a purely economic perspective of new workers or potential shareholders. Others might see America as a gigantic cruise ship where they invite immigrants to join a great party in which everyone chases after happiness.

Everything is centered upon the individual and the frenetic pursuit of material well-being. This vision thrives in an atmosphere of unrestraint, sensations and emotions. It naturally finds resonance in liberal media and politics.

■ However, a second vision is represented by those who see America as a nation.

Those in this latter group can evoke organic metaphors to express their view.

Thus, we might say that America represents a community with a shared history, calling and set of social values. America is similar to a family that loves, shelters and nurtures its members.

America is a special land that is the object of sovereignty, identity and patriotism. All these elements unite and forge us into a people. The emphasis of this vision is the symbiosis between a nation and its people.

While including social cooperation, its foundations are cultural and spiritual values. The nation bestows blessings upon members but also exacts duties and sacrifices.

These two visions clash in the present caravan debate. The caravans are just the latest expression of the dispute in the general public over what America should be as a nation. And they further divide and polarize the country.

Making distinctions

The problem begins with the correct notion of what a society is. The shareholding vision thinks of society as a mere collection of individuals in which all seek their self-interest. It has no common goal or purpose other than coordinating the ambitions of its members.

However, the traditional notion of society is different. Society starts with informal groupings of individuals, families, and intermediary associations mostly dedicated to furthering their individual good. A people and a nation are born when this collection of social units coalesces into a distinctive whole.

By definition, a nation forms when a cultural, social, economic, and political unity is unable to be included or federated into any other one.

The goal of this new social unit is no longer only furthering the individual good of each member, but the common good of all. This common good ensures the peace of the community, allows virtuous co-existence, and favors the material and spiritual good of all community members.

The State arises as the nation's political organization and order. Its role is to safeguard the common good and facilitate virtuous life in common. The State, therefore, presupposes a people, intermediary associations, territory, organized political power and the acknowledgment of God and a higher law.

This classical notion of society is turned upside down by those who favor the forcing of American borders with the illegal entry of thousands of Central Americans and other nationals.

Two differing notions

Applying these two notions of America to the caravans, the first sees the invasion as a matter of processing individuals into the country. It involves coordinating, and if necessary, supplying the means for the illegal immigrants' individual material happiness. There are few intermediaries between the individual and the State, which usurps overwhelming tasks and functions that rightly belong to others in society.

However, the second school of thought holds that becoming part of the nation involves more than just being physically present. It must also include full integration and assimilation into the life of the nation. It must include obedience to the State and its laws which exist for the ordering of society the common good of all.

Such a relationship facilitates greater happiness but demands sacrifice and duty. Citizenship is not a document, but a participation in the nation's rich social life full of intermediary associations of family, community, work and faith that facilitate unity and virtuous life together. There is also a very vibrant notion of the role of God who blesses a nation that respects His law.

One vision favors a selfish fragmentation of the nation. The other provides for a shared and healthy framework of principles and values that allows for great diversity but only within the constraints of a unity that is vital and desired. Countless Americans hold these values sacred and see them as the foundation of our well-being and prosperity.

Why many Americans oppose the caravans

That is why many Americans oppose the caravans. The premises of the migrant rights movement—and the Pueblo Sin Fronteras (People Without Borders) and other leftist organizations making it happen—are opposed to the traditional understanding of nation and people.

Few Americans oppose the healthy immigration that has always characterized and revitalized our society throughout our history. However, historically, waves of integration and assimilation took place inside the framework of a nation striving for unity and respectful of the common good.

What Americans see now are caravans that destroy the common good by disrespecting the law. They impose themselves upon the nation and its communities without any organic process of assimilation. America becomes a processing center for individuals desiring to enter at the expense of all.

There is no attempt to maintain unity or honor in this chaotic march to the border. Indeed, liberals have weaponized these poor people to serve their purposes of promoting open borders and the dissolution of the American order.

Some caravan participants even burned the American flag and cursed our government. Criminal elements have infiltrated the caravans and will bring harm to the nation when they enter. This is not immigration, but an asymmetric invasion of the country.

Why the caravans are unacceptable

Accepting these caravans will force the government into disordering the common good. America will endorse the violation of its sovereignty that it is obliged to uphold. America would dishonor its past by betraying that sacred trust to uphold the rule of law that assures that order is to be maintained.

Above all, America must remain true to herself. We are a nation, not a processing center, a shareholding company or a collection of individuals on a cruise ship pursuing their individual material happiness.

We welcome those who wish to unite themselves to the nation, assimilating into our society under the generous conditions set up for this purpose. Nothing has changed in this regard.

However, a nation means we are like a community and family that exist not only for individual benefit but that of the common good. We have history, identity and purpose. We are a sovereign nation under God and His law. Thus, we cannot accept a suicidal travesty that imperils America.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Skin in the Game" was posted at jewish-worldreview.com on Nov. 7, 2018. Following is the article.

In describing the GOP tax cuts, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi said that they and bonuses American workers were getting were "crumbs." They were "tax cuts for the rich." Some argued that the tax cuts would reduce revenues. Pelosi predicted, "This thing will explode the deficit." How about some tax facts?

The argument that tax cuts reduce federal revenues can be disposed of quite easily. According to the Congressional Budget Office, revenues from federal income taxes were \$76 billion higher in the first half of this year than they were in the first half of 2017. The Treasury Department says it expects that federal revenues will continue to exceed last year's for the rest of 2018.

Despite record federal revenues, 2018 will see a massive deficit, perhaps topping \$1 trillion.

Our massive deficit is a result not of tax cuts but of profligate congressional spending that outruns rising tax revenues. Grossly false statements about tax cuts' reducing revenue should be put to rest in the wake of federal revenue increases seen with tax cuts during the Kennedy, Reagan and Trump administrations.

A very disturbing and mostly ignored issue is how absence of skin in the game negatively impacts the political arena. It turns out that 45 percent of American households, nearly 78 million individuals, have no federal income tax obligation. That poses a serious political problem.

Americans with no federal income tax obligation become natural constituencies for big-spending politicians. After all, if one doesn't pay federal income taxes, what does he care about big spending?

Also, if one doesn't pay federal taxes, why should he be happy about a tax cut? What's in it for him? In fact, those with no skin in the game might see tax cuts as a threat to their handout programs.

Whenever tax cuts are called for, it's not long before they are called tax cuts for the rich. Let's look at who pays what in federal income taxes.

Using IRS data for 2015, the latest year available, the Tax Foundation reports that the top 1 percent of earners made about 21 percent of the nation's income, but their share of federal income taxes was 39 percent. They paid more in income taxes than the bottom 90 percent, who paid 29.4 percent of federal income taxes (<http://tinyurl.com/y7t4ljev8>).

In 2015, the top 50 percent of taxpayers paid 97.2 percent of all individual income taxes. Also, the top 1 percent had an income tax rate of 27 percent, while the bottom 50 percent had a tax rate of less than 4 percent. It turns out that 892,420 households—out of roughly 34 million total households—paid 39 percent of federal taxes that year.

Most Americans have little or no federal income tax obligation, so how in the world is it possible to give a tax cut to them?

Another part of the Trump tax cuts was with corporate income—lowering the rate from 35 percent to 21 percent. That, too, has been condemned by the left as a tax cut for the rich.

But corporations do not pay taxes. Why? Corporations are legal fictions. Only people pay taxes. If a tax is levied on a corporation, it will have one or more of the following responses in order to remain in business. It will raise the price of its product, lower its dividends to shareholders and/or lay off workers.

Thus, only flesh-and-blood people pay taxes. We can think of corporations as tax collectors. Politicians love our ignorance about this. They suggest that corporations, not people, will be taxed.

Here's how to see through this charade: Suppose a politician told you, as a homeowner, "I'm not going to tax you. I'm going to tax your land." I hope you wouldn't fall for that jive. Land doesn't pay taxes.

Getting back to skin in the game, sometimes I wonder whether one should be allowed in the game if he doesn't have any skin in it.



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "Race Relations, 2018" was posted at patriotpost.us on Nov. 3, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

The ways in which Obama's eight-year reign hurt America are too numerous to list here, but at the top or near the top of the list would be the way he turned blacks and whites against each other.

Even those of us who worried when he ran on a platform of redistributing America's wealth and overturning a first-rate health care system held out the

hope that the nation's racial wounds would finally be healed by the election of the first black president.

Instead, every time there was a conflict between cops and black criminals, he sided with the latter, taking every opportunity to pick at racial scabs and creating, whenever possible, a whole new set of scars.

For years, people waited in vain to hear Germany apologize for the Holocaust; for the Japanese to apologize for Pearl Harbor and for turning thousands of Korean women into whores for the convenience of their soldiers; and for the Turks to apologize for the genocide of the Armenians.

I, for one, am still waiting for the Democrats to apologize for the Ku Klux Klan and Jim Crow laws and for passing welfare legislation in the 1960s that they knew would destroy the family unit in the black community by chasing black men out of their homes and make black women and children dependent on the federal government to support them. The Democrats, Lyndon Johnson in particular, knew it was the one sure way to lock up the black vote for generations to come.

People, like dogs, he understood, are unlikely to bite the hand that feeds them.

■ Discrimination

In a related matter, we have the wonderful lawsuit filed against Harvard College by Asian Americans for the school's discriminatory admission policy.

The college's laughable defense is that it is merely trying to advance affirmative action in the holy name of diversity by offering blacks and Hispanics the opportunity to become as brilliant as the white students, apparently through the process of osmosis.

The folks at Harvard apparently subscribe to the magical properties of secondhand air. Apparently, merely breathing the same, or at least similar, air that has been inhaled and exhaled by the likes of Al Gore, FDR, George W. Bush, Henry Kissinger, Tim Kaine, Ashley Judd, Ted Kennedy and his father Joseph, Richard Blumenthal, Al Franken, Chuck Schumer, Barney Frank, Allan Grayson, Timothy Leary, Alger Hiss, and Ted (The Unabomber) Kaczynski is supposed to turn mediocre students into intellectual heavyweights.

The inevitable result of affirmative action is that when, in the name of social justice, you favor one or two racial groups, such as blacks and Hispanics, you are also discriminating against others, such as whites and Asians. There are, after all, only finite slots available to be filled by incoming freshmen at places like Harvard and Berkeley.

But a second and nearly equally corrosive result of the practice that's never mentioned is that it diminishes the accomplishments of academically superior blacks and Hispanics. A diploma from an Ivy League school is supposed to mean something, but so long as everyone knows that when it's on the wall of a graduate who may have been the recipient of affirmative action, everyone who looks at the framed parchment will see a large question mark imposed on it.

A diploma, after all, is supposed to denote scholastic achievement and not suggest the graduate was merely the recipient of a charitable act.

■ Not much blood

A picture that has gone viral shows a mosquito on a person's hand with the caption: "And just like that, Elizabeth Warren's Indian blood was gone."



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "I'm Not Guilty!" was posted at patriot-post.us on Nov. 5, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

When you add to all that the fact the packages [which had the pipe bombs] were sent to people I despise, including the Clintons, the Obamas, Eric Holder, Maxine Waters, Joe Biden, George Soros, and Robert De Niro, I was half surprised that the FBI didn't come knocking at my door.

One good thing that came of it is that I learned that George Soros lives in Katonah, New York. Once I had the man's address, I felt compelled to write him a letter.

"Dear Mr. Soros," I began, "you are not only an extremely mysterious figure, you remain one of the world's great enigmas.

"As a teenager, you saw the German socialists (a.k.a. Nazis) murder your relatives, friends and neighbors, and yet here you are, all these decades later, promoting socialism in all corners of the globe.

"Although you have prospered in America and owe your fortune to capitalism, you and your sons apparently disapprove of both the country and its economic system. You are certainly entitled to bite the hands that have fed you awfully well, but I would love to know why.

"In my Russian-Jewish family, we had two kinds of leftists. We had the self-indulgent sort who had made a killing on the black market during World War II, and we had the others, those who barely eked out a living as low-paid cutters and sewers in the garment industry. I understood the politics of the latter group because it was the communist-led unions that had improved working conditions in the sweat shops. I never did understand the others.

"I once pointed out to my wealthy uncle Al that if the revolution he kept calling for ever took place, the communists would probably have him in front of a firing squad even before they got to the Rockefellers. After all, he had been a black marketeer and was an absentee landlord and a wealthy capitalist living off his stock dividends. Red meat, as it were, for the Reds.

"Frankly, I never understood him and his contempt for this country, and I certainly don't understand you.

"I would very much appreciate your taking a minute to explain why, instead of sitting back and enjoying yourself and donating to good causes such as stamping out childhood leukemia and Alzheimer's, you prefer to spend your billions subsidizing Antifa, Black Lives Matter, and presidential campaigns for the tawdry likes of Al Gore, John Kerry, Barack Obama, and Hillary Clinton.

"Sincerely, Burt Prelutsky"

I'll let you know if he gets back to me.

■ Quality of quotes

One of the many things that separate conservatives from liberals is the quality of their quotes. Whereas Ronald Reagan said any number of things that are as timely and witty nearly 40 years after the fact, just about the only things I recall hearing from Obama was that the Republicans should shut up, sit down, and get out of his way, and that if we liked what we had when it came to health care, we would be able to keep our doctors and our health insurance. The first was rude; the second was a lie.

On the other hand, consider the following quotes attributed to the late, great economist Milton Friedman:

"If you put the federal government in charge of the Sahara Desert, in five years there'd be a shortage of sand."

"Many people want the government to protect the consumer. A much more urgent problem is to protect the consumer from the government."

"The greatest advances of civilization, whether in architecture or painting, in science or literature, in industry or agriculture, have never come from centralized government."

"Nothing is so permanent as a temporary government program."

"Concentrated power is not rendered harmless by the good intentions of those who create it."

"The government solution to a problem is usually as bad as the problem."

"We have a system that increasingly taxes work and subsidizes non-work."

"The Great Depression, like most other periods of severe unemployment, was produced by government mismanagement rather than by any inherent instability of the private economy."

"There's no such thing as a free lunch."

I was recently reminded that in 1910, left-wing radicals blew up the LA Times building. A century later, left-wing radicals run the place.



“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 titled “Lowe’s to Close 51 Stores, Including 20 in the U.S.” was posted at marketwatch.com on Nov. 5, 2018.
- An article by Leslie Patton titled “Senior Citizens Are Replacing Teenagers As Fast-Food Workers” was posted at bloomberg.com on Nov. 5, 2018.
- An article by Jordan Blum titled “U.S. Crude Output at New Record With Oil at Lowest Price Since March” was posted at chron.com on Nov. 8, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- A video titled “Caravan Migrants File Class-Action Lawsuit Against Trump” was posted at foxnews.com on Nov. 2, 2018.
- An article by Beth Baumann titled “San Francisco Drops a Pretty Penny to Register Illegal Aliens to Vote” was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 4, 2018.
- An article by Rachel Alexander titled “Will the DOJ Go After the Beto Campaign for Diverting Campaign Funds to the Caravan?” was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 5, 2018.

Comments about weapons

- An article by Hope Schreiber titled “Iowa Pastor Rigs Church With a Bulletproof Pulpit, a Magnetic Gun Moment, and Medical Trauma Bags” was posted at yahoo.com on Nov. 1, 2018.
- An article titled “After Pittsburgh Attack, Course Offers Gun Training Against Shooters in Synagogues” was posted at france24.com on Nov. 5, 2018.
- An article titled “Washington State Voters Agree to Further Regulate Guns, Including Semi-Automatic Rifles” was posted at seattletimes.com on Nov. 6, 2018.
- An article titled “Three Dead After Shooter Opens Fire in Florida Yoga Studio” was posted at yahoo.com on Nov. 2, 2018.
- An article titled “13 Dead in Mass Shooting at Thousand Oaks [Calif.] Bar; Gunman is Former Marine” was posted at dailynews.com on Nov. 8, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

- An editorial by Matthew Whitaker titled “Mueller’s Investigation of Trump is Going Too Far” was posted at cnn.com on Nov. 7, 2018.
- An article by Michael W. Chapman titled “New Acting AG Whitaker: Trump’s Family Finances Beyond Scope of Special Counsel” was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 7, 2018.

■ An article by Laretta Brown titled "West Virginia and Alabama Voters Passed Some Significant Pro-Life Amendments in the Midterms" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 7, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

■ An article by Jack Crowe titled "Protesters Send Message to Tucker Carlson Outside His Home: 'We Know Where You Sleep at Night' " was posted at nationalreview.com on Nov. 7, 2018.

■ An article by Cassandra Fairbanks titled "DC Antifa Publishes Home Addresses of Tucker Carlson and His Brother—As Well As Ann Coulter, Neil Patei and Sean Hannity" was posted at thegatewaypundit.com on Nov. 7, 2018.

■ An article by David Corn titled "House Dems Already Have Their List of Trump Scandals to Investigate" was posted at motherjones.com on Nov. 6, 2018.

■ An article by Daniel Chaitin titled "Trump's Tax Returns Already in Democrats' Crosshairs As They Take the House" was posted at washingtonexaminer.com on Nov. 6, 2018.

■ An article by Melanie Arter titled "Trump Forces Attorney General Sessions to Resign" was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 7, 2018.

■ An article by Thomas Burr titled "Trump Fired Sessions, and in Response Utah's Senator-Elect Mitt Romney Defended Mueller's Investigation" was posted at sltrib.com (Salt Lake City) on Nov. 7, 2018.

■ An article by Chris Riotta and Tom Embury-Dennis titled "Texas Election: Beto O'Rourke Senate Loss Paves the Way for 2020 Presidential Bid" was posted at independent.co.uk on Nov. 7, 2018.

■ An article by Mariah Haas titled "Celebs [including Alyssa Milano, Olivia Wilde and Busy Philipps] React to Ted Cruz Defeating Beto O'Rourke in Texas Senate Race: 'Now He Can Run For President' " was posted at foxnews.com on Nov. 7, 2018.

■ An article by Tara Golshan titled "Democrat Ilhan Omar Becomes One of the First Muslim Women Elected to Congress" was posted at vox.com on Nov. 7, 2018.

■ An article by Justin Caruso titled "Taylor Swift Fails to Take Out Marsha Blackburn" was posted at Breitbart.com on Nov. 6, 2018.

■ An article by Sahil Kapur titled "Rust Belt Defeats Are a 2020 Warning for Trump" was posted at bloomberg.com on Nov. 7, 2018.

■ An article by Ron Dicker titled "Twitter Has Great Time Mocking Donald Trump's 'I'm a Great Moral Leader' Boast" was posted at huffpost.com on Nov. 8, 2018.

News about the media

■ An article by Corinne Weaver titled "Facebook Apologizes, Then Deletes More 'Graphic' Pro-Life Ads" was posted at newsbusters.org on Nov. 2, 2018.

- An article by Alexander Hall titled "Facebook Removes Persecuted Rabbi's Post About Farrakhan" was posted at newsbuster.org on Nov. 5, 2018.
- An article by Corinne Weaver titled "Facebook Allows Sudanese Girl to Be Auctioned for Marriage" was posted at newsbusters.org on Nov. 7, 2018.
- An article by Zack Whittaker titled "Twitter Removes Thousands of Accounts That Tried to Dissuade Democrats From Voting" was posted at techcrunch.com on Nov. 2, 2018.
- An article by Corinne Weaver titled "Democrats O'Rourke, Harris and Gillibrand Spend Most on Twitter Ads" was posted at newsbusters.org on Nov. 2, 2018.
- An article by Ron Dicker titled "Stephen Colbert Gets in the Face of Chris Wallace for Defending Trump" was posted at huffpost.com on Nov. 2, 2018.
- An article by Beth Baumann titled "Former Navy SEAL Who Was the Target of a Disgusting SNL 'Joke' Responds With Pure Class" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 4, 2018.
- An article by Matt Vespa titled "Even CNN Thought SNL's Swipe at Former Navy SEAL Was Total Garbage" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 5, 2018.
- An article by Jason Schwartz and Caitlin Oprysko titled "Fox News Raps Hannity for Appearing Onstage at Trump Rally" was posted at politico.com on Nov. 6, 2018.
- An article by Brian Flood titled "MSNBC Election Night Anchor Rachel Maddow Promotes Pro-Mueller Street Protests" was posted at foxnews.com on Nov. 8, 2018.
- An article by Nikki Schwab and Bob Fredericks titled "Trump Rails Against 'Rude' Media in Heated Press Conference" was posted at nypost.com on Nov. 7, 2018.
- An article by Dominic Patten and Dawn C. Chmeilewski titled "CNN's Jim Acosta Denied White House Entry After Trump Presser Dust-Up" was posted at deadline.com on Nov. 7, 2018.
- An article by Jeremy Barr titled "Jeff Zucker to CNN Staffers After Latest Trump Attack: 'We Have Your Backs' " was posted at hollywoodreporter.com on Nov. 7, 2018.

General interest

- An article by Madison Flager titled "A Heart Medicine [Irbesartan] Was Just Recalled for Containing a Likely Carcinogen" was posted at yahoo.com on Nov. 1, 2018.
- An article titled "Subaru and Toyota to Recall 165,000 Vehicles for Engine Issues" was posted at yahoo.com on Nov. 2, 2018.
- An article by Doug Phillips titled " 'Thank You for Your Service, Buddy': Police Dog Who Helped Nab More Than 200 Suspects Dies" was posted at heraldmailmedia.com (Fort Lauderdale, Florida) on Nov. 5, 2018.



Isaiah 55:6-11—“Seek you the LORD while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; let him return to the LORD, and He will have mercy on him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon. ‘For My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways My ways,’ says the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain comes down, and the snow from heaven, and do not return there, but water the earth, and make it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall My word be that goes forth from My mouth; it shall not return to Me void, but it shall accomplish what I please, and it shall prosper in the thing for which I sent it.”