

Eye on the World

July 21, 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 21, 2018.

Compiled by Dave Havar

Luke 21:34-36—"But take heed to yourselves, lest your souls be weighed down with self-indulgence, and drunkenness, or the anxieties of this life, and that day come on you suddenly, like a falling trap; for it will come on all dwellers on the face of the whole earth. But beware of slumbering; and every moment pray that you may be fully strengthened to escape from all these coming evils, and to take your stand in the presence of the Son of Man" (Weymouth New Testament).



A Reuters article by Helen Coster titled "Five Questions on the Trump-Putin Summit" was posted at reuters.com on July 16, 2018. Following is the article.

In a joint press conference that followed Monday's closed-door summit between Donald Trump and Vladimir Putin, the U.S. president refused to blame the Russian president for any meddling in the 2016 presidential election, accepted Putin's denial of interference—and cast doubt on the findings of U.S. intelligence agencies, just two days after a federal grand jury indicted 12 Russian military officers for conspiring to interfere with the election.

Trump's Helsinki performance drew criticism from Republican lawmakers such as Senators John McCain, Jeff Flake and Rob Corker, who denounced the president's comments. On Twitter former CIA director John Brennan called Trump's behavior "nothing short of treasonous."

Steven Pifer, a non-resident senior fellow with the Brookings Institution and a former State Department official focused on U.S. relations with the former Soviet Union, spoke with Reuters editor Helen Coster about the summit.

"Following Trump's bull-in-the-china-shop diplomacy at NATO and in London and his obsequious and embarrassing performance in Helsinki," said Pifer, "it is hard to avoid the conclusion that U.S. foreign policy interests would have been better served had Trump stayed home."

COSTER: What was your main takeaway from the summit?

PIFER: Based on the press conference, Vladimir Putin has every reason to be happy. He got a formal summit with President Trump, which helps his spin that Russia is no longer isolated. He did not appear to give on any major issue, and Trump declined to challenge Russian actions. The president, at least in public, failed to criticize Russian aggression against Ukraine and did not put down a marker that Russian meddling in U.S. politics is unacceptable and, if continued, would result in U.S. retaliation. One can only hope that things went better in the actual discussions, but it's not clear there is any reason to believe that.

COSTER: What do you think of the fact that Trump took Putin's side against the U.S. intelligence community?

PIFER: Trump's acceptance of Putin's denial of election-meddling over the considered judgment of the U.S. intelligence community (and the growing number of indictments of individual Russians) is astonishing. He gave the Kremlin no reason not to continue such interference in U.S. election processes: it's been successful (from their point of view), the costs are minimal, and the U.S. president apparently does not believe it is happening. Why not continue?

COSTER: What do you expect to be the reaction among U.S. allies—in public and in private?

PIFER: U.S. allies will likely keep their views to themselves publicly, but they have to be dismayed in private. Contrast Trump's reluctance in Helsinki to criticize Putin or any Russian misbehavior with his eager readiness to criticize allies [at last week's NATO summit] in Brussels, particularly Germany and German Chancellor Angela Merkel, over defense spending, plus his London interview in which he put the European Union at the top of his list of foes of the United States.

COSTER: So much of diplomacy happens in small steps and behind the scenes. What steps of that nature might have come out of today's meeting, and what do you expect for U.S.-Russia relations going forward?

PIFER: Hopefully, the summit will produce follow-up dialogues that might yield some progress. Putin opened the door for discussions on arms control, including on extending the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which would be in the U.S. interest. We will have to see what comes, but it would be wise to be patient and keep expectations modest.

COSTER: A lot of people are stating that Trump's comments today give Putin a blank check in terms of his future behavior. What do you think?

PIFER: Genuine improvement in U.S.-Russian relations will require at least some change in problematic Russian policies, such as aggression against Ukraine, interference in U.S. domestic politics and involvement in Syria. It does not appear that Trump gave Putin a reason to change any of those policies, so Russian misbehavior will likely continue.



An article by Jonah Goldberg titled “Trump’s Deference to Putin is Less About Collusion Than Character” was posted at townhall.com on July 18, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Last week, I wrote that the best way to think about a Trump Doctrine is as nothing more than Trumpism on the international stage. By Trumpism, I do not mean a coherent ideological program, but a psychological phenomenon, or simply the manifestation of his character.

Monday, we literally saw President Trump on an international stage, in Helsinki, and he seemed hell-bent on proving me right.

During a joint news appearance with Russian President Vladimir Putin, Trump demonstrated that, when put to the test, he cannot see any issue through a prism other than his grievances and ego.

In a performance that should elicit some resignations from his administration, the president sided with Russia over America’s national security community, including Dan Coats, the Trump-appointed director of national intelligence.

Days ago, Coats issued a blistering warning that not only had Russia meddled in our election—undisputed by almost everyone save the president himself—but that it is preparing to do so again.

But when asked about Russian interference in Helsinki, Trump replied, “All I can do is ask the question. My people came to me, Dan Coats came to me and some others. They said they think it’s Russia. I have President Putin. He just said it’s not Russia. I will say this. I don’t see any reason why it would be [Russia] . . . I have confidence in both parties.”

Amid these and other appalling statements, Trump made it clear that he can only understand the investigation into Russian interference as an attempt to rob him of credit for his electoral victory, and thus to delegitimize his presidency.

For most people with a grasp of the facts—supporters and critics alike—the question of Russian interference and the question of Russian collusion with the Trump campaign are separate.

- Russia did interfere in the election, full stop.
- Whether there was collusion is still an open question, even if many Trump supporters have made up their minds about it.
- Whether Russian interference, or collusion, got Trump over the finish line is ultimately unknowable, though I think it’s very unlikely.

The great parlor game in Washington (and beyond) is to theorize why Trump is so incapable of speaking ill of Putin and so determined to make apologies for Russia.

Among the self-styled “resistance,” the answer takes several sometimes overlapping, sometimes contradictory forms.

- One theory is that the Russians have “kompromat”—that is, embarrassing or incriminating intelligence on Trump.
- Another is that he is a willing asset of the Russians—“Agent Orange”—with whom he colluded to win the presidency.
- But their real shortcoming is that they are less plausible than the Aesopian explanation: This is who Trump is.

Even if Russia hadn’t meddled in the election at all, Trump would still admire Putin because Trump admires men like Putin—which is why he’s praised numerous other dictators and strongmen.

But Trump’s stubborn refusal to listen to his own advisers in the matter of the Russia investigation likely stems from his inability to admit that his instincts are ever wrong. As always, Trump’s character trumps all.



An article by Ann Coulter titled “Putin is Killing Millions of Americans” was posted at anncoulter.com on July 18, 2018. Following is the article.

I don’t know what Trump said during that two hours when he met privately with Russian President Vladimir Putin, but like so many in the media, I know what I hope he said: Mr. Putin, I need you to publicly admit your complicity in our illegal alien problem.

Only if Putin owns up to deploying a vast network of Russian assets to personally direct the movements of millions of illegal aliens across the Sonoran Desert, through dozens of checkpoints and into our country, in fulfillment of his master plan to attack America’s financial viability, national security and future prospects, will the media, the Democratic Party and corporate Republicans ever emerge from their stupor and admit that we have a huge problem on our southern border.

Illegal immigrants have killed multiple times more Americans than Russia has in its entire history—or could ever hope to kill, even with a well-placed nuclear bomb.

But nothing will be done, unless we can prove Putin is behind it.

Our media and government want you to fixate on Russia’s annexation of Crimea as the big problem facing our country, hoping you’ll forget about the gaping hole on our border.

I haven’t counted to see how many Americans died as a result of Putin’s reacquiring Crimea—yes, I have! ZERO. Meanwhile, Mexican drug couriers kill more Americans every week than the Communist Soviet Union did when it shot down Korean flight 007 for flying into its airspace, almost starting a nuclear war.

Obsessing over irrelevant, unsolvable problems in remote parts of the globe is how liberals prove they are intellectuals. North Korea, Syria, Russia—that's what you're supposed to care about. Not your own country. Only Walmart shoppers care about their own country.

It would be as if in 1939, as the Nazi threat was looming, British newspapers discussed nothing but the bushfires in Victoria, Australia.

How many died?

Do they need our help?

What shall we do?

Where does the prime minister stand?

With Russia, liberals get an extra bonus of bludgeoning Trump over his non-existent collusion with Russia—our greatest enemy since very, very recently.

At least no Democratic president ever publicly embraced a Russian dictator, while handing him all of Eastern Europe at Yalta, so the left's conscience is clear!

Actually, no. Until all the Roosevelt statues come down, liberals need to settle down about Russia. At least Trump isn't calling Putin "Uncle Vlad" and giving him one-third of Europe, as he is being advised by two Russian spies.

While I'm sure Russia's invasion of Ukraine and annexation of Crimea were a grave threat to every man, woman and child in America, Putin should also be held to account for the rape and murder of thousands of Americans on our own soil every year, as a result of apparently unstoppable illegal immigration. (Who knew a wall was such an inconceivable engineering feat?)

Where else to lay the blame for this monstrous attack but on Putin, the most evil man since Hitler?

True, liberals have spent decades lobbying for a never-ending flow of illegal aliens. But that shouldn't be a problem. They also spent decades defending Russian dictators.

Abandoning every position they've ever held to attack Trump is standard operating procedure these days.

In addition to Trump's not challenging Putin to a fistfight in Helsinki, the media have gone bananas over the fact that he cited the findings of our intelligence agencies—but then added that Putin denied the charges.

HE'S BELIEVING PUTIN OVER OUR OWN INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES? Moral equivalence! Treason! High crimes and misdemeanors! Kristallnacht! Trump might as well have trampled on a portrait of George Washington. (Or, since we're talking about liberals, Stalin.)

But the way I remember it, elected Democrats—even Democratic candidates for president—have criticized our intelligence agencies pretty ferociously, particularly regarding the Iraq War.

The media turned that clown Joe Wilson into a national hero for ridiculing the findings of our intelligence agencies.

At the inception of the war, U.S. intelligence, British intelligence and the Senate Intelligence Committee concluded that Saddam Hussein had been seeking massive quantities of uranium from Niger.

But Joe Wilson was sent by his wife, a non-covert, paper-pushing CIA agent, on a trip to Niger, where he looked government officials directly in the eye and asked them: Did Saddam send envoys to this godforsaken country that has nothing to sell but uranium in order to buy uranium?

Be honest! I have absolutely no way of knowing if you are lying, and powerful, nuclear-armed nations will be really mad at you if you say "yes."

It was on the basis of this conversation that Wilson concluded, as he wrote in *The New York Times*: "I have little choice but to conclude that some of the intelligence related to Iraq's nuclear weapons program was twisted to exaggerate the Iraqi threat."

Far from condemning this unpatriotic lout for crapping on our intelligence agencies, the media made him a star! Only a fool like George W. Bush would believe our inept intelligence agencies over the word of a government official from Niger.

So doing an about-face on a previous, long-held position is no problem for liberals, provided it serves the larger purpose of getting Trump.

I don't know if liberals have noticed, but trying to work the public into a white-hot rage over Putin's annexation of Crimea hasn't been wildly successful.

Apart from the fact that who owns Crimea is of absolutely no conceivable national security interest to the United States, Crimea has been a part of Russia since forever. (Technically, since 1783—when they took it from the Muslims, bless them.)

Google "Potemkin village." The story is that an aide to Russian Empress Catherine II, Grigory Potemkin, tried to impress her with her newest territorial possession by setting up fake villages along their route through it. Dateline: Crimea, 1787.

The left needs something a little more consequential to make us mad at Russia—and illegal immigration is just the ticket! The only thing liberals care about is Russia, but the only thing most Americans care about is their own country.

The solution is staring us right in the face. Convince Putin to admit that he is responsible for the millions of foreign invaders sneaking into our country, depressing wages on a good day, and raping little girls and committing sickening murders on the bad days.

In exchange, we'll give Putin Bill Browder and George Soros.



An article by Pat Buchanan titled "Trump Calls Off Cold War II" was posted at townhall.com on July 17, 2018. Following is the article.

Beginning his joint press conference with Vladimir Putin, President Trump declared that U.S. relations with Russia have "never been worse."

He then added pointedly, that just changed "about four hours ago."

It certainly did. With his remarks in Helsinki and at the NATO summit in Brussels, Trump has signaled a historic shift in U.S. foreign policy that may determine the future of this nation and the fate of his presidency.

He has rejected the fundamental premises of American foreign policy since the end of the Cold War and blamed our wretched relations with Russia, not on Vladimir Putin, but squarely on the U.S. establishment.

In a tweet prior to the meeting, Trump indicted the elites of both parties: "Our relationship with Russia has NEVER been worse thanks to many years of U.S. foolishness and stupidity and now, the Rigged Witch Hunt!"

Trump thereby repudiated the records and agendas of the neocons and their liberal interventionist allies, as well as the archipelago of War Party think tanks beaver away inside the Beltway.

Looking back over the week, from Brussels to Britain to Helsinki, Trump's message has been clear, consistent and startling.

NATO is obsolete. European allies have freeloaded off U.S. defense while rolling up huge trade surpluses at our expense. Those days are over. Europeans are going to stop stealing our markets and start paying for their own defense.

And there will be no Cold War II.

We are not going to let Putin's annexation of Crimea or aid to pro-Russian rebels in Ukraine prevent us from working on a rapprochement and a partnership with him, Trump is saying. We are going to negotiate arms treaties and talk out our differences as Ronald Reagan did with Mikhail Gorbachev.

Helsinki showed that Trump meant what he said when he declared repeatedly, "Peace with Russia is a good thing, not a bad thing."

On Syria, Trump indicated that he and Putin are working with Bibi Netanyahu, who wants all Iranian forces and Iran-backed militias kept far from the Golan Heights. As for U.S. troops in Syria, says Trump, they will be coming out after ISIS is crushed, and we are 98 percent there.

That is another underlying message here: America is coming home from foreign wars and will be shedding foreign commitments.

Both before and after the Trump-Putin meeting, the cable news coverage was as hostile and hateful toward the president as any this writer has ever seen. The media may not be the “enemy of the people” Trump says they are, but many are implacable enemies of this president.

Some wanted Trump to emulate Nikita Khrushchev, who blew up the Paris summit in May 1960 over a failed U.S. intelligence operation—the U-2 spy plane shot down over the Urals just weeks earlier.

Khrushchev had demanded that Ike apologize. Ike refused, and Khrushchev exploded. Some media seemed to be hoping for just such a confrontation.

When Trump spoke of the “foolishness and stupidity” of the U.S. foreign policy establishment that contributed to this era of animosity in U.S.-Russia relations, what might he have had in mind?

Was it the U.S. provocatively moving NATO into Russia’s front yard after the collapse of the USSR?

Was it the U.S. invasion of Iraq to strip Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction he did not have that plunged us into endless wars of the Middle East?

Was it U.S. support of Syrian rebels determined to oust Bashar Assad, leading to ISIS intervention and a seven-year civil war with half a million dead, a war which Putin eventually entered to save his Syrian ally?

Was it George W. Bush’s abrogation of Richard Nixon’s ABM treaty and drive for a missile defense that caused Putin to break out of the Reagan INF treaty and start deploying cruise missiles to counter it?

Was it U.S. complicity in the Kiev coup that ousted the elected pro-Russian regime that caused Putin to seize Crimea to hold onto Russia’s Black Sea naval base at Sevastopol?

Many Putin actions we condemn were reactions to what we did.

Russia annexed Crimea bloodlessly. But did not the U.S. bomb Serbia for 78 days to force Belgrade to surrender her cradle province of Kosovo?

How was that more moral than what Putin did in Crimea?

If Russian military intelligence hacked into the emails of the DNC, exposing how they stuck it to Bernie Sanders, Trump says he did not collude in it. Is there, after two years, any proof that he did?

Trump insists Russian meddling had no effect on the outcome in 2016 and he is not going to allow media obsession with Russiagate to interfere with establishing better relations.

Former CIA Director John Brennan rages that, “Donald Trump’s press conference performance in Helsinki . . . was . . . treasonous . . . He is wholly in the pocket of Putin. Republican Patriots: Where are you???”

Well, as Patrick Henry said long ago, "If this be treason, make the most of it!"



An article by Christopher White titled "Papal Confidants Rue Prosperity Gospel, Distorted 'American Dream' " was posted at cruxnow.com on July 18, 2018. Following is the article.

In a follow-up to their much-discussed July 2017 article condemning an alliance between conservative U.S. Catholics and Evangelicals as an "ecumenism of hate," papal confidantes Jesuit Father Antonio Spadaro and Presbyterian pastor Marcelo Figueroa have published a new essay in which they criticize the "prosperity gospel" and its influence on the idea of the "American Dream."

In their latest essay in the influential Rome-based Jesuit journal *La Civiltà Cattolica*, the authors argue that the prosperity gospel, which traces its origins to the United States in the late 19th-century, views wealth and success as synonymous with true religious conviction, and consequently, sees "poverty, sickness and unhappiness" as a lack of faith.

Spadaro, who is Italian, and Figueroa, an Argentinian, chronicle the global embrace of the prosperity gospel movement, which has swept across Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In their essay, however, the two specifically identify its origins in the United States, where the American Dream—the idea that the country is a place of "open opportunity" where migrants can pursue the prospect of success in ways "unreachable in their old world"—has been translated into religious belief, defined by affluence.

Although U.S. President Donald Trump's name is only mentioned once in the article's text—along with multiple footnote citations—the two clearly see the current occupant of the Oval Office, a wealthy businessman turned politician, as emblematic of their criticisms that a theology defined by prosperity has, in Pope Francis's words, "overshadow[ed] the Gospel of Christ."

While Spadaro and Figueroa offered a shorter critique of the prosperity gospel in last July's essay, blasting "prosperous televangelists" who "mix marketing, strategic direction and preaching, concentrating more on personal success than on salvation or eternal life," their latest piece provides a more explicit indictment of the "theological justification for economic neo-liberalism."

An emphasis on economic well-being and health, along with a limiting of the Holy Spirit to one's individual desires, have distorted the fullness of the Christian, the authors argue, while at the same time acknowledging a massive appeal that has attracted millions of American believers led by the likes of Kenneth Copeland, Pat Robertson, Benny Hinn, Joel Osteen, and Joyce Meyer—all popular televangelists and authors in the United States who serve as luminaries of the prosperity gospel movement, and who are dubbed as "evangelicals of the American Dream" by Spadaro and Figueroa.

According to the authors, the prosperity gospel “puts the accent on the faith as a ‘merit’ to climb the social ladder,” which they condemn as “unjust and radically anti-evangelical.”

“Generally, the fact that there are riches and material benefits falls once again on the exclusive responsibility of the believer, and consequently so too their poverty or lack of goods,” they write.

“Material victory places the believer in a position of pride due to the power of their ‘faith.’ On the contrary, poverty hits them with a blow that is unbearable for two reasons: first, the person thinks their faith is unable to move the providential hands of God; second, their miserable situation is a divine imposition, a relentless punishment to be accepted in submission,” they continue.

A consequence of the prosperity gospel’s entanglement in the idea of the American Dream, according to Spadaro and Figueroa, is that the economic success of the United States has been viewed as a direct result of its faith.

“It leads to the conclusion that the United States has grown as a nation under the blessing of the providential God of the Evangelical movement,” they write. “Meanwhile, those who dwell south of the Rio Grande are sinking in poverty because the Catholic Church has a different, opposed vision, exalting poverty.”

Such a view, they believe, “exasperates individualism and knocks down the sense of solidarity.” In particular, Spadaro and Figueroa identify the consequences that such a belief system yields when responding to marginalized individuals or communities.

“Sad and disastrous events, including natural ones, or tragedies such as those of migrants and others in similar situations do not offer winning narratives that help to keep the faithful tied to the thought of the prosperity gospel,” they argue.

“This is why there can be a lack of empathy and solidarity in these cases from its followers. There can be no compassion for those who are not prosperous, for clearly they have not followed the rules and thus live in failure and are not loved by God.”

Since his election in 2013, Pope Francis has routinely criticized a theology of prosperity, emphasizing that salvation is given, rather than something that is derived from material success or prosperity.

“The vision of faith offered by the prosperity gospel is a clear contradiction to the concept of a humanity marked by sin with a need for eschatological salvation, tied to Jesus Christ as savior and not to the success of its own works,” they write.

In concluding their piece, Spadaro and Figueroa lament the corrosive influence of the prosperity gospel on the American Dream, which they describe as a “positive and enlightening prophecy . . . that has inspired many.”

In particular, they point to the legendary address of Civil Rights crusader Martin Luther King whose “I have a dream” speech offered an alternative

vision marked by “social, inclusive, and revolutionary content,” and a stark contrast from the vision popularized by today’s televangelists.

Although not an official publication of the Vatican, *La Civiltà Cattolica* is reviewed by the Vatican’s Secretary of State before publication, and under Spadaro, who serves as its editor-in-chief, it has been considered one of the foremost vehicles for understanding the views of the current pontificate.



“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 Daniel John Sobieski titled “Brazile, Rice, Obama Gave Russian Hackers Free Rein” was posted at americanthinker.com on July 17, 2018.

■ An article by Alice Ritchie titled “Tony Blair Calls for Second Vote to Fix Brexit ‘Mess’ ” was posted at yahoo.com on July 17, 2018.

■ An article by Sanford Nowlin titled “Weather Service Photos Show Just How Badly Saharan Dust is Screwing Up Our Air” was posted at sacurrent.com (San Antonio, Texas) on July 16, 2018.

■ An article by Leah Barkoukis titled “After Attacking Israel, Ocasio—Cortez Laughs and Admits She Has No Clue What She’s Talking About” was posted at townhall.com on July 16, 2018.



An article by Michelle Malkin titled “Ms. Diversity-Con Artist: Boston University’s Fake-O-Nomics Darling” was posted at michellemalkin.com on July 18, 2018. Following is the article.

It costs a pretty penny to earn a diploma in stupid.

The annual list price to attend Boston University—including tuition, fees, room and board—currently rounds out to \$70,000. To acquire a degree in economics from this tony institution of higher learning, an undergrad must complete courses in calculus, microeconomic and macroeconomic analysis, empirical economics, statistics and assorted electives.

Four years, 52 credits and nearly \$300,000 later, the school promises that BU economics majors will depart “with a firm understanding of core microeconomic and macroeconomic theory” and the “empirical skills that are essential to applying economic reasoning in our increasingly data-driven world.”

How, then, to explain the abject economic illiteracy of meteoric media darling and democratic socialist “political rock star” Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez? The 28-year-old BU alumna graduated with an economics and international relations degree in 2011. She calls herself a “nerd” and bragged about her academic credentials, tweeting earlier this month:

“How many other House Democrats have a degree in Economics like I do? Trying to find who out here is going to be in the Gini Coefficient Appreciation Squad.”

The upstart New York congressional candidate has been hailed by pundits, newspapers and pols as “sharp,” “smart” and “extraordinary.” BU’s Associate Provost and Dean of Students Kenneth Elmore gushed that Ocasio-Cortez is “brilliant—she is boldly curious and always present. She makes me think and could always see multiple sides of any issue . . . I can’t wait to see what happens when her time truly comes.”

But when the time came to put her BU economics education to work, Ocasio-Cortez flunked. On PBS last week, she asserted that “unemployment is low because everyone has two jobs.” Moreover, the erudite B.A. holder in economics posited, “unemployment is low because people are working 60, 70, 80 hours a week and can barely feed their kids.”

Egad. This nonsense needs more unpacking than a cross-country Mayflower moving truck.

The unemployment rate, which stands at a historically low 4 percent, is calculated by extrapolating and dividing the number of people out of work by the total number of individuals in the American work force.

If you have one job, two jobs, three jobs or more, you don’t count as unemployed. Whether you are working 40 hours or 80 hours or 120 hours a week, if you’re working, that has no effect on the unemployment rate, either. The number of workers moonlighting and the number of hours they moonlight have zero, zip and nada effect on the unemployment rate.

Ocasio-Cortez’s claim that “everyone has two jobs” is more fake-o-nomics. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the number of Americans holding down multiple jobs is less than 5 percent and has been declining for nearly 30 years. Pew Research adds that both “in terms of raw numbers and as a share of all employed people, fewer Americans are working more than one job than in the mid-1990s.”

As for starving children, government statistics show that hunger has dropped to its lowest levels in a decade as unemployment and food inflation have declined. Federal food stamp usage has also plunged to historic lows.

Instead of hitting the books, Ocasio-Cortez appears to have spent most of her college days pounding the social justice pavement. The Boston Globe reports approvingly that she “was active at BU in organizations that empower minorities,” including a stint as president of Alianza Latina, BU’s largest Latin American student organization, and as a student ambassador at the Howard Thurman Center for Common Ground, “which aims to foster inclusiveness among students of all backgrounds.”

Ms. Diversity-ConArtista may be able to blow hot air about Gini coefficients while tweeting anti-capitalist platitudes. But the numbers don't lie. She's everything that's wrong with overpriced liberal ivory towers, radical identity politics and left-wing media ideologues pining for their next savior.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Our Rules of the Game: US Constitution" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on July 18, 2018. Following is the article.

Jusstice Anthony Kennedy's retirement, leading to President Donald Trump's nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court, has thrown progressives, the Democratic Party and the news media into an out-and-out tizzy.

The online magazine Slate declared, "Anthony Kennedy Just Destroyed His Legacy as a Gay Rights Hero."

The New York Times' editorial board said about a second Trump court appointment, "It is a dark moment in the history of the court and the nation, and it's about to get a lot darker."

It's indeed a "dark moment" for those who've for decades used the courts to accomplish what would have been impossible through federal and state legislatures—such as same-sex marriage, abortion and preferences with regard to race and sex.

With this Supreme Court pick—and possibly another during his term—President Trump can return us to the Framers' vision of the judiciary—a vision that's held in contempt by many liberals and conservatives.

The U.S. Constitution represents our "rules of the game." Supreme Court justices should be seen as umpires or referees, whose job is to enforce neutral rules.

I'll give a somewhat trivial example of neutral rules from my youth; let's call it Mom's Rule. On occasion, my sister and I would have lunch in my mother's absence.

She'd ask either me or my younger sister to divide a last piece of cake or pie. More often than not, an argument would ensue about the fairness of the cut.

Those arguments ended when Mom came up with a rule: Whoever cuts the cake lets the other take the first piece. As if by magic or divine intervention, fairness emerged, and arguments ended. No matter who did the cutting, there was an even division.

That's the kind of rule we need for our society—the kind whereby you'd be OK even if your worst enemy were in charge. By creating and enforcing neutral rules, we minimize conflict. Consider one area of ruthless competition where that's demonstrated—sports.

The 52nd Super Bowl featured the Philadelphia Eagles and the New England Patriots. A lot was at stake. Each player on the winning team would earn \$112,000; losers would get half that.

Plus, each winner would get a Super Bowl ring that might cost as much as \$40,000.

Despite a bitterly fought contest and all that was at stake, the game ended peaceably, and winners and losers were civil to one another.

How is it that players with conflicting interests can play a game, agree with the outcome and walk away as good sports?

It's a miracle of sorts. That "miracle" is that it is far easier to reach agreement about the game's rules than the game's outcome. The rules are known and durable. The referee's only job is evenhanded enforcement of those rules.

Suppose football's rules were "living" and the referee and other officials played a role in determining them. The officials could adjust the applications of the rules.

Suppose the officials were more interested in the pursuit of what they saw as football justice than they were in the unbiased enforcement of neutral rules.

In the case of Super Bowl LII, officials might have considered it unfair that the Eagles had never won a Super Bowl and the Patriots had won five. If officials could determine game rules, team owners, instead of trying to raise team productivity, would spend resources lobbying or bribing officials.

The returns from raising team productivity would be reduced. Also, I doubt that the games would end amicably. The players probably wouldn't walk off the field peaceably, shaking hands and sharing hugs, as they do now.

We should demand that Supreme Court justices act as referees and enforce the U.S. Constitution. If they don't and play favorites with different groups of Americans, as we've seen, the potential for conflict among the American people is enhanced. Who is appointed to the high court becomes the all-consuming issue.

The question is not whether a justice would uphold and defend the Constitution but whether he would rig the game to benefit one American or another.



An article by Vicki Batts titled "Monsanto Bullies 'Fought Science' to Hide Cancer Risks, Lawyer Says" was posted at pollutionnews.com on July 13, 2018. Following is the article.

California resident Dewayne Johnson's landmark court case against Monsanto has begun, and his attorney Brett Wisner is on the prowl. Johnson, father of three, is the first individual to bring the biotech behemoth to trial over the allegations that Monsanto's flagship herbicide, Roundup, contains cancer-causing chemicals.

Thousands of people in the U.S. have launched similar legal complaints.

Doctors say Johnson may only have a few months left to live, and that his cancer has spread throughout his body. He was first diagnosed with non-Hodgkins lymphoma in 2014, at age 42.

Johnson used to be a groundskeeper for the school district in Benicia, CA—and he was charged with applying Roundup to the grounds.

Wisner declared on Monday [July 9] that Monsanto “bullied scientists” and went to great lengths to suppress science that showed glyphosate caused cancer. Glyphosate is the active ingredient in Roundup, a widely used weedkiller.

“Monsanto has specifically gone out of its way to bully . . . and to fight independent researchers,” the attorney contended.

“They fought science,” he stated further in the San Francisco courtroom.

Wisner presented internal emails from Monsanto; he contended that the emails show how the company rejected important research and ignored warnings from experts—and that the agricultural giant “pursued” and “helped” write more favorable studies.

Fighting Monsanto with evidence

As *The Guardian* reports, the fact that the judge has allowed Johnson’s lawyers to present scientific arguments makes this case even more noteworthy.

Unsurprisingly, Monsanto’s lawyer, George Lombardi, continues to assert that the “science” is in their favor.

“The scientific evidence is overwhelming that glyphosate-based products do not cause cancer and did not cause Mr. Johnson’s cancer,” he commented during opening statements.

However, you might suppose that’s because Monsanto has done a very good job of controlling the science on glyphosate.

Wisner presented the court with emails indicative of such. In an email exchange about a critical study of glyphosate exposure, Monsanto’s product protection lead Donna Farmer, wrote: “How do we combat this?”

In another email, where Farmer was giving colleagues tips for talking about glyphosate publicly, she explicitly stated, “You cannot say that Roundup does not cause cancer.”

Wisner further presented internal documents which clearly described Monsanto’s plan to obfuscate the International Agency for Research on Cancer’s finding that glyphosate was a probable carcinogen.

The multi-step black ops plan included directives to “orchestrate public outcry” and named “industry partners” it would call upon for help.

Additionally, evidence of Monsanto’s plans to “ghostwrite” favorable research on glyphosate was also provided.

Does Monsanto even stand a chance?

Monsanto lawyer Lombardi argued that Johnson and his lawyers were “cherry picking” evidence—a claim that’s really rather laughable when its coming from Monsanto.

Lombardi fell back on pointing to the EPA's approval of glyphosate—which has already been proven to be nothing more than a sham.

The EPA's stance on glyphosate blatantly ignored the threat it poses to human health, according to the very panel of expert scientists hired to review the government agency's opinion.

In another bid to keep Monsanto afloat, Lombardi proclaimed, "Testing has been done by independent scientists, by university scientists, by government scientists."

Will that statement fall on deaf ears, in light of the internal documents which all but prove Monsanto has been in cahoots with a number of phony "independent" organizations?

The fact that Monsanto has been conspiring to keep the truth about glyphosate's potential to harm humans under wraps is plain as day.

Timothy Litzenburg, one of Johnson's lawyers, contended that regardless of what the verdict ends up being, "so much of what Monsanto has worked to keep secret is coming out."



"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 Anna Edney titled "U.S. to Make More Drugs Easily Available, Cutting Role Docs Play" was posted at bloomberg.com on July 17, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- An article by Matt Vespa titled "Former Obama DHS Chief: This Far Left Push to Abolish ICE is Nonsense" was posted at townhall.com on July 9, 2018.

- An article by Timothy Meads titled "5th Time is the Charm! MS-13 Gang Member Arrested Again After 4 Deportations" was posted at townhall.com on July 14, 2018.

- An article by Stephen Dinan titled "40% Vacancy: Feds Release Illegal Immigrant Families Instead of Filling Detention Centers" was posted at washingtontimes.com on July 15, 2018.

- An article by Don Sweeny titled "Non-Citizens Legally Register to Vote in San Francisco School Elections" was posted at sacbee.com on July 18, 2018.

- An article by Peter Hasson titled "Keith Ellison Claims National Borders Create 'An Injustice' " was posted at dailycaller.com on dailycaller.com July 18, 2018.

Comments about weapons

- An article by John Dempsey titled "The Left's Policies Have Increased Death and Crime in Baltimore Since Freddy Gray" was posted at townhall.com on July 17, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

- An article by Katie Pavlich titled "Trey Gowdy Destroys FBI's Peter Strzok: Why Did You Talk About Impeaching Trump a Day After the Special Counsel Launched?" was posted at townhall.com on July 12, 2018.
- An article by Melanie Arter titled "Goodlatte to Democrats: 'Replace Trump's Name' With Obama's in Strzok's Text Messages" was posted at townhall.com on July 12, 2018.
- An article titled "Rand [Paul] Slams [John] Brennan: 'Most Biased, Bigoted, Hyperbolic, Unhinged Director of CIA' Ever" was posted at grabien.com on July 18, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

- An article by Katie Pavlich titled "Democrats Literally Cheer on FBI's Peter Strzok During His Testimony" was posted at townhall.com on July 12, 2018.
- An article by Cortney O'Brien titled "Dems Heap Praise on Strzok at Hearing, Say He 'Deserves' Purple Heart" was posted at townhall.com on July 12, 2018.
- An article by Chris Reeves titled "Strzok: Trump-Hating Texts Were An Expression of My 'Deep Patriotism' " was posted at townhall.com on July 12, 2018.
- An article by Cortney O'Brien titled "Liberal Activist [Ezra Levin]: We'll 'Force' Female Lawmakers to Vote Against Kavanaugh" was posted at townhall.com on July 12, 2018.
- An article by Susan Jones titled "Rep. Devin Nunes: Why is Russian Targeting of Republicans Omitted From DOJ Indictment?" was posted at cnsnews.com on July 16, 2018.
- An article by Katie Reilly titled "John McCain Calls Trump's Press Conference With Putin 'One of the Most Disgraceful Performances by An American President' " was posted at time.com on July 16, 2018.
- An article by Phil Owen titled "Kimmel: 'We Now Know Beyond a Reasonable Doubt' That Putin is Blackmailing Trump" was posted at thewrap.com on July 17, 2018.
- An article by Michael Steinberger titled "George Soros Bet Big on Liberal Democracy, Now He Fears He is Losing" was posted at nytimes.com on July 17, 2018.
- An article by Sam Meredith titled "Ex-FBI Chief James Comey Urges Americans to Vote for Democrats in Midterm Election" was posted at cnbc.com on July 18, 2018.

News about the media

- An article by Matt Vespa titled "CNN Torches FBI Agent Strzok's Claim That His Texts Aren't Indicative of Bias" was posted at townhall.com on July 12, 2018.

■ An article by Curtis Houck titled “Kurtz: Media Have Serious Problem Overreacting to ‘Incendiary’ Trump Comments, Mistakes” was posted at newsbusters.org on July 18, 2018.

General interest

■ An article by Sarah Gray titled “Blood Pressure Medication That May Contain Cancer-Causing Impurity is Recalled” was posted at yahoo.com on July 16, 2018.

■ A Reuters article titled “Texas Power Demand Breaking Records During Heat Wave—ERCOT” was posted at reuters.com on July 17, 2018.

■ An article by Jeff Mosier titled “Texas Sets Four Consecutive Electricity-Usage Records and Summer is Only Getting Started” was posted at dallasnews.com on July 18, 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.”