

Eye on the World

Oct. 13, 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. 13, 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 Michael Bastasch titled “A \$240 Per Gallon Tax to Fight Global Warming? New UN Report Suggests Carbon Pricing” was posted at daily-caller.com on Oct. 8, 2018. Following is the article.

A United Nations special climate report suggests a tax on carbon dioxide emissions would need to be as high as \$27,000 per ton at the end of the century to effectively limit global warming.

For Americans, that’s the same as a \$240 per gallon tax on gasoline in the year 2100, should such a recommendation be adopted. In 2030, the report says a carbon tax would need to be as high as \$5,500—that’s equivalent to a \$49 per gallon gas tax.

If you think that’s an unlikely scenario, you’re probably not wrong. However, it’s what the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s report, released Sunday night, sees as a policy option for reducing emissions enough to keep projected warming below 1.5 degrees Celsius.

The IPCC’s report is meant to galvanize political support for doubling down on the Paris climate accord ahead of a U.N. climate summit scheduled for December. The report calls for societal changes that are “unprecedented in

terms of scale” in order to limit future global warming to below 1.5 degrees Celsius, the stretch goal of the Paris accord.

However, the costs of meeting that goal are high based on the IPCC’s own figures.

In order to effectively keep future warming below 1.5 degrees Celsius, the IPCC says carbon taxes would need to be in the following ranges.

- From \$135 to \$5,500 per ton in 2030.
- From \$245 to \$13,000 per ton in 2050.
- From \$420 to \$17,000 per ton in 2070.
- From \$690 to \$27,000 per ton in 2100.

To meet the goals of the Paris accord, which seeks to limit future warming to below 2 degrees Celsius, the IPCC says carbon taxes would have range between \$10 and \$200 in 2030 and \$160 and \$2,125 in 2100.

That’s equivalent to a gas tax as high as \$1.70 per gallon in 2030 to nearly \$19 per gallon at the end of the century. That’s less onerous than limiting warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius, but still no walk in the park.

California and many European countries have policies to price carbon dioxide emissions and mandate green energy, including cap-and-trade systems and carbon taxes. But carbon prices under those systems are nowhere near where the IPCC says they need to be.

The IPCC said the “price of carbon would need to increase significantly when a higher level of stringency is pursued.” However, the group’s report tacitly acknowledges the unlikelihood that governments will enact astronomical taxes on energy.

“While the price of carbon is central to prompt mitigation pathways compatible with 1.5 [degree Celsius]-consistent pathways, a complementary mix of stringent policies is required,” reads the IPCC’s report.

In the U.S., Republican lawmakers overwhelmingly passed a resolution opposed to carbon taxes in July. Democrats called for a price on carbon dioxide in their 2016 party platform, but they haven’t made much effort on that front since the failure of cap-and-trade legislation in 2010.

Republican Rep. Carlos Curbelo of Florida introduced carbon tax legislation shortly after all but five of his GOP colleagues in the House voted to oppose such a bill. Curbelo’s bill would tax carbon dioxide at \$23 a ton—nowhere near what the IPCC calls for.

However, the IPCC suggested a lower carbon tax could be used in conjunction with command and control policies, like regulations and bans on coal plants, could achieve “generate a 1.5° C pathway for the U.S. electric sector.”

But that point only serves to undermine Curbelo's bill, which would put a moratorium on some environmental regulations and possibly eliminate some if emissions goals are reached.

The IPCC noted the "literature indicates that the pricing of emissions is relevant but needs to be complemented with other policies to drive the required changes in line with 1.5° C—consistent cost-effective pathways."



A video and an article by Arjun Wells titled "EMF Frequencies Used for Crowd Control Weapons Form the Foundation of 5G Network" were posted at collective-evolution.com on Sept. 26, 2018. Following is the article.

The Facts: New research show how the frequencies utilized in crowd control weapons, one that physically impact our biology, form the basis of the new 5G network that's been rolling out.

Reflect On: With more than 2000 peer-reviewed studies and thousands of scientists raising multiple cause for concern, why has the industry been allowed to implement this technology without the appropriate health safety testing?

Multiple countries around the world have banned WiFi, and the building of cell phone towers near primary schools and nurseries, among many other places due to the evidence that shows they are not safe and can implicate the health of young children, and adults, in multiple ways.

With all of the science that's emerged over the years, it seems very unethical for the corporations who control this market to continue to manufacture and promote these services in such a manner. Furthermore, government agencies have failed to address what's happening, despite the fact that hundreds of scientists and thousands of peer-reviewed papers have been calling for it for years.

5G is the new technology currently being implemented in a lot of areas, and research has shown that the same frequencies used by the Department of Defense in crowd control weapons, make the foundation of the latest network known as 5G.

This kind of technology, which is in many of our homes, actually interacts with human skin and eyes. The shocking finding was made public via Israeli research studies that were presented at an international conference on the subject last year. Below you can find a lecture from Dr. Ben-Ishai of the Department of Physics at Hebrew University. He goes through how human sweat ducts act like a number of helical antennas when exposed to these wavelengths that are put out by the devices that employ 5G technology.

These technologies are already rolling out, despite the fact that scientists have been cautioning against it, more research on human health effects should have been done before their approval, but it wasn't.

Dr. Devra Lee Davis, founding director of the board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology of the U.S. National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, founding director of the Center for Environmental Oncology, University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute, and President of the Environmental Health Trust stated:

■ “If you are one of the millions who seek faster downloads of movies, games and virtual pornography, a solution is at hand, that is, if you do not mind volunteering your living body in a giant uncontrolled experiment on the human population. At this moment, residents of the Washington, DC region—like those of 100 Chinese cities—are about to be living within a vast experimental Millimeter wave network to which they have not consented—all courtesy of American taxpayers.”

Davis proposed that the Trump Administration could provide funds for research and training by implementing a 2 cents per month fee on all wireless devices, their manufacturers and network providers “training and research in bioelectromagnetics including the evaluation of new technologies is essential before universal deployment.”

U.S., Russian, and Chinese defense agencies have been active in developing weapons that rely on the capability of this electromagnetic technology to create burning sensations on the skin, for crowd control. The waves are Millimetre waves, also used by the U.S. Army in crowd dispersal guns called Active Denial Systems.

What Can You Do?

Well, you could not use 5G technology, you could get a wired connection for your internet, which would be faster than wireless. You could unplug the devices that beam out these electromagnetic waves at night.

You could be healthy and have a good lifestyle, keeping your immune system in tip top shape, and utilize what’s becoming known with regards to how powerful consciousness is, the mind-body connection.

Obviously, panic and worry isn’t the answer, it never is.



A video and an article by Terrence Newton titled “5G Network Uses Same EMF Waves As Pentagon Crowd Control System” were posted at naturalblaze.com on Oct. 7, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

The global rollout of 5G is well underway, and we soon may see new small cell towers near all schools, on every residential street, dispersed throughout the natural environment, and pretty much everywhere. But the safety of this technology is in serious question, and there is a raging battle to stop the taxpayer funded implementation of 5G.

The new cell network uses high-band radio frequency millimeter waves to deliver high bandwidth data to any device within line of sight.

■ **Entrust.org:** Today's cellular and Wi-Fi networks rely on microwaves—a type of electromagnetic radiation utilizing frequencies up to 6 gigahertz (GHz) in order to wirelessly transmit voice or data. However, 5G applications will require unlocking of new spectrum bands in higher frequency ranges above 6 GHz to 100 GHz and beyond, utilizing submillimeter and millimeter waves—to allow ultra-high rates of data to be transmitted in the same amount of time as compared with previous deployments of microwave radiation.

■ **Engadget.com:** One of the ways 5G will enable this is by tapping into new, unused bands at the top of the radio spectrum. These high bands are known as millimeter waves (mmwaves), and have been recently been opened up by regulators for licensing. They've largely been untouched by the public, since the equipment required to use them effectively has typically been expensive and inaccessible.

Among the many potential problems with exposure to 5G radio waves are issues with the skin, which is interesting when you consider that this technology is already being used in the military for crowd control purposes.

■ **Collective-evolution.com:** This kind of technology, which is in many of our homes, actually interacts with human skin and eyes. The shocking finding was made public via Israeli research studies that were presented at an international conference on the subject last year.

The U.S. military developed a non-lethal crowd control weapon system called the Active Denial System (ADS). It uses radio frequency millimeter waves in the 95GHz range to penetrate the top 1/64 of an inch layer of skin on the targeted individual, instantly producing an intolerable heating sensation that causes them to flee.

This technology is becoming ubiquitous in top world militaries, demonstrating how genuinely effective this radio frequency energy can be at causing harm to humans and anything else.

■ **Collective-evolution.com:** U.S., Russian, and Chinese defense agencies have been active in developing weapons that rely on the capability of this electromagnetic technology to create burning sensations on the skin, for crowd control. The waves are Millimetre waves, also used by the U.S. Army in crowd dispersal guns called Active Denial Systems.

The fight over 5G is heating up at the community level, and awareness of this important issue is spreading fast. Now is the time to speak out against it.



"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 Patrick Goodenough titled “Human Rights Council Elections Set to Deliver Another Record-High Number of Rights-Abusing Members” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 9, 2018.
 - An article by Katie Pavlich titled “Israel Especially Grateful for Nikki Haley’s Service at the UN: We Will Miss Her” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 10, 2018.
 - An article by Isabel Debre titled “US Student Detained in Israel Over Alleged Boycott Support” was posted at yahoo.com on Oct. 9, 2018.
 - An article by Chris Reeves titled “Italy Arrests World-Renowned Sanctuary City Mayor for Aiding Illegal Migrants” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 4, 2018.
 - A Reuters article by Vladimir Soldarkin and Sanjeev Miglani titled “India Quietly Seals Missile Deal With Russia Despite U.S. Warning” was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 5, 2018.
 - An article by Corinne Weaver titled “Google Will Work With China, But Not the Pentagon” was posted at newsbusters.org on Oct. 9, 2018.
 - An article by Glen Carey and Sarah Algethami titled “Saudi Critic’s Disappearance Deepens Major Middle East Rifts” was posted at bloomberg.com on Oct. 11, 2018.
 - An article by Shane Harris titled “[Saudi] Crown Prince Sought to Lure [Journalist] Khashoggi Back to Saudi Arabia and Detain Him, U.S. Intercepts Show” was posted at washingtonpost.com on Oct. 10, 2018.



A Reuters article titled “Florida Panhandle Pummeled by Record-Breaking Hurricane Michael” was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 11, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Hurricane Michael, the fiercest storm to hit Florida in 80 years and the third-most powerful ever to strike the U.S. mainland, battered the state’s Gulf coast with roof-shredding winds, raging surf and torrential rains before turning its diminishing fury on Georgia.

Michael, whose rapid intensification as it churned north over the Gulf of Mexico caught many by surprise, made landfall on Wednesday afternoon near Mexico Beach, about 20 miles (32 km) southeast of Panama City in Florida’s Panhandle region, with top sustained winds reaching 155 miles per hour (249 kph).

The storm came ashore as a Category 4 hurricane on the five-step Saffir-Simpson wind scale, the biggest storm on record to strike the Florida Panhandle. Its sustained winds were just 2 mph (3.2 kph) shy of an extremely rare Category 5.

The storm's intensity waned steadily as it pushed inland and curled north-easterly into Georgia after dark. It was downgraded to a Category 1 storm, with top sustained winds diminishing to 75 miles per hour (120 kph), about nine hours after it made landfall.

The National Hurricane Center said Michael would pass through the Carolinas as a tropical storm on Thursday, dumping as much as 8 inches of rain in some areas. Up to a foot (30 cm) of rain was forecast in Florida.

Numerous buildings in Panama City were demolished, partially collapsed or without roofs amid deserted streets littered with debris, twisted, fallen tree trunks and dangling wires.

Without power, the city was plunged into darkness at nightfall and its flooded streets were mostly silent and devoid of people or traffic.

By Wednesday night, more than 403,000 homes and businesses were without electricity in Florida, Georgia and Alabama, utility companies said.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) said on Tuesday an estimated 500,000 Florida residents had been ordered or urged to seek higher ground before the storm in 20 counties spanning a 200-mile (320-km) stretch of shoreline.

But Brad Kieserman of the American Red Cross said on Wednesday as many as 320,000 people on Florida's Gulf Coast had disregarded evacuation notices.

An estimated 6,000 evacuees took cover in emergency shelters, most of them in Florida, and that number was expected to swell to 20,000 across five states by week's end, Kieserman said.

- With a low barometric pressure recorded at 919 millibars, the measure of a hurricane's force, Michael ranked as the third-strongest storm on record to make landfall in the continental United States.
- Only Hurricane Camille on the Mississippi Gulf Coast in 1969 and the so-called Labor Day hurricane of 1935 in the Florida Keys were more intense.



An article by Allen West titled "We Are Now Fully Embroiled in an Uncivil Ideological Civil War" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 8, 2018. Following is the article.

Let me start by cautioning constitutional conservatives on being giddy, gloating, and excessively celebrating over the confirmation of Justice Brett Kavanaugh.

College football head coach emeritus Lou Holtz once admonished his players that when they end up in the end zone and score a touchdown, act like you have been there before.

Yes, a good man survived, withstood, the most vile, vicious, and vitriolic of assaults and character assassination from the progressive, socialist left. Already the left has evidenced that they are not done. They now want to investigate and impeach Justice Brett Kavanaugh. The question to be asked: why?

Once upon a time, we taught civics in our schools, and our children were raised to understand the three branches of government: legislative, executive, and judicial.

We taught the rule of law, our Constitution, and its enumerated powers given to each respective branch of government.

We instructed future generations on how these branches were coequal and that there were checks and balances in place to prevent any certain branch from accumulating power. As a matter of fact, the branch of government that has the most enumerated powers according to our Constitution is the legislative branch. That is because in our constitutional republic, we have a representative democracy.

However, the Kavanaugh episode has opened our eyes to a very disconcerting development in America, the rise of a mobocracy.

And for those who are observant, and not fearful of saying what needs to be said, we have seen this coming for some time. It has become increasingly apparent ever since Donald Trump won the presidency.

The conflagration in America is no longer about political party, it is about the political philosophy, ideology. It is, for the progressive, socialist left, not about the three branches of government, it is about their three branches of rule—the media, academia, and the courts.

During this Kavanaugh episode, we saw the clear one-sided partisan position of the liberal, progressive media.

I am quite sure if the Media Research Center was to do a positive/negative analysis of how the mainstream media covered the Kavanaugh nomination and hearings, along with the allegations and accusations of sexual misconduct it would be no surprise.

■ The left in America must have this very important branch to rule.

As it was once said by an infamous propagandist, if you repeat a lie often enough, it will eventually become the truth. To rule, the progressive, socialist left must own the narrative. They must have the capability—and the 24/7 news cycle gives them this—to promulgate and proliferate not objective analysis, but their ideological message and talking points.

And it is no coincidence that the media message oft-times is aligned with the message of the progressive socialist elected officials. The media, for the leftists, is not just a fourth estate, it is a very vital branch of their rule.

Pay attention, as you will see the talking points of the Democratic [Socialist] Party being parroted by the leftist media. Namely, the objective is to investigate and impeach Judge Brett Kavanaugh, and that is why the media will advocate political control of the Mobocrat party.

■ The second branch of rule for the progressive socialists is academia.

As previously mentioned, we are not teaching civics. So what is it that we are teaching? Ahh, that is the seminal question, and the answer is that our children are not being taught. They are being indoctrinated.

Consider the Georgetown University professor who was censored by Twitter for her rant about Judge Kavanaugh being a serial rapist and suggesting that the entitled white men supporting Kavanaugh deserve miserable deaths.

If we do not have the rule of law and due process being taught in our halls of academia, what are we producing on our college and university campuses, our High Schools?

There were reports that college professors were giving credits to students going out to protest the Kavanaugh nomination.

Should those students have been in class and learning about the three branches of government, the enumerated power of the executive branch to nominate a SCOTUS justice?

Should those students not have been in class for earning their degree in their respective majors . . . not to be indoctrinated into ideological foot soldiers for the mob?

Maybe, post-Kavanaugh confirmation, there should be open forums on these campuses to have intellectual discourse, debate, to better educate and enlighten these students on the Supreme Court nomination process and due process.

Chances are, that will not happen, since you will only see more mob rule on these campuses and the most abhorrent behavior facing anyone that does not submit and subjugate to the ideological agenda of the progressive, socialist left.

Let's be honest, the left is not about to cede over any opportunity for constitutional conservatives to impact, or influence, simply to have a voice in their second branch of rule.

■ Lastly, the most important branch of rule for the progressive, socialist left is our courts.

And this is the reason why the left has gone into a catastrophic, apoplectic meltdown over President Donald Trump's second SCOTUS selection.

The progressive, socialist left does not mind losing the legislative and executive branch. They will figure out a way, legal or not, to obtain power in those two branches, but they cannot stomach losing the ability to mandate their ideological agenda via judicial activism.

And, since we are not teaching future generations that courts do not make laws—they are supposed to interpret laws—we have come to this place in America.

What has sent the left in America over the edge is that they now realize their three branches of rule is failing. The American people have stood up to them, their threats, intimidations, coercion, and violence, and the left no longer controls any of the three branches of government, including the one that is sacrosanct for them: the Supreme Court.

Ladies and gents, we are now fully embroiled in an uncivil ideological civil war.

As I previously wrote in a commentary, it comes down to the rule of law versus the rule of the mob. It comes down to whether or not we have three branches of governance in this republic. Or do we have three branches of rule that influences and uses the culture to achieve its ends—by any means necessary.

Always remember, after you score a touchdown, you kick the ball back to the opposing team.

In the military, after a successful attack and achieving your objective, you must prepare for a counterattack.

America, the choice is simple, we can choose to have governance that is based upon the fundamentals of this constitutional republic, or we can choose to be ruled based upon the whims of the mob.



An article by Ann Coulter titled “GOP Needs Update to Dems’ UFC Cage Match Rules” was posted at anncoulter.com on Oct. 10, 2018. Following is the article.

It’s time to update the GOP’s Marquess of Queensbury Rules.

If you saw Ruth Bader Ginsburg at Brett Kavanaugh’s swearing-in ceremony, you know that we may need to fill her seat in about 4 1/2 minutes. Naturally, I hope she lives to be 300—although parenthetically, it seems she already has.

The confirmation hearings for Kavanaugh made Robert Bork’s hearings look like a day at the beach. At least liberals only lied about Bork’s judicial philosophy. They didn’t accuse him of being Ted Bundy. The next nomination hearing will make Kavanaugh’s look like an ice cream social.

Just because it didn’t work this time doesn’t mean Republicans’ work is done. They have to make sure this never happens again.

Democrats are already pushing the idea that Kavanaugh’s confirmation was somehow illegitimate because of the shoddy FBI investigation. Liberals’ beef is that the FBI neglected to interview Kavanaugh’s former Yale classmates, who dispute his characterization of precisely how big a drinker he was in college.

I wouldn't say he was a belligerent drunk, but more of an obstreperous drunk. No, no! I would say he was a mild drunk with periods of obstreperousness. This is not the stuff of perjury prosecutions.

Of course, if true, it's HUGE. Kavanaugh's demeanor when drunk in college sounds nearly as awful as liberals' behavior when sober—obnoxious, aggressive and argumentative. I refer you to the recent antics we've seen on Capitol Hill, as well as anywhere Ted Cruz stops in for a bite.

Since none of the FBI's latest report on Kavanaugh has leaked, the one thing we can be sure of is that the agents turned up nothing unfavorable on him. Except for a colonoscopy, I think we're done with Kavanaugh.

It's the accusers who have skirted investigation. Even Republicans have moved on. He's on the court, so who cares if Kavanaugh was falsely accused of "rape" in front of his little girls?

That's what everyone thought when the falsely accused Duke lacrosse players were proved innocent and the D.A. was disbarred. Why go after the accuser? Hasn't she suffered enough?

Crystal Mangum was not prosecuted for falsely charging she was gang-raped. And see? No harm, no foul! She went on to live a happy and productive—oh, wait! The next time we heard about Mangum was when she stabbed her boyfriend to death.

On reflection, it certainly seems possible that Kavanaugh accuser Julie Swetnick was not being completely, 100 percent honest in her sworn statements about repeatedly attending high school parties in the 1980s, when she was a college student, where underage girls were drugged and gang-raped.

Deborah Ramirez's three-decade-old, unsubstantiated, recovered memory of a drunken Kavanaugh exposing himself as a college freshman is the sort of charge that makes feminists laugh!

(I know that from reading Gloria Steinem's explanation in *The New York Times* that Gov. Bill Clinton summoning a female underling to his hotel room, dropping his pants and . . . did not rise to the level of sexual harassment. He took "no" for an answer!)

Perhaps Republicans could get Steinem to explain under oath why it's acceptable for a sitting governor to do what is disqualifying for a drunk college freshman to do.

While no one would question the word of a living saint like Christine Blasey Ford, some parts of her testimony demand the clarity that can be obtained only in a formal legal proceeding—such as her trauma-induced need for two front doors (when the second front door seems clearly attached to a rental apartment); her fear of flying (but only when it will delay a confirmation

hearing); and her claim that she never helped anyone prepare for a polygraph (contradicted by her ex-live-in boyfriend); among other things.

Pretending they are the wronged ones, liberals keep yipping about Barack Obama's Supreme Court nominee Merrick Garland. They believe any attack on Kavanaugh was justified after the dirty trick pulled by Republicans on Garland.

The Republicans' refusal to hold hearings on Garland has been called an "unprecedented obstruction" (MSNBC's Chris Hayes), a "violation of traditions in norms" (Hayes again), an "insult and injury" (Sen. Cory Booker) and "remarkable and unprecedented" (MSNBC's Rachel Maddow). The GOP's treatment of Garland showed their "hypocrisy on Brett Kavanaugh" (MSNBC's Ari Melber).

The truth is apparently a big secret, inasmuch as even Republicans aren't saying it. You'll read it here for the first time.

The Republicans' wily, underhanded, double-dealing trick with Garland was this: Win a majority of seats in the U.S. Senate! I know liberals won't read the Constitution, but can they do math? Garland didn't have the votes.

Republicans had 54 seats and, in 2016, Senate rules still required 60 votes for Supreme Court appointments. Democrats would have needed 14 Republican senators to switch sides to confirm a Democratic president's nominee.

There was no way that was happening. A Republican Senate simply wasn't going to give "consent" to any Democratic nominee eight months before a presidential election—even an election that everyone thought Hillary was going to win. The Constitution says "advice and consent," not "advice and rubber-stamp."

There was nothing "unprecedented" about a Republican Senate rejecting a Democratic nominee—other than the fact that Republicans were the ones doing it. Democrats do it all the time.

That's how we got Justice Anthony Kennedy—whom Kavanaugh replaced: A Democratic Senate rejected Reagan nominee Robert Bork. That's also how we got Harry Blackmun, author of the ridiculously lawless *Roe v. Wade*: A Democratic Senate rejected Richard Nixon's previous nominees Clement Haynsworth and G. Harrold Carswell.

It would have been a waste of time and only humiliated Garland to hold hearings. At least Republicans didn't accuse him of gang rape.



An article by Emily Ward titled "Shapiro: The Left Wants to 'Restrict Freedom of Speech' by Labeling It 'Hate Speech' " was posted at [cnsnews.com](https://www.cnsnews.com) on Oct. 8, 2018. Following is the article.

Conservative commentator and Editor-in-Chief of *The Daily Wire* Ben Shapiro said that the Left wants to "restrict freedom of speech" on college campuses by labeling it 'hate speech,' in an appearance at the University of Southern California (USC) Thursday night.

"The easiest way to restrict freedom of speech on campus is by claiming that some sort of hate speech has been used, right? I am a purveyor of hate speech. This is what I've been told by the protesters outside," Shapiro said at the event, which was hosted by the USC chapter of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF).

Shapiro noted that 'hate speech' does not appear in the U.S. Constitution, and argued that "the Left" uses the term to cover "stuff they disagree with."

"Let's be clear: there is no constitutional category called 'hate speech,'" Shapiro said. "The reason there is no constitutional category called hate speech is because that which many of us call 'reasonable speech' the Left says is hate speech. They say that a lot of stuff they disagree with is just hate speech."

Shapiro said that, while there are some words that are "fairly objectively hateful," the government should not be able to ban even those words. He pointed out that the nation's Founders did not intend for the government to be able to restrict speech.

"I think that there is certain speech that is fairly objectively hateful. People who use the n-word, right, I think that's objectively hateful. Does that mean it gets to be banned? Even there, I say, 'No,' because the fact is that I don't want the government deciding what speech can and cannot be said—and the constitutional founders agreed with this," Shapiro said.

"They also did not want the government deciding what can and cannot be said, even stuff that I find absolutely vile."

Shapiro took issue with the term "microaggression," arguing that it is "idiotic."

"They say that I'm somehow micro-aggressing somebody... The idea is that I've performed some sort of minor aggression on you, by speaking, and, therefore, you get to act with macro-aggression against me," Shapiro said.

"Why don't you just say that you don't like what I'm saying, and you're a little offended, and then I'll say I don't care, and then we can go about our daily business?" he added.

He also took issue with attempts to "redefine" speech as violence and even use it to incite violence.

"The dirty little secret is that identity politics advocates know that I'm not advocating violence, have never advocated violence and would not advocate violence. So instead what they do, is they just redefine my speech as violence."

Shapiro made a face and rolled his eyes, then borrowed the words of former Republican California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger.

"In the words of our former governor, 'Stop whining.'"

"Once you start labeling speech violence, it's pretty easy to justify to yourself, 'Hey, I can use violence in response to speech,'" Shapiro said.

Despite efforts by some USC students to disrupt Shapiro's speech at USC, the event took place as planned. Shapiro thanked the administration of USC for "doing the right thing" and allowing him to speak at the event.

"I keep thanking USC for doing the right thing, because I think that when campuses do the right thing they ought to be praised. So, 'Thank you' to USC for doing the right thing," Shapiro said.



An article by Ben Shapiro titled "What Do We Have in Common?" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 10, 2018. Following is the article.

America stands at a precipice.

It's a moral precipice of our own making: We're not facing any external existential threat, or any serious economic crisis. Nonetheless, we're at each other's throats in a shocking and unique way.

At least in the 1960s, serious issues divided us: the national attempt to grapple with legally enshrined racism, the sexual revolution, the Vietnam War. We have no such excuse now.

Yet to view the sheer chaos surrounding the confirmation of Justice Brett Kavanaugh is to realize that we may simply have nothing in common anymore, other than our sheer blind luck at having been born into the most prosperous, free, productive country in world history.

But a nation is more than a country. A nation is a people united by history, ideals, culture, institutions. But we've been steadily chipping away at each element of that nationhood.

■ Our history now divides us.

This week, retired astronaut Scott Kelly was forced to apologize on Twitter for the grave sin of quoting Winston Churchill; he tweeted, "I will go and educate myself further on his atrocities, racist views which I do not support."

Meanwhile, across America, left-leaning city councils celebrated Indigenous Peoples Day in place of Columbus Day, signaling their belief that Christopher Columbus' discovery of the New World was a tragedy rather than a cause for celebration.

We Americans are in the midst of a serious division regarding our own character.

Was America and the West founded on fundamentally good and eternal principles, principles we've sometimes failed to live up to, of course, but principles worth fighting for?

Or is America and the West the font of evil, the source of suffering, and is all our prosperity merely the fruit of the poisonous tree?

■ Our ideals divide us, too.

On the one hand are “red state” Americans, steeped in traditional Judeo-Christian principles and mores—Americans who believe that our rights are God-given, and that liberty must be balanced by traditional moral virtue.

On the other hand are “blue state” Americans, steeped in egalitarian principles and mores—Americans who believe that rights spring from government, and that inequality is a more pressing concern than individual liberty, and that systems of traditional virtue merely mask hierarchical power structures.

Without a shared history or shared ideals, culture and institutions crumble. Our culture has fragmented.

Can we celebrate July Fourth and stand for the national anthem together, or even watch a football game without arguing about our divisions?

Can we attend a movie together without feeling sandbagged by the questions that divide us outside the theater?

We certainly no longer attend church or even go bowling together.

And as for institutions, Democrats have now discussed packing the Supreme Court, destroying the Senate and ending the Electoral College thanks to their recent spate of political defeats.

All of that follows hard on former President Barack Obama simply arrogating power to himself when he couldn’t get Congress to go along with him. Our institutions won’t restrain us if we decide to tear ourselves apart.

So, what can hold us together

We can start with gratitude, gratitude for this unique moment in human history, for our unique country, for our unique ideals, for our unique institutions. If we’re ungrateful, spite will win the day. And that means that we could be setting the charges for a spectacular implosion.



An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled “The Argument Chuck Schumer Doesn’t Have the Courage to Make” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 10, 2018. Following is the article.

Someone awakening from a 50-year coma around the time that Justice Anthony Kennedy announced his retirement from the U.S. Supreme Court might have mistakenly come to the conclusion—had he or she listened to the admonitory speeches of Senate Democratic Leader Chuck Schumer—that efforts were being launched across the United States to legally require women to conceive, or not conceive, children.

Schumer repeatedly warned of an imminent attack on what he called the “reproductive rights” of women.

“We recently received news that Justice Anthony Kennedy will be retiring, leaving a vacancy on the nation’s highest court,” Schumer said on the Senate floor on June 27, the day Kennedy announced his retirement.

“This is the most important Supreme Court vacancy for this country in at least a generation,” Schumer said. “Nothing less than the fate of our health care system, reproductive rights for women and countless other protections for middle-class Americans are at stake.”

After President Donald Trump nominated Judge Brett Kavanaugh to replace Kennedy, Schumer returned to the floor to make the point again.

“In selecting Judge Kavanaugh,” Schumer said, “President Trump did exactly what he said he would do on the campaign trail: nominate someone who will overturn women’s reproductive rights and strike down health care protections for millions of Americans, including those with preexisting conditions.”

“Judge Kavanaugh got the nomination not because he will be an impartial judge on behalf of all Americans,” Schumer said, “but because he passed President Trump’s litmus tests: repeal women’s freedom for their reproductive rights and repeal America’s health care, including protection for preexisting conditions.”

When Kavanaugh’s nomination finally came up for a vote last week, Democratic Sen. Robert Menendez of New Jersey echoed Schumer’s rhetoric in explaining why he would vote no.

Menendez had to stop the attack on “reproductive rights.”

“My daughter has grown up never knowing what it was to live in a country where women were denied reproductive rights,” Menendez said. “Now I fear my granddaughter may grow up never knowing what it was like to live in a country where women had reproductive rights.”

But is it plausible that Justice Kavanaugh may vote on the Supreme Court to advance some sort of legal framework that denies women the right to have as many children as they wish—or forces them to conceive children against their will?

Of course not.

Americans who have not been in a coma for the last 50 years know that when politicians like Chuck Schumer or Robert Menendez use the term “reproductive rights,” they are not talking about the right to reproduce.

They are talking about a claimed “right” to kill an unborn child.

But because politicians like Schumer and Menendez apparently do not believe they can win an unambiguous debate on whether there is, in fact, a “right” to kill an unborn child, they use the term “reproductive rights” as a euphemistic substitute.

This is the classic fallacy of mistaking the question, which can always be rebutted by pointing to the real question—and forcing deniers to confront it.

The state of Iowa is doing precisely this in defending the right of life.

Earlier this year, Iowa Gov. Kim Reynolds signed the “heartbeat bill,” which prohibits physicians in that state from aborting an unborn child if the child has detectable heartbeat.

“I believe that all innocent life is precious and sacred, and as governor, I pledged to do everything in my power to protect it,” Reynolds said when she signed the law.

“I understand that not everyone will agree with this decision,” she said. “But if death is determined when a heart stops beating, then doesn’t a beating heart indicate life? For me, it is immoral to stop an innocent beating heart.”

“I understand and anticipate that this will likely be challenged in court, and that courts may even put a hold on the law until it reaches the Supreme Court,” she said. “However, this is bigger than just a law. This is about life. I am not going to back down from who I am or what I believe in.”

Planned Parenthood of the Heartland sued to stop this Iowa law—stating in its complaint that detectable “fetal cardiac tones” (n.b. a heartbeat) occur “as early as six weeks” into pregnancy. An Iowa court issued an injunction to delay the law’s enforcement while the case is under consideration.

In the federal Congress, Republican Rep. Steve King of Iowa has introduced The Heartbeat Protection Act. It would prohibit physicians nationwide from aborting an unborn child with a detectable heartbeat.

King’s bill has 173 co-sponsors.

The Republican-controlled House of Representatives should pass this bill and send it to the Republican-controlled Senate. If Chuck Schumer wants to block it with a filibuster, let him try.

Make him stand on the Senate floor day after day—as he did in the Kavanaugh fight—and defend not “reproductive rights” but killing a baby with a beating heart.

Schumer may have the heart to do that, but does he have the guts?



An article by Rebecca Hagelin titled “What the Kavanaugh Protests and Kermit Gosnell Have in Common” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 10, 2018. Following is the article.

The darkness of evil infiltrated the nation’s capital during the Senate confirmation process of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Brett M. Kavanaugh.

You could feel the vitriol in the shrills of protesters interrupting the hearings and the confirmation vote. Senators were confronted by satanic threats so real that many still require police escorts. Justice Kavanaugh and his lovely wife and young daughters continue to be berated by the evil.

For those who have been working to rescue babies and their mothers from the horrific evil of abortion, the piercing screams and gnashing of teeth are familiar sounds. We hear them often when we fight for the lives of the innocent.

But for those who have not been in the battle, who have shrugged their shoulders at abortion, who unthinkingly repeat the mantra that abortion is just a “woman’s health issue,” the oppressive nature of the protests was shocking, even confusing.

Launched under the false guise of sexual assault, the attack against Justice Kavanaugh was actually an all-out war by the left to continue the practice of sacrificing human children on the altar of convenience.

It’s time for America to understand what abortion really is. There will be no healing for our nation until we first know the evil that has infected us, and then take every measure to eradicate it. Which is why I believe this Friday’s release of the movie “Gosnell: The Trial of America’s Biggest Serial Killer” is divinely appointed.

This remarkable crime/courtroom drama scrupulously follows the grand jury and court testimony of what happened in abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell’s Philadelphia “clinic.”

The following passage from the grand jury report provides a taste of the repugnant evil of abortions that occur daily in America. Though the details vary from “clinic” to “clinic,” the results of the barbaric acts that take place in every abortuary are the same: dead children:

“This case is about a doctor who killed babies and endangered women. What we mean is that he regularly and illegally delivered live, viable babies in the third trimester of pregnancy—and then murdered these newborns by severing their spinal cords with scissors. The medical practice by which he carried out this business was a filthy fraud in which he overdosed his patients with dangerous drugs, spread venereal disease among them with infected instruments, perforated their wombs and bowels—and, on at least two occasions, caused their deaths. Over the years, many people came to know that something was going on here. But no one put a stop to it.”

Kermit Gosnell is serving three life sentences for murdering babies moments after they were delivered. He got off lightly when you consider that he was also found guilty of involuntary manslaughter of a mother.

Gosnell is perhaps America’s most prolific serial killer—who has been tried and convicted, that is. The reality is that babies’ bodies are routinely ripped apart, their bones crushed, their flesh chemically burned, and their brains sucked out in abortion clinics across America.

This rare glimpse into the evil that most protesters against Justice Kavanaugh seek to propagate reveals the nature of the demonic screams in the Senate gallery, the vile threats against Sen. Susan M. Collins and the continued harassment of Justice Kavanaugh and his family.

The Gosnell movie is a "must see" for any woman considering abortion, for every man urging a woman to "get rid of the problem" and for every lawmaker. It should be shown in all law schools, and its viewing required by every attorney. It should be part of medical school curriculum and the continuing education of physicians.

You must watch the Gosnell movie too.

The media largely ignored this landmark trial, attempting to hide the realities of abortion.

But courageous producers Ann McElhinney and Phelim McAleer, whose views of abortion were changed when they studied Gosnell's "house of horrors," courageously tell the truth so that Americans from all walks of life can confront the unspeakable evil.

The filmmakers created a brilliant work that shows no graphic details or gore, but simply presents the powerful reality of abortion as described by abortion providers and crime investigators in their actual court testimony.

Abortion abuses women and kills babies - and feeds the insatiable appetite of the powers of darkness.

Watch the Gosnell trailer at www.Gosnellmovie.com and go see the movie. In so doing, you will help shine the light of truth and force the darkness to flee.



An article by Jay Lehr titled "Socialism is Evil: The Moral Case Against Marx's Radical Dream" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 9, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

In *Socialism is Evil: The Moral Case Against Marx's Radical Dream* author Justin Haskins tackles an imminent threat to America.

Younger Americans have not experienced up close and personal the true evils of socialism and communism in societies ruled by these ideologies, such as China, Cuba, Russia, and Venezuela.

Millennials think European-style democratic socialism looks reasonable and, in some cases, even idyllic. Hence, they naïvely believe that socialism is superior to capitalism.

In Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.)'s many illogical rants, during which he offers college education, health care, and virtually everything else for "free," he has led many to believe that socialism is the cure for all their problems. Well, it isn't, plain and simple.

Haskins, a widely published writer and the Heartland Institute's executive editor, has undertaken the task of correcting this misguided thinking among young Americans.

Socialism Is Evil is a short, 90-page book that examines the historical failures of socialism; disproves socialists' claims; and, more importantly, details what Americans would experience if progressives were to gain control of government.

In his book, Haskins tells simple stories that illustrate the depravity of socialism. These stories are in first person, allowing you to connect to issues you have not likely considered seriously enough.

He often refers to Karl Marx's *Communist Manifesto*, which codified the socialist thoughts that plague society today. Most would instantly reject these philosophies, such as abolition of property rights and inheritance; centralization of industry, communication, and transportation; and government-controlled education.

One of the most unique issues Haskins examines in *Socialism Is Evil* deals with humanity's innate competitive spirit. Marx and true socialists believe that competitiveness is learned in society.

However, this is clearly not true. It is inbred in human DNA. Children compete on the playground from birth.

Who among us does not want to be better than someone at something? But socialism will always "reward" everyone equally, regardless of effort, which is the downfall of every factory, family, or team.

In Aldous Huxley's brilliant novel *Brave New World*, socialism is indeed achieved. It just requires the daily ingestion of a little pill that eliminates individual thought. How else, Haskins asks, could people voluntarily decide to work in a sewage plant rather than an office tower or live in a desert rather than an oasis?

Every reader will wonder how Haskins defines evil. Obviously, in different parts of the world and in different religions, many things could be considered "evil."

However, Haskins explains it simply and directly in a manner all likely would agree with. Haskins starts with the Merriam-Webster definition: "morally reprehensible." He then says we would all agree that it is immoral to threaten peaceful people into activities they are morally opposed to, and he then offers a number of simple religious laws that would be overrun in a socialist society.

Americans are engaged in a national discussion of issues such as free college and universal health care. We hear about the systems in place in other countries, and we witnessed the disaster of Obamacare. Haskins walks you through the serious problems that all socialized medicine programs are unable to avoid, let alone solve.

Hopefully, the brevity of this outstanding book will inspire many Millennials who do not understand the true horrors of socialism. “Americans as well as many people around the world, value their personal freedom more than many economic concerns,” Haskins writes.

Although *Socialism Is Evil* is concise, it needs to be read with total concentration to fully comprehend the scope of evil socialism implements on a society.

Haskins concludes with this penetrating statement: “Whatever problems exist in a capitalist society, they pale in comparison to the moral tragedies that must accompany Marx’s socialism, which is why it should be avoided at all costs. To do otherwise would be to perpetuate a great injustice on the free peoples of the world.”

A digital copy of *Socialism Is Evil* is available for free at StoppingSocialism.com.



An article by Walter Williams titled “Real Economics” was posted at jewish-worldreview.com on Oct. 10, 2018. Following is the article.

A widely anticipated textbook, “Universal Economics,” has just been published by Liberty Fund. Its authors are two noted UCLA economists, the late Armen A. Alchian and William R. Allen. Editor Jerry L. Jordan was their student and later became a member of President Ronald Reagan’s Council of Economic Advisers, as well as the president and CEO of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Professor Alchian was probably the greatest microeconomic theorist of the 20th century, while Professor Allen’s genius was in the area of international trade and the history of economic thought. Both were tenacious mentors of mine during my student days at UCLA in the mid-1960s and early ‘70s.

“Universal Economics’ ” 680 pages, not including its glossary and index, reflect a friendly chat I had with Professor Alchian during one of the UCLA economics department’s weekly faculty/graduate student coffee hour, in which he said, “Williams, the true test of whether someone understands his subject is whether he can explain it to someone who doesn’t know a darn thing about it.”

That’s precisely what “Universal Economics” does—explain economics in a way that anyone can understand. There’s no economic jargon, just a tiny bit of simple mathematics and a few graphs.

Chapter 1 introduces the fundamental issue that faces all of mankind—scarcity. How does one know whether things are scarce? That’s easy. When human wants exceed the means to satisfy those wants, we say that there’s scarcity.

The bounds to human wants do not frequently reveal themselves; however, the means to satisfy those wants are indeed limited. Thus, scarcity creates conflict issues—namely, what things will be produced, how will they be pro-

duced, when will they be produced and who will get them? Analyzing those issues represents the heart of microeconomics.

Alchian and Allen want your study of economics to be “interesting and enjoyable.” They caution: “You’ll be brainwashed—in the ‘desirable’ sense of removing erroneous beliefs. You will begin to suspect that a vast majority of what people popularly believe about economic events is at least misleading and often wrong.”

The authors give a long list of erroneous beliefs that people hold.

Here’s a tiny sample.

- Employers pay for employer-provided insurance.
- Larger incomes for some people require smaller incomes for others
- Minimum wage legislation helps the unskilled and minorities.
- Foreign imports reduce the number of domestic jobs.
- “Equal pay for equal work” laws aid women, minorities and the young.
- Labor unions protect the natural brotherhood and collective well-being of workers against their natural enemies, employers.
- We cannot compete in a world in which most foreign wages are lower than wages paid to domestic workers.

One of Professor Alchian’s major contributions to economic science is in the area of property rights and its effect on the outcomes observed.

The essence of private property rights contains three components

- The owner’s right to make decisions about the uses of what’s deemed his property.
- His right to acquire, keep and dispose of his property.
- His right to enjoy the income, as well as bear losses, resulting from his decisions.

If one or more of those three elements is missing, private property rights are not present.

Private property rights also restrain one from interfering with other people’s rights.

Private property rights have long been seen as vital to personal liberty.

James Madison, in an 1829 speech at the Virginia Constitutional Convention, said: “It is sufficiently obvious that persons and property are the two great subjects on which governments are to act and that the rights of persons and the rights of property are the objects for the protection of which government was instituted. These rights cannot well be separated.”

At the end of many of “Universal Economics” 42 chapters, there’s a section named “Questions and Meditations.”

Here’s my guarantee: If you know and can understand those questions and answers, you will be better trained than the average economist teaching or working in Washington, D.C.



“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 Terence P. Jeffrey titled “Manufacturing Jobs +18,000 in September” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 5, 2018.
- An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled “Federal Government Cut 1,000 Jobs in September; -16,000 Under Trump” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 5, 2018.
- An article by Fred Imbert and Alexandria Gibbs titled “Dow Tumbles Over 500 Points, Bringing Two-Day Losses to More Than 1,300 Points” was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 11, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- An article by Michael W. Chapman titled “Previously Deported Illegal Alien Now Sentenced for Child Porn” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 9, 2018.

Comments about weapons

- An article by David Harsanyi titled “Democrats’ New Anti-Gun Laws Are Also an Attack on Due Process” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 5, 2018.
- An article by Chris Reeves titled “Bloomberg’s ‘Everytown’ Group Set to Spend \$2 Million to Elect Pro-Gun Control Democrats in Florida” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 10, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

- An article by Susan Jones titled “Chris Christie and Lindsey Graham: Make Kavanaugh Impeachment an Election Issue” was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 8, 2018.
- An article titled “Brett Kavanaugh Just Hired the Supreme Court’s First All-Women Law Clerk Team” was posted at theweek.com on Oct. 8, 2018.
- An article titled “Melanie Trump to Survivors of Sexual Assaults, Don’t Report Unless You Have Evidence” was posted at fortune.com on Oct. 10, 2018.

- An article by Leah Barkoukis titled "GOP Fundraising Numbers Skyrocket Amid Kavanaugh's Confirmation Battle" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 10, 2018.
- An article by Jim Geraghty titled "Nikki Haley Does the Impossible: Leave the Trump Team on Good Terms" was posted at nationalreview.com on Oct. 9, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

- An article by Jim Geraghty titled "Democrats Encouraged to Go Rogue on Republicans" was posted at nationalreview.com on Oct. 11, 2018.
- An article by Monica Showalter titled "The Left Escalates Its Vilification of Susan Collins" was posted at americanthinker.com on Oct. 6, 2018.
- An article by Noel K. Gallagher titled "Sen. Collins' Vote on Kavanaugh Triggers Calls to Boycott Maine" was posted at pressherald.com (Portland, Maine) on Oct. 8, 2018.
- A video and an article by Emily Zanotti titled "Watch: Leftist Protesters Freak Out, Claw at Supreme Court Doors While Brett Kavanaugh is Sworn In" were posted at dailywire.com on Oct. 7, 2018.
- An article by Erin Golden titled "Rosemont Educator [Unnamed Female] Resigns After 'Kill Kavanaugh' Tweet" was posted at startribune.com (Minneapolis, Minn.) on Oct. 9, 2018.
- An article by Laretta Brown titled "Hillary Clinton: Throw Civility Out the Window Until Democrats Retake Congress" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 9, 2018.
- A video and an article by Cristina Laila titled "Eric Holder: When Republicans Go Low, 'We Kick them'—Crowd Chants, 'Fight! Fight! Fight!' " were posted at thegatewaypundit.com on Oct. 10, 2018.
- An article by Laretta Brown titled "Sen. Hirono on Leftists Targeting GOP in Their Homes and at Restaurants: They're Just Very 'Motivated' " was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 8, 2018.
- An article by Melanie Arter titled "Sen. Mazie Hirono Defends Harassing GOP Officials: 'When You Look at White Supremacists,' This is What's Coming Forth" was posted at cnsnews.com on Oct. 8, 2018.
- A video and an article by Robert Kraychik titled "Watch—Rand Paul's Wife: I Sleep With a Loaded Gun Thanks to Leftists' Threats" were posted at Breitbart.com on Oct. 8, 2018.
- An article by James Rogers titled "Google Exec [Dave Hogue] Slams GOP Over Kavanaugh Nomination: 'F—k You All to Hell' " was posted at foxnews.com on Oct. 8, 2018.
- An article by Henry A. Giroux titled "Donald Trump, Brett Kavanaugh and the Path to Neoliberal Fascism" was posted at salon.com on Oct. 11, 2018.

- An article by Ken Thomas titled "Sanders Barnstorming Country Ahead of Midterm Elections" was posted at apnews.com on Oct. 9, 2018.
- An article by Natasha Bach titled "Taylor Swift's Instagram Post [to 112 Million Followers] Spurred Thousands to Register to Vote [Contributing to 65,000 Registrations Over Three Days]" was posted at fortune.com on Oct. 9, 2018.
- An article by Matt Vespa titled "Word of Wisdom From Ocasio-Cortez: Abolish the Electoral College to Stop More Conservative Judicial Appointments" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 9, 2018.
- An article titled "Biden Not Planning 2020 Run 'At This Point,' But Bitter Feud With Trump Continues" was posted at foxnews.com on Oct. 11, 2018.
- A Reuters article by Lisa Richwire titled "Hollywood Rewrites Its Script to Resist Trump in Midterms" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 11, 2018.
- Looking back to August, an article by John Kass titled "Media Don't Want to Understand Trump Voters, All 63 Million of Them" was posted at chicagotribune.com on Aug. 1, 2018.
- Looking back to August, an article by Julia Manchester titled "Alyssa Milano: News Media Continues to Normalize Trump" was posted at thehill.com on Aug. 30, 2018.

News about the media

- An article by Matt Vespa titled "Veteran Journalist Ted Koppel Tells CNN Host His Network's Ratings Would Be Trash Without Trump" was posted at americanthinker.com on Oct. 3, 2018.
- An article by Steve McCann titled "The Mainstream Media Fraud" was posted at americanthinker.com on Oct. 5, 2018.
- An article by Annie Pel titled "Netflix is Down 15% From Its High, And There Could Be More Pain Ahead" was posted at cnbc.com on Oct. 7, 2018.
- An article by Rich Noyes titled "Study: Economic Boom Largely Ignored As TV's Trump Coverage Hits 92% Negative" was posted at newsbusters.org on Oct. 9, 2018.
- A video and an article by Jon Levine titled "CNN Panel Mocks Kanye West As Trump's 'Token Negro.' Don Lemon Laughs" were posted at thewrap.com on Oct. 10, 2018.

General interest

- An article by Michelle Malkin titled "The Most Important Movie You've Never Heard Of ['Gosnell: The Trial of America's Biggest Serial Killer']" was posted at michellemalkin.com on Oct. 10, 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.”