

Eye on the World

Oct. 6, 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 Oct. 6, 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 Jan Hennop and Danny Kemp titled "UN Court Tells US to Ease Iran Sanctions in Blow to Trump" was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 3, 2018. Following is the article.

The UN's top court ordered the United States on Wednesday to lift sanctions on humanitarian goods for Iran in a stunning rebuke to US President Donald Trump.

Tehran hailed its "victory" after the International Court of Justice [ICJ] ruled that sanctions reimposed after Trump pulled out of a nuclear deal put Iranian lives at risk.

The US said the case was "meritless" and only involved a few sanctions, although the decision is still likely to rile Trump.

It remains unclear whether the judgment will be anything more than symbolic because both Washington and Tehran have ignored ICJ decisions in the past.

The judges at the court in The Hague ruled unanimously that the sanctions on some goods breached a 1955 "Treaty of Amity" between Iran and the US that predates Iran's Islamic Revolution.

They said Washington "shall remove by means of its choosing any impediments arising from the measures announced on 8 May to the free exportation to Iran

of medicines and medical devices, food and agricultural commodities” as well as airplane parts and services, chief judge Abdulqawi Ahmed Yusuf said.

The court said sanctions on goods “required for humanitarian needs . . . may have a serious detrimental impact on the health and lives of individuals on the territory of Iran.”

US sanctions also had the “potential to endanger civil aviation safety in Iran.”

Trump slapped a first round of sanctions on Iran in August after pulling out in May from the 2015 international deal aimed at curbing Tehran’s nuclear ambitions, to the dismay of his European allies. A second round of punitive measures is due in November.

Meritless case

Iran dragged the US to the ICJ in July, and during four days of hearings in late August, its lawyers accused Washington of “strangling” its economy.

Foreign drugs are now a rare commodity in Iran which is also dealing with a free-falling rial local currency and price hikes. Official Iranian statements acknowledge the shortage and say imports of certain drugs are no longer subsidised.

Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif called the court ruling “another failure for sanctions-addicted US government and victory for rule of law.”

The foreign ministry said in a statement that the ruling was a “clear sign” that “Iran is in the right.”

Washington however says the case is outside the court’s purview as it concerns a matter of national security.

“This is a meritless case over which the court has no jurisdiction,” US ambassador to the Netherlands Pete Hoekstra tweeted.

But Hoekstra pointed out that the tribunal “declined to grant the sweeping measures requested by Iran” and it was “a narrow decision on a very limited range of sectors.”

Wednesday’s ruling is in fact a decision on so-called provisional measures ahead of a final decision on the matter, which may take several more years, experts said.

Decisions by the Hague-based ICJ, which rules on disputes between United Nations members, are binding but it has no mechanism through which it can enforce its decisions.

Iran, US ignored rulings

In 1986 Washington disregarded the court’s finding that it had violated international law by supporting the pro-US Contra rebels in Nicaragua.

Iran in turn ignored the ICJ’s ruling in 1980 to release hostages taken during the Iran hostage crisis.

Trump has previously shown his disdain for overarching international organisations that limit US sovereignty, including the UN.

He recently heavily criticised the separate International Criminal Court in The Hague over a probe into alleged US abuses in Afghanistan.

Trump has also ridden roughshod over his allies, alarming allies with his decision to pull out of the 2015 nuclear deal that saw Iran agree to limit its nuclear programme and let in international inspectors in return for an end to years of sanctions by the West.

Trump argues that funds from the lifting of sanctions under the pact have been used to support terrorism and build nuclear-capable missiles.

European allies have pledged to keep the deal alive, with plans for a mechanism to let firms skirt the US sanctions as they do business with Iran.

US-Iran relations have plunged to a new low since Trump's election in 2016 Trump and Iranian President Hassan Rouhani facing off at the UN in September.

Despite their 1955 Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations, Iran and the United States have not had diplomatic ties since 1980.

Hearings in a separate Iranian case against the US freezing of around \$2 billion of Iranian assets to help American terror victims is due to start at the ICJ next week.



An article titled "Amid Trade Spat, US-China Military Tensions Soar" was posted at economictimes.com on Oct. 3, 2018. Following is the article.

The bitter trade dispute between China and the US is increasingly spilling into the military domain, with a risky incident in the South China Sea highlighting the dangers of souring relations.

In what the US Navy has called an "unsafe and unprofessional" encounter, a Chinese warship sailed within just 45 yards (41 meters) of a US destroyer Sunday as it passed by Chinese-claimed features in the South China Sea, forcing the American vessel to take evasive action.

The close call capped days of tit-for-tat military moves that came as President Donald Trump ramped up his trade war with China.

"The close encounter between the Chinese destroyer and the USS Decatur was the closest one yet," Timothy Heath, senior international defense research analyst at the RAND Corporation, told AFP.

It "may reflect in part the growing US-China tensions. But it also appears to reflect a growing willingness by Beijing to test the Americans in the South China Sea," he added.

Beijing reacted furiously after the incident, saying America's "freedom of navigation" operation threatened China's sovereignty and security, and damaged military relations between the two powers.

The encounter followed a string of other military incidents.

Last week, plans for a Beijing meeting between US Defense Secretary Jim Mattis and his Chinese counterpart General Wei Fenghe fell through after China declined to make Wei available.

Days earlier, China nixed a planned port visit of a US warship to Hong Kong, and canceled a meeting between the head of the Chinese navy and his American counterpart.

That all came around the time US B-52 bombers took part in a combined operation with Japan over the East China Sea, and flew through international airspace over the South China Sea.

The Chinese defense ministry denounced the flyovers as "provocative" actions.

Mattis this week acknowledged "tension points" between the US and China, but told reporters he did not "see it getting worse."

The US and Chinese militaries in 2014 agreed on a code of conduct for unplanned encounters at sea, aimed at helping the two navies avoid mishaps.

It was unclear whether Sunday's manoeuver came at Beijing's request—or was initiated by the Chinese ship's captain—but political motivations were likely a factor in forcing a close call.

"With tensions elevated, China seems motivated to risk a possible collision as a means of intimidation. There is a real risk of miscalculation," Heath said.

Trump's trade war has infuriated Beijing, as did his authorization of a \$1.3 billion arms sale to Taiwan, which China considers a rebel province.

Washington last week enacted new tariffs against China covering another \$200 billion of its imports.

And Washington has placed financial sanctions on China for its recent purchase of Russian Sukhoi Su-35 fighter jets and S-400 surface-to-air missile systems.

US-China military relations have been strained before.

Military exchanges between the countries, including port calls, were temporarily suspended following a mid-air collision between a US EP-3 spy plane and Chinese fighter in 2001 off the south China coast that sparked a major diplomatic row.

The Chinese fighter pilot was killed in the collision and the EP-3 was forced to make an emergency landing in China's Hainan Island, with the crew detained for 11 days before being released.

Current military tensions are likely to persist, said Bonnie Glaser, a senior adviser at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, as they suit Trump's political objectives.

The president last week slapped \$200 billion in tariffs on Chinese goods and has accused Beijing of interfering in the upcoming US election.

"This looks like a strategy from the president," Glaser told AFP.

"He just wants to double down on putting as much pressure on China as possible."

Noting that such actions violated established rules, Glaser added the encounter in the South China Sea represented a "different level of interfering" in a US freedom of navigation operation.



"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.

■ A Reuters article by Michael Georgy titled "Iran's Khamenei Blames Gulf Arab States for Military Parade Attack" was posted at reuters.com on Sept. 22, 2018.

■ A Reuters article titled "Israel Sets October Deadline to Evacuate Bedouin Village [Khan Al-Ahmar] in West Bank" was posted at reuters.com on Sept. 23, 2018.

■ An article titled "Iran's Ayatollah Tells 'Western Women' How to Solve #MeToo Problem: Wear Hijab" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

■ An article by Elena Mazneva, Jack Farhy and Annmarie Hordern titled "Saudis Raise Oil Output to Near-Record Amid Pressure From Trump" was posted at bloomberg.com on Oct. 3, 2018.

■ An article by Antoine Pollez titled "Campaigners Hit the Streets in Bid to Reverse Brexit" was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

■ An article by Liam Deacon titled "May: France Believes Brexit Can Be Blocked, Will Push Bad Deal to Force Second Referendum" was posted at Breitbart.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

■ An article by Sushmita Pathak titled "Cow Dung [and Cow Urine] Soap is Cleaning Up in India" was posted at npr.com on Oct. 3, 2018.



An article by Mary Olohan titled "Five Things the Left Tries to Hide About Kermit Gosnell" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 4, 2018. Following is the article.

Leftist hate of Brett Kavanaugh is unbounded—and it stems from terror that Kavanaugh will be instrumental in overturning *Roe V. Wade*. Yet while emotional leftists berate Kavanaugh supporters as inhumane and sexist, they conveniently overlook the atrocities of the abortion industry—and murderers like Kermit Gosnell.

Time and again, the pro-choice media has sought to exonerate Gosnell. Liberals falsely claim his trial occurred because of religious anti-abortion zealots.

Why? Because his story sheds light on the horrors of the abortion industry like never before. Masquerading as a woman's rights activist and zealously pro-choice doctor, Gosnell was left to butcher and blunder as he pleased.

Kermit Gosnell was ultimately convicted of murdering three born alive infants by stabbing their necks with scissors. Yet these are only three of many hundreds (if not thousands) of murders that Gosnell committed. *Gosnell: The Untold Story of America's Most Prolific Serial Killer* was a nationally best-selling book in 2017, and now it has been turned in to a major motion picture premiering on October 12.

Here are five grisly facts about the Gosnell case, investigative journalists Ann McElhinney and Phelim McAleer, and America's most prolific serial killer.

1. Kermit Gosnell's "abortion" clinic was really a "House of Horrors."

Kermit Gosnell was an abortion doctor. He owned a private practice nestled in the heart of Philadelphia where he employed a variety of unlicensed, under-privileged workers.

When the FBI raided his clinic on February 18, 2010, they were horrified to find blood on the floor, the stench of urine in the air, flea-ridden cats wandering the halls, rusty and unsterile equipment sitting about, and a room full of moaning women who had been left alone on bloody recliners after their abortion procedures.

They described his home as "a house of horrors"—and to this day it is boarded up and shunned by the neighborhood. Even more horrifying: Gosnell's collection of forty-seven pairs of babies in his refrigerator—and the body parts discovered jammed in the garbage disposal.

2. Gosnell butchered women, botched abortions, and murdered born alive infants.

Multiple women died under Gosnell's sloppy handiwork, but thousands of babies died by his purposeful hand. It was well known that he was rough with his patients, slapping their legs and shouting in their faces if they cried or told him they were scared.

Gosnell was known for editing sonograms to make babies appear younger and smaller than they were, and he saved the biggest babies to be aborted on Sundays—when only he and his wife would be at the clinic to see how large these infants were.

Gosnell would cause the babies to be born prematurely, and then snip their spinal cord while they were still breathing. His assistants, hardened though they were, were shocked by the size of some of these babies (left in boxes on the counters or frozen until they could be burned), and this ultimately led to Gosnell's demise.

3. Gosnell also made a living from illegally selling drugs.

Gosnell was supplying drug dealers whilst masking as a women's health advocate and a benevolent community member—writing prescriptions for OxyContin, Percocet, Xanax, and codeine syrup for anyone who requested.

"Patients" would show up to his clinic, wait a couple hours to meet with him, pay \$150 for the appointment, and receive several prescriptions to whatever medication they requested.

During the following weeks, that patient could call in and order as many new scripts for the prescription as they desired—for just \$20 a script. As his luxury shore house and his wife's many designer purses show, Gosnell was making bank.

Ultimately it was Gosnell's drug dealings that caused Detective Jim Wood to stumble into his house of horrors.

4. A husband and wife decided Gosnell must be exposed—and his story became a national bestseller.

Ann McElhinney and Phelim McAleer, the investigative journalists and authors of *Gosnell: The Untold Story of America's Most Prolific Serial Killer*, spent three years researching this case and compiling evidence.

They have both spoken with Gosnell himself—now an unrepentant and boastful prisoner serving three life term sentences in a Philadelphia prison. Now these passionate and determined duo have made Gosnell into a major motion picture premiering on October 12.

Their work was no walk in the park. "Reading the testimony and sifting through the evidence in the case in the research for this book and writing the script of the movie has been brutal,"

McElhinney wrote in Gosnell's preface. "I have wept at my computer. I have said the Our Father sitting at my desk. I am no holy roller—I hadn't prayed in years—but at times when I was confronted with the worst of this story I didn't know what else to do . . ."

5. The biased media refuses to acknowledge Gosnell.

When *Gosnell: The Untold Story of America's Most Prolific Serial Killer* first was released, it blazed through the ranks on Amazon to become a national bestseller—selling out in just three days!

Ranking at #3 in all books on Amazon, Gosnell was dubbed "Amazon's #1 Hot New Release"—and should have been #4 on the New York Times best seller list.

Yet the NYT utterly ignored Gosnell's claim to fame, arguing that they represented the "best assessment of what books are the most broadly popular." This mirrors much of what went on at the time of the actual Gosnell trial; hardly any media showed up at the courthouse, let alone covered the case.

Yet despite the media's attempts to hush up Gosnell's crimes, the book continues to thrive (and it was actually just reprinted in paperback). Now it is time for the movie to do its work.



An article by Ann Coulter titled "Haven Monahan to Testify at Kavanaugh Hearings" was posted at anncoulter.com on Sept. 19, 2018. Following is the article.

If this is what the left pulls against a sweet nerd like Brett Kavanaugh, I can't wait for the hearings to replace Ruth Bader Ginsburg!

Observers of the passing scene were not surprised that the same lunatics screaming that Kavanaugh is going to impose "The Handmaid's Tale" on America also announced that he had committed attempted rape and murder in high school.

His accuser, Christine Blasey Ford, remembered this in a therapy session 30-plus years after the alleged incident—coincidentally, at the exact moment Kavanaugh was all over the news as Mitt Romney's likely Supreme Court nominee.

She doesn't remember the time or place of the assault, told no one for 30 years and has no evidence or corroboration. Maybe the party was at Haven Monahan's house. (He was the instigator of the fraternity gang rape reported in Rolling Stone, which never happened and—luckily for Monahan!—who doesn't exist. Otherwise, he was in BIG trouble.)

But the psychology professor at Palo Alto University—who recently signed a letter denouncing President Trump's border policies (thank you, Attorney General Sessions!)—says a teenaged Kavanaugh threw her on a bed at a party and began groping her, trying to take off her clothes.

Here's the kicker: "I thought he might inadvertently kill me."

We went pretty quickly from drunken teenaged groping to manslaughter.

This is always my favorite part of any feminist claim: The leap from "he used a bad word" to "HE ADMITTED COMMITTING SEXUAL ASSAULT!" (That's what the media lyingly said about Trump's remarks on the "Access Hollywood" tape, as detailed in Chapter Two of my new book, *Resistance Is Futile!: How the Trump-Hating Left Lost Its Collective Mind.*)

Kavanaugh emphatically denies that anything of the sort ever occurred at any party, but feminists are already off on. Maybe he's one of these sick people who rapes corpses!

It's also great how the media act as if attempted rape was perfectly acceptable in America, until we were educated by the #MeToo movement. No, the breakthrough of the #MeToo movement was that it was finally acceptable to call out liberal sexual predators.

Until recently, it was OK to rape and even murder girls—but only if your name was "Clinton," "Kennedy" or "Weinstein," et al. Then Hillary lost, and Teddy was dead, so there was no point in ferociously protecting the Democrats' rapists any longer.

Thus, for example, *The New York Times* defended Blasey Ford's failure to tell anyone about the alleged groping/manslaughter for 30 years, claiming things were different in the 1980s. "More likely," the editorial explained, "a girl in the early 1980s would have blamed herself than report it."

As proof, the Times linked to a *Washington Post* article citing the Times' own treatment of a Kennedy victim. After Patricia Bowman accused William Kennedy Smith of rape, the Times "reported on her speeding tickets, partying in adulthood and even dredged up an unnamed woman who claimed Bowman showed a 'little wild streak' in high school."

So the Times' defense of the decades-old, therapy-induced recovered memory by Kavanaugh's accuser is, Look at the way we abused a Kennedy accuser! We were horrible to her! OK, New York Times, you win.

Most hilarious is the media's insistence that Kavanaugh's accuser is putting herself at enormous risk by coming forward.

Oh, cut the crap, media.

In terms of press coverage, no one alive would prefer to be Kavanaugh than his accuser. Everywhere you look, someone is praising the "survivor" for her stunning, unprecedented courage as she viciously tries to derail Kavanaugh's nomination.

True, accuse a Clinton, a Kennedy or a Weinstein (et al), and you'll be treated like dirt. You'll get the Patricia Bowman treatment. Paula Jones was smeared and laughed at for three years, until Stuart Taylor's 15,000-word article defending her in the *American Lawyer*. (That took courage.)

But accuse the elitist white male Duke lacrosse team, Haven Monahan or a Republican nominee to the Supreme Court, and you can upgrade to a much better university and spend the rest of your life being showered with awards, fellowships, honorary degrees, media appearances and so on. Look up "Anita Hill."

And, boy, was Hill right about Clarence Thomas! (Honorary white male.) He got confirmed, and now he issues conservative rulings. We warned you.

Following days of the entire media demanding that the victim (by which they mean the accuser) be allowed to tell her story, it turns out she'd really rather not. Blasey Ford spent an eternity deciding whether to accept the Senate's invitation to testify, finally announcing on Tuesday night that she would appear only after a thorough and complete FBI investigation.

Tell me what an “investigation” of this matter involves. Do agents go door to door in Montgomery County, Maryland asking everyone who went to high school in the early 1980s if they remember going to some kind of party?

Second: IT’S NEVER THE VICTIM WHO NEEDS AN INVESTIGATION! She knows what her story is. It’s the accused who wants an investigation to know exactly what he’s accused of.

Blasey Ford already knows what she thinks happened. I’ve been waiting my whole life to unburden myself about that night in 1981, 1982 or 1983 in a dark bedroom. Well, I’m not sure if it was a bedroom, but it definitely had a door. And a ceiling and a floor-ish kind of thing. And walls—I know I was surrounded by walls. I remember thinking, “OH MY GOSH, I’M IN A CLOSED SPACE!” On one hand, walls keep me warm, but that’s also why I’ve never enjoyed sex.

The only reason for the professor to insist upon an “investigation” is to delay having to give her story under oath until she knows what can be proved—and what can be disproved.

Of course, the main purpose of an “investigation” is to give the media time to browbeat Republicans into withdrawing Kavanaugh’s name and doing the honorable thing by nominating someone more suitable. Someone like Asia Argent



An article by Ann Coulter titled “No More Mr. White Guy” was posted at anncoulter.com on Sept. 26, 2018. Following is the article.

-
- “They know the optics of 11 white men questioning Dr. Ford . . . will be so harmful and so damaging to the GOP.”—Areva Martin, CNN legal analyst
 - “They understand that you have all of these white men who would be questioning this woman . . . the optics of it would look terrible.”—Gloria Borger, CNN chief political analyst
 - “Women across this nation should be outraged at what these white men senators are doing to this woman.”—Rep. John Garamendi, D-Calif.
 - “There has been some discussion of the GOP senators who happened to all be . . . white men.”—Jim Sciutto, CNN correspondent
 - “What troubles me is now there are . . . they’re all white men.”—Jennifer Granholm, former governor of Michigan, on CNN
 - “You’re seeing on display a metaphor for what this party is, which is basically ignorant white men.”—“Morning Joe” contributor Donny Deutsch
 - “All these white men . . . stumbling all over themselves asking her, you know, aggressive and obnoxious questions.”—Asha Rangappa, CNN analyst

- “What are those—that collection of old white men going to do?”—Cynthia Alksne, MSNBC contributor
- “If she testifies in front of the Judiciary Committee, where 11 members are white men ...”—Susan Del Percio, Republican political strategist, on MSNBC
- “Once again, it will be all white men on the Republican side of the Judiciary Committee.”—CNN anchor Poppy Harlow
- “The optics for Republicans are going to be really tricky . . . You’ve got all white men on the Republican side here ...”—Julie Pace, Washington bureau chief for The Associated Press, on CNN
- “The Republicans, it happens to be 11 white men still on that side.”—CNN host John Berman
- “The Republicans, it is 11 white men, talk to me about how you think the tone inside this hearing on Monday will be perceived?”—Berman, a few minutes later
- “On the Republican side, all 11 are white men.”—Berman, again, same show, several minutes later
- “What hasn’t changed is the number of white men questioning, certainly, on the Republican side.”—Dana Bash, CNN chief political correspondent
- “The Republican side on the Senate Judiciary Committee is all white men . . .”—Irin Carmon, senior correspondent for New York Magazine, on MSNBC
- “Only this crowd of clueless old white guys ...”—The Washington Post’s Jennifer Rubin on Twitter

Let me begin by saying these commentators are making a brilliant and totally ORIGINAL point, the plain truth of which is outshone only by, as I’ve said, its sheer no-one-has-ever-made-that-observation-before-ness.

As the Supreme Court confirmation hearing resumes this week for Judge Brett Kavanaugh, it’s clear that the Republicans are simply too white to get the job done. I suggest the Republicans sign up some outside help, the way baseball teams make late-season acquisitions of pitchers and designated hitters for the playoffs.

Some suggestions (note: not all of the following individuals are Republicans, but none has any partisan profile that I am aware of):

1. The Rev. Al Sharpton (Tawana Brawley affair demonstrates that he believes women).
2. Bill Cosby (extensive, up-close experience with victims of sexual assault, albeit from a rapist’s, rather than a “rapee’s” perspective).
3. Keith Ellison (likely good rapport with committee Democrats; has own transportation to Capitol Building).
4. Matias Reyes (would undoubtedly throw himself into committee’s work as pleasant change of pace from prison).

5. Sorry, I don't remember the gentleman's name, but that guy who kidnaped and raped the Columbia student, poured bleach on her and Krazy-Glued her lips shut. (This one is sort of a "wild card," I admit; he could be absolutely great, or, judging by his history of poor impulse control, he could be too emotionally unstable to handle the committee's important work; definitely a Person of Color, though; that I'm sure about.)

6. Alton Maddox, attorney for black youth hired by Jewish landlord to slash a model's face because she refused to date him. Maddox pioneered novel "she's a manipulative slut who had it coming" defense. (Close relationship with the Rev. Sharpton a definite plus.)

7. Lakireddy Bali Reddy, entrepreneurial Indian immigrant with strong experience with underage rape victims, having brought little girls to the U.S. purchased from their poverty-stricken parents in India as his private sex slaves. (His presence may bring Asha Rangappa on board.)

Seriously, if feminists want to make the point that only female senators have any business conducting these hearings, they have a logical point, albeit an idiotic one.

Of course, the last time feminists bet big on women being certain allies in the fight against misogyny, they were the women of the O.J. jury.

Still, I get the logic of demanding women interlocutors.

But what is the thinking behind snickering at "white men" judging an accusation of sexual assault? Chuck Grassley is a big rapist?

You can be for rape or against it—I happen to be against it—but the idea that alleged sexual assault survivors need the loving care of black, Indian or Hispanic men to judge their stories flies in the face of crime statistics from around the globe.

In the history of the world, there has never been a more pacific, less rapey creature than the white male of Western European descent.

I realize it gives *The New York Times'* editorial board (recent acquisition: Sarah Jeong) warm feelings every time someone throws in the word "white" as an intensifier, denoting extra hatefulness, but really, guys, it's getting old.

Can we please, for the love of God, drop the painfully trite, mind-numbing cliché about "white men," as if somehow their whiteness makes evil even eviler?



An article by Ann Coulter titled "Whatever It Takes" was posted at anncoulter.com on Oct. 3, 2018. Following is the article.

The Democrats' current position on the Supreme Court nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh is: We cannot have someone addicted to beer on our highest court! What if a foreign power were to ply him with this nectar in a can?

Talk about taking control of our government! Suppose they throw in a case of Weihenstephaner Hefeweissbier?

A bitter college roommate is going whole hog, wailing, He lied about being a beeraholic.

By the media's account, Kavanaugh was a bouncer, a brawler and a drunk. And yet he still managed to graduate at the top of his class, go to Yale, then to Yale Law and work in the highest positions in government.

I am in awe of his manliness. Hemingway has nothing on this guy! He should be our president. To paraphrase Abraham Lincoln after being told Ulysses S. Grant was a drunk, let's find out what Kavanaugh drank and send a barrel of it to every college student.

At least the Democrats seem to have moved on from the Crazy Ladies Who Must Be Believed.

Kavanaugh's first accuser, Christine Blasey Ford, doesn't remember the time or place of the alleged high school groping, and all four witnesses she named deny any memory of such a party.

Forcing our first one-week delay, we were told that the poor lady was so traumatized by being groped in high school that she couldn't fly. It was the worst thing that ever happened to her, compelling her to do what any reasonable person would under the circumstances: Add a second front door to her house.

She was supposedly terrified of small spaces, and an airplane, one of her friends told CNN, "was the ultimate closed space where you cannot get away."

Then we found out that Ford regularly jets off to Hawaii, Costa Rica, the South Pacific islands and French Polynesia . . . to go surfing, one of the most terrifying activities around.

It sounded like a joke. I was so shattered and broken, I could only go rock climbing in the Grand Tetons. After that, I'd repair to my room and curl up in a fetal position. Then I'd go rock climbing again.

An ex-boyfriend has come forward to say that in six years of dating Ford, she never mentioned a sexual assault, had no fear of flying, lived comfortably in a tiny home with only one front door, once coached a friend on how to take a polygraph, contrary to her sworn testimony—and also lied about stealing \$600 from him.

Kavanaugh's second accuser, Deborah Ramirez, jumped in to help, dusting off a memory of the nominee pulling a Bill Clinton on her as a freshman in college—but only after she spent a week huddled with her attorney, "assessing her memories" and calling classmates to ask if they thought it was true.

And did she have corroboration? She doesn't need any! She's a "survivor." Even The New York Times—the newspaper that believed the Duke lacrosse rape case until about five minutes before the prosecutor was disbarred—said Ramirez didn't have enough evidence to meet its standards.

His third accuser, our heroine Julie Swetnik, is the woman produced by porn lawyer Michael Avenatti. She claims that she repeatedly attended gang rape parties in the 1980s—and she saw Brett Kavanaugh there!

An ex-boyfriend says Swetnik once threatened to kill him and his unborn child; she had a restraining order taken out against her; was sued by an employer for engaging in “sexually offensive conduct,” making “false and retaliatory allegations” against co-workers and also lying about her educational background and work history.

A Democrat and Emmy-winning meteorologist wrote a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee stating that, soon after he met Swetnik in the 1990s, she proposed group sex to him. Some years later, her own father told him to stay away, citing Swetnik’s psychological problems.

She is now the Democrats’ leading contender for 2020.

Poor Kate Snow of NBC News thought she had landed the interview of a lifetime when she sat down with Swetnik. Within about three questions, it became clear that she was talking to a lunatic. At that point, most of Snow’s energy went into hoping for a building-wide power failure to shut down the cameras.

Of the four witnesses Swetnik provided to NBC, whom she claimed would confirm her story, one denied knowing any Julie Swetnik, one was dead, and two did not respond to the network, perhaps wishing they were dead too.

By the end of the interview, Snow’s purse was missing.

But the Democrats are energetic devils. They’ve been poring over Kavanaugh’s high school yearbook and exclaiming, He’s a beeraholic!

With grim passion, they say, how dare you laugh at this? If he were a teetotaler, they’d say, We can’t have someone on the court who’s so nerdy. How can this weird aesthete sympathize with murderers and insider traders?

They’ve already won a second week’s delay by having two deranged women scream at Sen. Jeff Flake in an elevator.

After wetting himself, Flake insisted on a seventh FBI investigation. For weeks, the Democrats have been demanding an investigation—of an incident without witnesses, on a date unknown at a place unknown—by saying, Oh, you big babies, the FBI investigation of Anita Hill only took three days!

The FBI wrapped up its investigation of Kavanaugh in a few days and then sat around wondering how long it had to wait before producing the report.

So now the “it will only take three days” crowd is saying, Keep investigating! We don’t know how long the probe should be, but the minimum standards of decency require that it last at least until there’s a new president.

Whatever they find, they will argue in the alternative and just keep doing it and doing it. If Kavanaugh stepped on a bug, PETA activists would be screaming at Flake in an elevator.

The Democrats have a pair of twos, but they expect Republicans to fold. Why? Because that's what Republicans always do!

Unfortunately, this time, Kavanaugh's supporters are not accepting surrender.



An article by Michelle Malkin titled "Don't Believe a Gender; Believe Evidence" was posted at michellemalkin.com on Sept. 18, 2018. Following is the article.

I have a message for virtue-signaling men who've rushed to embrace #MeToo operatives hurling uncorroborated sexual assault allegations into the chaotic court of public opinion.

Stuff it.

Your blanket "Believe Women" bloviations are moral and intellectual abominations that insult every human being of sound mind and soul.

A certain class of never Trump-harumpers are leading the charge on behalf of Supreme Court nominee Brett Kavanaugh's memory-addled partisan accuser Christine Blasey Ford—who cannot recall the year she was allegedly traumatized, where it happened, who threw the party that paralyzed her for nearly four decades, how many were in attendance during her claimed assault, how she got there or how she left.

No matter! Bush campaign hack-turned-ABC News analyst Matthew Dowd doesn't need any data to analyze. "Enough with the 'he said, she said'" storyline," he declared this week. "If this is he said, she said, then let's believe the she in these scenarios. She has nothing to gain, and everything to lose. For 250 years we have believed the he in these scenarios. Enough is enough."

Clinton/Kerry flack Peter Daou echoed the unthinking sentiment: "To everyone on the right who says I'm being selective, I BELIEVE WOMEN whether the accused is a Republican or Democrat. And yes, that includes all the names you're throwing at me. My default in these situations is to BELIEVE WOMEN."

Ivy League poobah Simon Hedlin asserted: "Accusers go public not because of any supposed benefits but despite the immense costs." He argued: "When somebody is credibly accused of sexual misconduct, the default should be to believe the accuser."

That is a dumb and dangerous default. The costly toll of "believing women," instead of believing evidence, can be seen in the hundreds and hundreds of cases recorded by the University of Michigan Law School's National Registry of Exonerations involving innocent men falsely accused of rape and rape/murders.

■ One of those men whose plight I've reported on for CRTV and my syndicated column, former Fort Worth police officer Brian Franklin, spent 21 years

in prison of a life sentence after he was convicted of sexually assaulting a 13-year-old girl in 1995 who had committed perjury on the stand.

Franklin vigilantly maintained his innocence, studied law in the prison library and won a reversal of his conviction in 2016. The jury took less than two hours to acquit him.

But his name is still not clear. He recently submitted a 200-page application for a pardon for innocence and cannot do what he wants to do—return to law enforcement—unless the members of the Texas board of pardons and paroles (along with Texas constitutional conservatives who pay lip service to truth, justice and due process) do the right thing.

■ In Philadelphia, Anthony Wright also served more than two decades behind bars like Franklin. He was convicted in 1993 for a brutal rape and murder of an elderly woman.

It was a female prosecutor, Bridget Kirn, who “failed to alert the Court or the jury to what she personally knew was the falsity of (police detectives’) testimony, or otherwise honor her ethical duty to correct it,” according to Wright’s lawyers with the Innocence Project.

They have filed a lawsuit directly aimed at the prosecutor this week to hold her accountable for her criminal falsehoods.

■ And just this week, Oregonian Joshua Horner, serving a 50-year sentence for sexual abuse of a young girl, was exonerated after a dog that the accuser had claimed he shot dead was found alive.

There had been no DNA, no corroborating witnesses and no other forensic evidence—just the word of girl whose contradictions and memory problems were explained away as “post-traumatic stress” while an innocent man nearly drowned.

The idea that all women and girls must be telling the truth at all times about sexual assault allegations because they “have nothing to gain” is perilously detached from reality.

Retired NYPD special victim squad detective John Savino, forensic scientist and criminal profiler of the Forensic Criminology Institute Brent Turvey, and forensic psychologist Aurelio Coronado Mares detail the myriad “prosocial” and “antisocial” lies people tell in their textbook, “False Allegations: Investigative and Forensic Issues in Fraudulent Reports of Crime.”

“Prosocial deceptions” involve specific motives beneficial to both the deceiver and the deceived, including the incentives to “preserve the dignity of others,” to gain “financial benefit” for another; to protect a relationship; “ego-boosting or image protection (of others);” and “protecting others from harm or consequence.”

“Antisocial” lies involve selfish motives to “further a personal agenda at some cost to others,” including “self-deception and rationalization to protect or boost self-esteem;” “enhance status or perception in the eyes of others;”

“garner sympathy;” “avoid social stigma;” “conceal inadequacy, error, and culpability;” “avoid consequence;” and for “personal and/or material gain.”

Let me repeat the themes of my work in this area for the past two years to counter the “Believe Women” baloney:

The role of the press should be verification, not validation.

Rape is a devastating crime. So is lying about it.

It’s not victim blaming to get to the bottom of the truth. It’s liar-shaming.

Don’t believe a gender. Believe evidence.



An article by Michelle Malkin titled “Stop Google’s Kiddie Data Predators” was posted at michellemalkin.com on Sept. 26, 2018. Following is the article.

No consent. No disclosure. No escape.

For legions of unwitting students and teachers across the country, this is the dangerous, de facto data policy Google has imposed over their school districts.

An estimated 80 million students and teachers are now signed up for free “G Suite for Education” accounts (formerly known as Google Apps for Education); more than 25 million students and teachers now use Google Chromebooks.

A Google logon is the key to accessing homework, quizzes, tests, group discussions, presentations, spreadsheets and other “seamless communication.”

Without it, students and teachers are locked out of their own virtual classrooms.

Local administrators, dazzled by “digital learning initiatives” and shiny tech toys, have sold out vulnerable children to Silicon Valley.

Educators and parents who expose and oppose this alarmingly intrusive regime are mocked and marginalized.

And Beltway politicians, who are holding Senate hearings this week on Big Tech’s consumer privacy breaches, remain clueless or complicit in the wholesale hijacking of school-age kids’ personally identifiable information for endless data mining and future profit.

Over the past several years, I’ve reported in my column and CRTV.com investigative program on edutech plundering the personal data and browsing habits of millions of American schoolchildren.

Remember: State and federal educational databases provide countless opportunities for private companies exploiting public schoolchildren subjected to annual assessments, which exploded after the adoption of the tech industry-supported Common Core “standards,” tests and aligned texts and curricula.

The Every Student Succeeds Act further enshrined government collection of personally identifiable information—including data collected on attitudes, values, beliefs and dispositions—and allows release of the data to third-party contractors thanks to Obama-era loopholes carved into the federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act.

The racket includes Facebook's Digital Promise partnership with the U.S. Department of Education and the social/emotional behavior tracking system of TS Gold (Teaching Strategies Gold) targeting preschoolers. Yes, preschoolers.

The Big Business-driven Project Unicorn promotes "data interoperability" between and among a cornucopia of edutech products vying for your kid's clicks and data. And despite getting caught data-mining students' emails without consent, Google continues to infiltrate classrooms and family rooms.

Parents, did you get notice before your child signed on to a Google account?

In many districts, school information officers usurp your family authority and are logging on your sons and daughters en masse without your consent or knowledge. You don't get to see the terms of service, the privacy policy or the G Suite agreement between Google and your school.

Even if parents do receive notice before their kids are dragooned into G World, opt-out mechanisms are nonexistent or nearly impossible to navigate.

Springfield, Missouri, public schools employee and parent Brooke Henderson, along with her sister, Brette Hay (who is also a mom and educator), were horrified to discover that even if they logged out of their G Suite accounts, their personal passwords, bank account information, parents' personal data, spouses' sensitive data and children's browsing habits were being stored on district-issued Google Drive accounts.

Unbeknownst to the sisters, Google's auto login and auto-sync functions allow the collection and archiving of non-education-related information across the extended family's devices.

Henderson showed me screenshots and videos of these breaches, including storage of her young niece's personal voice-to-text searches and memos and her nephew's YouTube viewing records.

Even worse, such information is accessible to unknown numbers of district employees. The security concerns are multiplied and exacerbated by other third-party data management systems used by Henderson's district that "play well" with Google, such as Instructure's program Canvas and single sign-on program Clever.

As parent privacy advocate and researcher Cheri Kiesecker asserts: "Parents don't want to just see businesses' policies after they get our kids' data. We want to have consent whether they get the data, and students should not be penalized if parents choose not to share data. There also should be an enforceable penalty if data is misused."

Message to Congress: Allowing Google to dictate “frameworks” for education information grabs is like letting the fox guard the henhouse.

Parents have a right to know—and the right to “NO”—when it comes to protecting their children’s privacy. Anything less is capitulation to kiddie data predators.



An article by Michelle Malkin titled “Investigate the Senate Democrat Wrecking Machine” was posted at michellemalkin.com on Oct. 3, 2018. Following is the article.

How did we get here? The Kavanaugh Supreme Court nomination circus didn’t happen by accident. The emergence of incredible—and by “incredible,” I mean the literal Merriam-Webster definition of “too extraordinary and improbable to be believed”—accusers in the 11th hour was no mistake.

It is my contention that this grand unearth-and-destroy spectacle was planned, coordinated and facilitated by Senate Judiciary Committee Democrats and their staffers.

After the FBI finishes its Freshmen Booze Investigations, Federal Barfight Interrogations and Fraternity Barfing Incidents probe of every last Yale and Holton Arms acquaintance and publicity hound ever photographed with Judge Brett Kavanaugh, every cog in the Resistance Wrecking Machine must be investigated.

■ Protest Orchestration.

The hearings were doomed from the very start, when 70 screaming demonstrators (including Women’s March holy warrior Linda Sarsour and actress Piper Perabo) systematically infiltrated the Hart Senate Office Building and disrupted the proceedings in Hour One of Day One.

Day Two saw another 72 social justice mobsters arrested, with more than 200 total taken into custody by Capitol Police by the end of Day Three.

Taxpayers have a right to know who sponsored the deliberate sabotage and abuse of the gallery pass privilege, which has been in place since 1890.

As the U.S. Senate website notes, “A code of conduct for visitors to the galleries is set by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and is enforced by the doorkeepers . . . each gallery pass requires the ‘signature’ of a senator or officer of the Senate.”

We’ve seen this partisan-organized circus mayhem before.

During the Bush years, Democratic Reps. Lynn Woolsey and Major Owens showered Code Pink radicals with free passes to disrupt speeches and hearings.

Last year, Sen. Chuck Schumer handed out passes to protesters for the Obamacare repeal vote.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein acknowledged that she invited gun control activist and Parkland father Fred Guttenberg to the manufactured Kavanaugh chaos, where he pulled an awful fake news stunt during a break in the hearings—a stunt that no major media bothered to verify.

Who else did Feinstein enable?

Which other senators joined the plot?

Those who deliberately aid and abet the hijacking of congressional proceedings should be named and shamed.

Their ability to sign for passes should be curtailed.

When they go low, the taxpaying public has a right to know.

■ Leaky sneaks.

Denial ain't just a river in Egypt. It's what fills the Beltway swamp.

Feinstein adamantly insists that she "did not leak the contents" or existence of Kavanaugh accuser Christine Blasey Ford's letter, which detailed an alleged sexual assault with more conjecture than actual details. Ford denied during panel questioning that she had leaked the letter. And the left-wing Intercept website, which ran the first report publicizing the letter's existence, also denies that Feinstein's office leaked it.

But it was Feinstein's office that sat on the letter for months until it would do the most damage.

And it was Feinstein's office that recommended veteran liberal lawyer and proud resistance activist Debra Katz to Ford.

Various media outlets that picked up the story point to other Democratic offices as possible sources for the privacy breach, since the letter purportedly went through California Democratic Rep. Anna Eshoo's office first before landing on Feinstein's desk and eventually arriving into the hands of Washington Post reporter Emma Brown.

I don't buy it. Feinstein's in control; her senior staffers, not Eshoo's, are the ones fielding complaints, auditioning potential victims and feeding the media.

When a Beltway swamp creature declaims that "survivors have a right to decide how their stories are made public," that's not a deflection of responsibility. That's an inadvertent boast of the senator's ability to pick and choose which reporters to enlist in their smear campaign.

■ Accuser procurement.

There's something fishy about the highly managed appearance of accuser Deborah Ramirez onto the Kavanaugh circus scene. Like Ford, Ramirez was assisted by a home state elected official—Colorado Democratic Sen. Michael Bennett.

But he got involved only after unnamed "Judiciary staff" reached out to him for help, according to the political operatives masquerading as journalists at the never-Trump New Yorker magazine.

"Judiciary staff reached out to our office and asked for a connection to someone who might be helpful should Deborah Ramirez decide to come forward with an allegation related to that made by Dr. Ford. We reached out to (liberal former Boulder County DA) Stan Garnett, who then met with Ramirez to work through how to analyze and present her allegations," Bennet Press Secretary Laurie Cipriano wrote in a statement.

A fish rots from the head down.

And at the head of the Senate Democrats' Resistance Wrecking Machine is power-mad Beltway barnacle Sen. Dianne Feinstein.

If the Senate Republicans can't man up and take back control of the judicial nominations process from the saboteurs seated next to them, they deserve to lose their majority.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Reasoning With Race" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Sept. 19, 2018. Following is the article.

So much of our reasoning about race is both emotional and faulty.

In ordinary, as well as professional, conversation, we use terms such as discrimination, prejudice, racial preferences and racism interchangeably, as if they referred to the same behavior. We can avoid many pitfalls of misguided thinking about race by establishing operational definitions so as to not confuse one behavior with another.

Discrimination can be operationally defined as an act of choice. Our entire lives are spent choosing to do or not to do thousands of activities. Choosing requires non-choosing.

When you chose to read this column, you discriminated against other possible uses of your time.

When you chose a spouse, you discriminated against other people.

When I chose Mrs. Williams, I systematically discriminated against other women. Much of it was racial. Namely, I discriminated against white women, Asian women, fat women and women with criminal backgrounds. In a word, I didn't offer every woman an equal opportunity, and they didn't offer me an equal opportunity.

One might be tempted to argue that racial discrimination in marriage is trivial and does not have important social consequences, but it does.

When high-IQ and high-income people marry other high-IQ and high-income people, and to the extent there is a racial correlation between these characteristics, racial discrimination in mate selection enhances the inequality in the population's intelligence and income distribution.

There would be greater income equality if high-IQ and high-income people married low-IQ and low-income people. But I imagine that most people would be horrified by the suggestion of a mandate to require the same.

Prejudice is a perfectly useful term, but it is used improperly. Its Latin root is *praejudicium*—meaning prejudgment. Prejudice can be operationally defined as making decisions on the basis of incomplete information.

Because the acquisition of information entails costs, we all seek to economize on information cost. Sometimes we use cheap-to-observe physical attributes as proxies for some other attribute more costlier to observe.

The cheaply observed fact that a person is a male or female can serve as a proxy for an unobserved attribute such as strength, aggressiveness or speed in running.

In the late 1990s, a black taxi commissioner in Washington, D.C., warned cabbies against going into low-income black neighborhoods and picking up "dangerous-looking" passengers whom she described as young black males dressed a certain way.

Some pizza deliverers in St. Louis who were black complained about delivering pizzas to black neighborhoods for fear of being assaulted or robbed.

In 1993, the Rev. Jesse Jackson was reported as saying that he is relieved when he learns that youthful footsteps walking behind him at night are white and not black.

Here's the question: Does the wariness of Washington's predominantly black cabbies to pick up "dangerous-looking" black males or black pizza deliverers' not wanting to deliver to some black neighborhoods or Rev. Jackson's feeling a sense of relief when the youthful footsteps behind him are those of white youngsters instead of black say anything unambiguous about whether cabbies, pizza deliverers and Jackson like or dislike blacks?

It's a vital and often overlooked point—namely, that watching a person's prejudicial (prejudging) behavior alone can tell us nothing unambiguous about that person's racial tastes or preferences.

Consider policing.

Suppose a chief of police is trying to capture culprits who break in to autos to steal electronic equipment.

Suppose further that you see him focusing most of his investigative resources on young males between the ages of 15 and 25. He spends none of his investigative resources on females of any age and very few on men who are 40 or older.

By watching his "profiling" behavior—prejudging behavior—would you conclude that he likes females and older males and dislikes males between the ages of 15 and 25? I think that it would take outright idiocy to reach such a conclusion.

The police chief is simply playing the odds based on the evidence he has gathered through experience that breaking in to autos tends to be a young man's fancy.



An article by Walter Williams titled "University Corruption" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Sept. 26, 2018. Following is the article.

I'm thankful that increasing attention is being paid to the dire state of higher education in our country. Heather Mac Donald, a fellow at the Manhattan Institute, has just published "The Diversity Delusion." Its subtitle captures much of the book's content: "How Race and Gender Pandering Corrupt the University and Undermine Our Culture."

Part of the gender pandering at our universities is seen in the effort to satisfy the diversity-obsessed National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, each of which gives millions of dollars of grant money to universities. If universities don't make an effort to diversify their science, technology, engineering and math (known as STEM) programs, they risk losing millions in grant money.

A UCLA scientist says, "All across the country the big question now in STEM is: how can we promote more women and minorities by 'changing' (i.e., lowering) the requirements we had previously set for graduate level study?"

Mac Donald says, "Mathematical problem-solving is being deemphasized in favor of more qualitative group projects; the pace of undergraduate physics education is being slowed down so that no one gets left behind."

Diversity-crazed people ignore the fact that there are systemic differences in race and sex that influence various outcomes.

■ Males outperform females at the highest levels of math; however, males are overrepresented at the lowest levels of math competence.

In 2016, the number of males scoring above 700 on the math portion of the SAT was nearly twice as high as the number of females scoring above 700. There are 2.5 males in the U.S. in the top 0.01 percent of math ability for every female, according to the journal *Intelligence* (February 2018).

■ In terms of careers, females are more people-centered than males.

That might explain why females make up 75 percent of workers in health care-related fields but only 14 percent of engineering workers and 25 percent of computer workers. Nearly 82 percent of obstetrics and gynecology medical residents in 2016 were women.

Mac Donald asks sarcastically, "Is gynecology biased against males, or are females selecting where they want to work?"

“The Diversity Delusion” documents academic practices that fall just shy of lunacy at many universities. Nowhere are these practices more unintelligent and harmful to their ostensible beneficiaries than in university efforts to promote racial diversity.

UC Berkeley and UCLA are the most competitive campuses in the University of California system. Before Proposition 209’s ban on racial discrimination, the median SAT score of blacks and Hispanics at Berkeley was 250 points below that of whites and Asians.

This difference was hard to miss in class.

Renowned Berkeley philosophy professor John Searle, who sees affirmative action as a disaster, said, “They admitted people who could barely read.”

Dr. Thomas Sowell and others have discussed this problem of mismatching students. Black and Hispanic students who might do well in a less competitive setting are recruited to highly competitive universities and become failures. Black parents have no obligation to make academic liberals feel good about themselves by allowing them to turn their children into failures.

Many readers know that I am a professor of economics at George Mason University. A few readers have asked me about “Black Freshmen Orientation,” held Aug. 25 and advertised as an opportunity for students to learn more about the black community at George Mason University.

GMU is not alone in promoting separation in the name of diversity and inclusion. Harvard, Yale, UCLA and many other universities, including GMU, have black graduation ceremonies.

Racial segregation goes beyond graduation ceremonies. Cal State Los Angeles, the University of Connecticut, UC Davis and UC Berkeley, among others, offer racially segregated housing for black students.

University administrators and faculty members who cave to the demands for racially segregated activities have lost their moral mooring, not to mention common sense.

I’m sure that if white students demanded a whites-only dormitory or whites-only graduation ceremonies, the university community would be outraged.

Some weak-minded administrators might make the argument that having black-only activities and facilities is welcoming and might make black students feel more comfortable.

I’m wondering whether they would also support calls by either white or black students for separate (themed) bathrooms and water fountains.



An article by Walter Williams titled “Racial Disparities in School Discipline” was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Oct. 3, 2018. Following is the article.

President Barack Obama's first education secretary, Arne Duncan, gave a speech on the 45th anniversary of "Bloody Sunday" at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, where, in 1965, state troopers beat and tear-gassed hundreds of peaceful civil rights marchers who were demanding voting rights.

Later that year, as a result of widespread support across the nation, the U.S. Congress passed the Voting Rights Act.

Secretary Duncan titled his speech "Crossing the Next Bridge." Duncan told the crowd that black students "are more than three times as likely to be expelled as their white peers," adding that Martin Luther King would be "dismayed."

Gail Heriot, a law professor at the University of San Diego and a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and her special assistant and counselor, Alison Somin, have written an important article in the *Texas Review of Law & Politics*, titled "The Department of Education's Obama-Era Initiative on Racial Disparities in School Discipline" (Spring 2018).

The article is about the departments of Education and Justice's "disparate impact" vision, wherein they see racial discrimination as the factor that explains why black male students face suspension and expulsion more often than other students.

Faced with threats from the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, schools have instituted new disciplinary policies.

For example, after the public school district in Oklahoma City was investigated by the OCR, there was a 42.5 percent decrease in the number of suspensions. According to an article in *The Oklahoman*, one teacher said, "Students are yelling, cursing, hitting and screaming at teachers and nothing is being done but teachers are being told to teach and ignore the behaviors."

According to *Chalkbeat*, new high school teachers left one school because they didn't feel safe. There have been cases in which students have assaulted teachers and returned to school the next day.

Many of the complaints about black student behavior are coming from black teachers. I doubt whether they could be accused of racial discrimination against black students.

The first vice president of the St. Paul, Minnesota, chapter of the NAACP said it's "very disturbing" that the school district would retaliate against a black teacher "for simply voicing the concern" that when black students are not held accountable for misbehaving, they are set up for failure in life.

An article in *Education Week* earlier this year, titled "When Students Assault Teachers, Effects Can Be Lasting," discusses the widespread assaults of teachers across the country: "In the 2015-16 school year, 5.8 percent of the nation's 3.8 million teachers were physically attacked by a student. Almost 10 percent were threatened with injury, according to federal education data" (<http://tinyurl.com/y7ndtyom>).

Measures that propose harsh punishment for students who assault teachers have not been successful.

In North Carolina, a bill was introduced that proposed that students 16 or older could be charged with a felony if they assaulted a teacher. It was opposed by children's advocacy and disability rights groups.

In Minnesota, a 2016 bill would have required school boards to automatically expel a student who threatened or inflicted bodily harm on a teacher for up to a year. It, too, was opposed, even in light of the fact that teachers have suffered serious bodily harm, such as the case in which a high school student slammed a teacher into a concrete wall and then squeezed his throat. That teacher ended up with a traumatic brain injury.

There are plenty of visuals of assaults on teachers.

Here's a tiny sample: Florida's Seminole Middle School (<http://tinyurl.com/yc2tmchd>), Pennsylvania's Cheltenham High School (<http://tinyurl.com/ydf8rajf>), Illinois' Rich Central High School (<http://tinyurl.com/yah3bjey>).

Byongook Moon, a professor in the criminal justice department at the University of Texas at San Antonio, says that according to his study of 1,600 teachers, about 44 percent of teachers who had been victims of physical assault said that being attacked had a negative impact on their job performance. Nearly 30 percent said they could no longer trust the student who had attacked them, and 27 percent said they thought of quitting their teaching career afterward.

My question is: Is there any reason whatsoever for adults to tolerate this kind of behavior from our young people?



"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

- A Reuters article titled "US Weekly Jobless Claims Drop to a New 49-Year Low" was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 4, 2018.
- An article by Thomas Franck and Alexandria Gibbs titled "10-Year Yield Jumps to Highest in 7 Years As Investors Bet on Roaring Economy, Higher Inflation" was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- An article by Steve Gruber titled "Illegal Immigration Helping California Steal Congress" was posted at newsmax.com on Oct. 3, 2018.

Comments about weapons

■ An article by Alex Gangitano titled "They're Protecting Senators During Kavanaugh Chaos" was posted at rollcall.com on Oct. 3, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

■ An article by Emily Ward titled "[Prosecutor] Rachel Mitchell Blows Holes in Christine Blasey Ford's Allegations" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 3, 2018.

■ An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled "[Senator Orrin] Hatch Goes Point-By-Point: 'No Corroborating Evidence to Dr. Ford's Claim' " was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

■ An article by Leah Barkoukis titled "In Open Letter, Rand Paul's Wife Calls Out Cory Booker for Encouraging Harassment of Lawmakers" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

■ An article titled "Anonymous New York Times Author Proves the Deep State is Real and Dangerous" was posted at dailysignal.com on Sept. 17, 2018.

■ An article by Jason Chaffetz titled "The Deep State is Real—I've Seen It Up Close and It's Far Worse Than You Can Imagine" was posted at foxnews.com on Sept. 18, 2018.

■ An article titled "Schumer on ABC's the View: 'I Believe Professor Ford' [Before Evidence was Presented]" was posted at senate.gov on Sept. 17, 2018.

■ An article by Ian Schwartz titled "Sen. Kamala Harris: I Believe Kavanaugh Accuser [Before Evidence was Presented], 'She Has Nothing to Gain' " was posted at realclearpolitics.com on Sept. 19, 2018.

■ An article by Steve Byas titled "Senator Hirono Tells Men [Before Evidence was Presented] to Shut Up; Ford Should Be Believed" was posted at the-newamerican.com on Sept. 19, 2018.

■ An article by Scott Whitlock titled "Despite No Evidence, Joy Behar says Brett Kavanaugh Is 'Probably Guilty' " was posted at lifenews.com on Sept. 19, 2018.

■ An article by Joshua Miller titled " 'I Believe Professor Ford,' [Charley] Baker [Republican Governor of Massachusetts] Says" was posted at boston-globe.com on Sept. 27, 2018.

■ An article by Morgan Chalfant and Melanie Zanona titled "Scores of Kavanaugh Protesters Arrested After Descending on Senate Building" was posted at thehill.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

■ An article by Craig Bannister titled "Planned Parenthood Threatens Senators Who Vote to Confirm Kavanaugh: 'We're Coming for You' " was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

■ An article by Lachian Markay, Asawin Suebsaeng, Gideon Resnick and Sam Stein titled "Democrats Fear the Party's Kavanaugh Obsession Could Backfire" was posted at thedailybeast.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

■ An article by Avery Anapol titled “National Council of Churches [Representing 40 Million People From 100,000 Local Congregations and From 38 Denominations] Calls for Kavanaugh’s Nomination to Be Withdrawn” was posted at thehill.com on Oct. 3, 2018.

■ An article by James Cook titled “Beto O’Rourke: Democrats Dazzled by Rising Star in Texas” was posted at bbc.com on Oct. 2, 2018.

■ An article by Henry J. Gomez titled “Scott Walker Keeps Warning Republicans About the Blue Wave; Now It Might Take Him Out” was posted at buzfeednews.com on Oct. 3, 2018.

News about the media

■ An article by Kristine Marsh titled “The View’s Hosts: ‘Everybody’ Believes Kavanaugh Assaulted Ford Because Women ‘Never’ Lie About Being Raped” was posted at lifenews.com on Oct. 3, 2018.

■ An article by Melanie Arter titled “Grassley Blasts Media Bias in Kavanaugh Coverage” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

General interest

■ An article titled “Toys R Us Launches Plan to Take Back the \$20B Toy Market From Amazon, Others” was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 4, 2018.

■ An article by Gabrielle Canon titled “Whole Foods vs. Vegans: Berkeley Store Gets Restraining Order Against [Animal-Rights] Activists” was posted at theguardian.com on Oct. 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.”