

Eye on the World

March 23, 2019

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 March 23, 2019.

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).



A Reuters article by Tom Perry titled “Syria Vows to Recover Golan As Trump Policy Shift Draws Criticism” was posted at reuters.com on March 22, 2019. Following is the article.

The Syrian government vowed to take back the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights as its allies and enemies alike condemned U.S. President Donald Trump on Friday for moving to recognize Israeli sovereignty over the territory seized in war.

Trump’s statement on Thursday marked a dramatic shift in U.S. policy over the status of a disputed area that Israel captured from Syria in the 1967 Middle East conflict and annexed in 1981—a move not recognized internationally.

Against this backdrop of hostility toward the U.S. move, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo visited Beirut where he took aim at Israel’s main regional foes—Hezbollah and its backer Iran—and declared the success of U.S. sanctions against them.

Trump’s declaration is the latest U.S. step to fuel anger in the region, both in states that are hostile to Israel and others that have relations with it and are allied to the United States.

It follows the U.S. recognition in December 2017 of Jerusalem as Israel’s capital—a decision that also stirred international criticism as the city’s disputed status remains at the heart of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Russia, an ally of President Bashar al-Assad with forces in Syria, said Trump's comments risked seriously destabilizing the region, and it voiced hope the statement was just declaratory.

Iran, Assad's main regional ally and which also has forces in Syria, condemned the statement as illegal and unacceptable.

"The personal decisions of Trump . . . will lead to crisis in the region," Iran's foreign ministry spokesman said.

Turkey, a U.S. ally and an adversary of Damascus, also said the move had brought the Middle East to the edge of a new crisis and the legitimization of the occupation of the Golan Heights could not be allowed.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu thanked Trump for his gesture "at a time when Iran seeks to use Syria as a platform to destroy Israel." It could help Netanyahu in the midst of a tough re-election battle, analysts said.

The Syrian government said the Golan was an "indivisible" part of Syrian territory and recovering it "via all means guaranteed by international law is still a priority."

It said United States with its "stupidity and arrogance" had no right to decide the fate of the area and any move to recognize Israeli sovereignty over it was "an illegal action with no impact."

After remaining calm for decades since a 1974 armistice monitored by U.N. peacekeepers, Golan re-emerged as a flashpoint for regional tensions during the Syrian war. Last May, Israel accused Iran's Revolutionary Guards of launching a rocket salvo into its territory from the Syrian side of the truce line.

Israel, which has mounted numerous air strikes against what it has called Iran-backed targets in Syria, has demanded Russia keep forces allied to Tehran away from the boundary.

The Syrian side was held by rebel forces for years until pro-government forces recovered it in July.

Israel could not give up the Golan

Jason Greenblatt, a senior White House adviser, said on Twitter that "under any conceivable circumstance, Israel could not give up the Golan . . . To do so would endanger Israel's very existence."

But Fouad Mundhir, a Syrian whose home village is in Israeli-occupied Golan, said Trump was "cancelling the will of an entire nation."

"You say you are carrying the flag of democracy. Okay, Mr. Trump, have you taken into account the will of the people of the Golan?" he told Reuters in Jaramana, near Damascus.

In the Golan itself, Druze Arabs also rejected the move, while Israeli settlers welcomed it.

The European Union said its position on the status of the Golan Heights was unchanged and that it did not recognize Israeli sovereignty over the strategic plateau.

Germany said any change in borders should be “done through peaceful means between all those involved,” while France said it did not recognize the Israeli annexation of the Golan and any recognition was contrary to international law.

The Arab League, which suspended Syria in 2011 after the start of its civil war, said Trump had paved “the way for official American recognition” of Israeli sovereignty over the Golan and called this “completely beyond international law.”

Egypt, which made peace with Israel in 1979, said it still considers the Golan as occupied Syrian territory.

Israel says Syria’s civil war has reaffirmed the need to keep the plateau—coveted for its water resources and fertile soil—as a buffer zone between Israeli towns and the instability of its neighbor.

In Lebanon, Pompeo said the United States would continue to use “all peaceful means” to choke off funding that “feeds Iran and Hezbollah terror operations.”

“Lebanon faces a choice: bravely move forward as an independent and proud nation, or allow the dark ambitions of Iran and Hezbollah to dictate your future,” he said.

Hezbollah-aligned Lebanese leaders including President Michel Aoun told him the group was a Lebanese party with popular support. The group has three cabinet ministers and together with its allies controls more than 70 of parliament’s 128 seats.

The United States is a major donor to the Lebanese army but its allies, including the Sunni Muslim Prime Minister Saad al-Hariri, have been weakened as Iran’s role has deepened through Lebanon, Iraq and Syria and Saudi influence has receded.

Washington has reintroduced sanctions on Iran and imposed new financial sanctions on Hezbollah which Lebanon’s Hezbollah-aligned president, Michel Aoun, said on Thursday were hurting all Lebanese.



Looking back to 2007, a Reuters article titled “Chronology: Who Banned Slavery When?” was posted at reuters.com on March 22, 2007. Following is the article.

Britain marks 200 years on March 25 [2007] since it enacted a law banning the trans-Atlantic slave trade, although full abolition of slavery did not follow for another generation.

Following are some key dates in the trans-atlantic trade in slaves from Africa and its abolition.

- 1444—First public sale of African slaves in Lagos, Portugal
- 1482—Portuguese start building first permanent slave trading post at Elmina, Gold Coast, now Ghana
- 1510—First slaves arrive in the Spanish colonies of South America, having travelled via Spain
- 1518—First direct shipment of slaves from Africa to the Americas
- 1777—State of Vermont, an independent Republic after the American Revolution, becomes first sovereign state to abolish slavery
- 1780s—Trans-Atlantic slave trade reaches peak
- 1787—The Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade founded in Britain by Granville Sharp and Thomas Clarkson
- 1792—Denmark bans import of slaves to its West Indies colonies, although the law only took effect from 1803.
- 1807—Britain passes Abolition of the Slave Trade Act, outlawing British Atlantic slave trade.
- United States passes legislation banning the slave trade, effective from start of 1808.
- 1811—Spain abolishes slavery, including in its colonies, though Cuba rejects ban and continues to deal in slaves.
- 1813—Sweden bans slave trading
- 1814—Netherlands bans slave trading
- 1817—France bans slave trading, but ban not effective until 1826
- 1833—Britain passes Abolition of Slavery Act, ordering gradual abolition of slavery in all British colonies. Plantation owners in the West Indies receive 20 million pounds in compensation
- Great Britain and Spain sign a treaty prohibiting the slave trade.
- 1819—Portugal abolishes slave trade north of the equator
- 1823—Britain's Anti-Slavery Society formed. Members include William Wilberforce
- 1846—Danish governor proclaims emancipation of slaves in Danish West Indies, abolishing slavery
- 1848—France abolishes slavery
- 1851—Brazil abolishes slave trading

- 1858—Portugal abolishes slavery in its colonies, although all slaves are subject to a 20-year apprenticeship
- 1861—Netherlands abolishes slavery in Dutch Caribbean colonies
- 1862—U.S. President Abraham Lincoln proclaims emancipation of slaves with effect from January 1, 1863; 13th Amendment of U.S. Constitution follows in 1865 banning slavery
- 1886—Slavery is abolished in Cuba
- 1888—Brazil abolishes slavery
- 1926—League of Nations adopts Slavery Convention abolishing slavery
- 1948—United Nations General Assembly adopts Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including article stating “No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.”



“Eye on the World” comment: The following list of articles consists of headlines of extra articles, which are considered international. The articles were not posted, but the headlines give the essence of the story.

-
- An article by Daniel Piotrowski, Alex Chapman and Josh Hanrahan titled “Smiling Mosque Massacre Shooter Makes a White Supremacist Sign With His Hand As He Is Charged With Murder After 50 People Lost Their Lives in New Zealand’s Worst Terror Attack—And Man Arrives at Court ‘Armed With Knife to Stab the Accused’ ” was posted at dailymail.co.uk on March 17, 2019.
 - An article by Adam Carlson titled “New Zealand Mass Shooter Will Have Justice But Not Infamy: ‘We Will Give Him Nothing, Not Even His Name’ ” was posted at people.com on March 19, 2019.
 - An article by John Bacon titled “New Zealanders Turn in Guns As Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern Promises Tighter Restrictions” was posted at usatoday.com on March 18, 2019.
 - A Reuters article titled “Volunteers Fly In to Wash the Dead in New Zealand” was posted at reuters.com on March 18, 2019.
 - A Reuters article by Maggie Fick titled “Ethiopian Airlines Black Boxes Showed ‘Clear Similarities’ With Lion Air Crash [in October]” was posted at reuters.com on March 17, 2019.
 - A Reuters article by Maggie Fick titled “High Speed, Then a Failed Climb for Doomed Ethiopia Flight” was posted at reuters.com on March 17, 2019.
 - An article by Anna Ahronheim titled “Iranian Commander: All of Israel Within Reach of Hezbollah’s Missiles” was posted at jpost.com on March 18, 2019.

- An article by Adam Kredo titled “Iran Building Two New Nuclear Plants” was posted at freebeacon.com on March 18, 2019.
- An article by Will Crisp titled “Rwanda Sparks Human Rights Concerns in Proposing World’s First Nationwide DNA Database” was posted at independent.co.uk on March 20, 2019.
- An article by Lily Kuo titled “China Says It Has Arrested 13,000 ‘Terrorists’ in Xinjiang” was posted at theguardian.com on March 18, 2019.
- A Reuters article titled “Russia Decides to Deploy Nuclear-Capable Strategic Bombers to Crimea: RIA” was posted at reuters.com on March 18, 2019.
- A Reuters article by Idrees Ali and Phil Stewart titled “Exclusive: U.S. May Soon Pause Preparations for Delivering F-35s to Turkey” was posted at reuters.com on March 21, 2019.
- An article by Marie Giffard titled “Yellow Vest ‘Ultimatum’ Rally Turns Violent in Paris” was posted at yahoo.com on March 16, 2019.
- A Reuters article by Gershon Peaks titled “Venezuela Opposition Takes Control of Diplomatic Properties in U.S.” was posted at reuters.com on March 18, 2019.
- An article by Deirdre Shesgreen titled “Venezuelan Forces Kidnap Opposition Leader Juan Guaidó’s Chief of Staff in Raid” was posted at usatoday.com on March 21, 2019.
- An article titled “Indonesia’s Aceh [Province] Whips Amorous Couples” was posted at yahoo.com on March 20, 2019.



An article by Joan Biskupic titled “The Inside Story of How John Roberts Negotiated to Save Obamacare” was posted at cnn.com on March 21, 2019. Following are excerpts of the article.

Chief Justice John Roberts arrived at the Valletta campus of the University of Malta on July 3, 2012, to teach a class on Supreme Court history. As he emerged from the back seat of a black sedan, he held his brown leather briefcase in front of him, almost as a shield. He wore a blue blazer, striped button-down shirt, and tan khakis. His clothes looked crisp, though his face was haggard. He was as exhausted and distressed as he had been in years.

Roberts had left behind a storm in Washington over his opinion upholding President Barack Obama’s health-care overhaul—the Affordable Care Act—a stunning validation of Obama’s signature domestic achievement that transformed public perceptions of the chief justice.

Republicans in Congress had been fighting the law dubbed Obamacare at every turn for two years, and all the GOP presidential candidates in 2012 had vowed to repeal it. And now Roberts, a nominee of President George W. Bush, had saved it.

Going forward, the chief justice would be viewed with skepticism by conservatives, despite also having taken the lead on limiting racial remedies and voting rights, helping roll back campaign finance regulations and voting for stronger Second Amendment gun rights.

Roberts' moves behind the scenes were as extraordinary as his ruling. He changed course multiple times. He was part of the majority of justices who initially voted in a private conference to strike down the individual insurance mandate—the heart of the law—but he also voted to uphold an expansion of Medicaid for people near the poverty line.

Two months later, Roberts had shifted on both.

The final tallies, 5-4 to uphold the individual mandate and 7-2 to curtail the Medicaid plan, came after weeks of negotiations and trade-offs among the justices.

The ACA, signed by Obama in 2010, followed decades of failed attempts in Washington to control spiraling medical costs and provide Americans with higher-quality health care. It created a marketplace where the uninsured could buy coverage and protected people from being unable to get health insurance because of pre-existing conditions such as diabetes, cancer and other chronic illnesses.

To support the system and draw in the healthy as well as the sick, the law required that most uninsured people obtain coverage (the “individual mandate”) or pay a penalty, to be collected as part of an individual’s annual taxes—a provision critical to the final ruling.

The law also expanded Medicaid benefits to a wider range of needy individuals. The money for about 90% of that expansion would come from the federal government. But it would come with a strict condition: If states did not broaden their programs as dictated they would lose all Medicaid funds.

■ The first meeting—5-4 against the mandate

After an unusual three full days of oral arguments in late March 2012 (a typical case gets one hour on one day), the nine justices gathered in a private conference room off the chief’s chambers to cast initial votes. They were alone, with no law clerks or administrative staff.

The discussion focused on the individual insurance mandate and Congress’ power to regulate commerce. Roberts went first, as was the custom, laying out his views. He emphasized that he believed the Constitution’s commerce clause never was intended to cover inactivity, such as the refusal to buy insurance.

After the chief, conservative Justices Antonin Scalia, Anthony Kennedy and Clarence Thomas offered their views. Like Roberts, they thought Congress’ commerce authority did not cover an individual’s decision to forgo—rather

than obtain—health insurance. There were thus four immediate votes cast to invalidate the mandate. No one at the table was surprised, based on the questions during oral arguments and word from law clerks inside the building circulating intelligence among the justices' chambers.

The votes of the liberals were known, too. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, fifth in seniority, was the first to cast a vote to uphold the individual mandate. She believed Supreme Court precedent demanded the law be found constitutional.

She was followed by Justice Stephen Breyer, who agreed with her.

Next in seniority was conservative Samuel Alito, who cast the fifth and final vote to strike down the law.

The eighth and ninth justices at the table, liberals Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan, joined Ginsburg and Breyer in voting for the law as part of Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce.

There was no sign on March 30, 2012, that any of the nine would defy the usual ideological and partisan alignment. That political division bothered Roberts, but he felt just as strongly about boundaries on the commerce power as the other four in the majority did.

Regarding Medicaid, all four liberals voted to uphold the program, and Roberts joined them. At the same time, he expressed some tentativeness.

No vote had been taken related to congressional taxing power. It did not seem to matter, because the individual mandate was going to be struck down. The only uncertainty was whether any of Obamacare would survive.

Roberts did not want the entire law to fall. A pro-business conservative, he understood the importance of the insurance industry to US businesses, and he was genuinely concerned about invalidating an entire law that had been approved through the democratic process to solve the intractable health care problem.

But his four fellow conservatives believed that if the individual mandate was going down, it should take the whole law with it. They believed all the pieces were interlocked. Roberts thought the individual mandate was entwined with only two other provisions, those known as the "community rating" and "guaranteed issue."

The community-rating section prevented insurers from charging some individuals higher premiums than others based on health status. The guaranteed-issue section required insurers to cover people regardless of pre-existing conditions.

As was his prerogative as chief justice, Roberts chose to write the majority opinion, giving him the ability to shape what the court would ultimately say. Senior liberal justice Ginsburg was ready to write for the dissenting foursome.

Soon after, Roberts began trying to persuade Kennedy to find that the unconstitutional insurance requirement could be severed from the rest of the law. But Kennedy—often a swing vote on high-profile cases—was firm in his

position. He was puzzled, and then put off, by Roberts' view that the ACA provisions could be severed.

■ The deal is struck

Later in April, Roberts tried another path. He began exploring whether, as the Obama administration had argued, the individual mandate could be upheld as a tax. (CBS's Jan Crawford reported earlier on Roberts' reversal on the mandate, but the full story of Roberts' switch, including on Medicaid expansion, and the changed votes of two liberal justices is detailed now for the first time.)

The chief justice then turned to Breyer and Kagan, the liberals most likely to work with him on contentious issues, to see if they could find common ground.

At the same time, Roberts began incorporating arguments that would invalidate the Medicaid expansion. This was a strange turn. None of the lower courts that had taken up the ACA had rejected the Medicaid expansion, and it wasn't seen as controversial in terms of constitutional debate and public controversy.

Roberts posited in a draft opinion that Congress had in effect held "a gun to the head" of the states by conditioning all Medicaid money on the expanded coverage. Yet he was not prepared to find that the expansion had to be scrapped altogether, only that states could not be forced to join through the leverage of losing all Medicaid funding.

Breyer and Kagan had voted in the private March conference to uphold the new Medicaid requirement, and their votes had been unequivocal. But they were pragmatists. If there was a chance that Roberts would cast the critical vote to uphold the central plank of Obamacare—and negotiations in May were such that they still considered that a shaky proposition—they were willing to meet him partway.

When Ginsburg found out about Roberts' new position, her first thought was, "It ain't over till it's over." She understood that the process could continue to be fluid, especially in such a monumental case.

"People change their minds about what they thought. So it isn't at all something extraordinary, and that's how it should work. We're in the process of trying to persuade each other and then the public," she told me in a 2012 interview in her chambers.

At the time, Ginsburg knew that Roberts was not deviating from his view of limited commerce clause power, and she wanted to make her dissent as persuasive as possible.

"I was forcing myself to stay awake and work on the opinion," Ginsburg said.

Another complication for Ginsburg was that in late spring she had fallen on the marble floor of her bathroom and cracked several ribs. There was nothing to be done except to work through the pain.

Scalia and the other conservatives were livid at the development. Scalia believed the taxing-power possibility had never truly been discussed in court, calling it a

“fly-by-night briefing.” Kennedy thought Roberts had presented his interpretation as “judicial modesty,” when it amounted instead “to a vast judicial overreaching.”

■ The announcement

The decision was revealed on June 28, the last courtroom sitting of the 2011-12 session. As Roberts began reading his opinion from the bench, he tried to speak steadily, but he was nervous. About 13 minutes into the 20-minute announcement, after he had summarized various legal rationales, he misstated the overall judgment. Few noticed the slip because he had already laid out the reasoning.

As Roberts spoke, he occasionally looked out at the spectators. Among them was retired Justice John Paul Stevens, who later said he thought the chief had shown integrity.

“He had to be thinking he did the right thing,” Stevens said in a 2016 interview in his chambers, “because he certainly made himself very unpopular” with the conservatives.

Perhaps Roberts’ move was born of a concern for the business of health care. Perhaps he had worries about his own legitimacy and legacy, intertwined with concerns about the legitimacy and legacy of the court. Perhaps his change of heart really arose from a sudden new understanding of congressional taxing power.

However the chief would explain it—and he has not explained it beyond his written opinion—the case added a new dimension to a man who insisted that he always decided cases based on the law.

Viewed only through a judicial lens, his moves were not consistent, and his legal arguments were not entirely coherent. But he brought people and their different interests together. His moves may have been good for the country at a time of division and a real crisis in health care, even as they engendered, in the years since, anger, confusion and distrust.

Criticism on the right—from insiders and outsiders—was swift, including from the Wall Street Journal editorial page, which described the decision as “shot through with confusion.”

Donald Trump, three years from launching his presidential run, went right to Twitter: “Wow, the Supreme Court passed @ObamaCare. I guess Justice Roberts wanted to be part of Georgetown society more than anyone knew.”

Trump later added: “John Roberts arrived in Malta yesterday. Maybe we will get lucky and he will stay there.”



An article titled “National Poll: Sanders Tied With Biden; Beto Gets Post-Announcement Bump” was posted at emersonpolling.com on March 19, 2019. Following are excerpts of the article.

- Joe Biden—26%
- Bernie Sanders—26%
- Kamala Harris—12%
- Beto O'Rourke—11% (an increase of 7 points)
- Elizabeth Warren—8%



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "Donald Trump Is the Life of the Party" was posted at patriotpost.us on March 16, 2019. Following are excerpts of the article.

While I've been recuperating with what is presently thought to be a torn rotator cuff (an MRI on Tuesday should confirm it), I've been thinking about why I like Donald Trump so much. Of course, I approve of his politics, but it's more than that. I can approve of someone's politics without believing I would care to hang around with them. Sean Hannity and Mark Levin come to mind.

I believe I, as well as many other people, like Trump because he so obviously enjoys life. He loves his crowds and he loves to laugh and make other laugh. He loves his wife and kids. He loves his wealth, but he also loves his meatloaf. Most of all, I like him because he wears his love of America on his sleeve, as well as on his MAGA hat.

Heck, he even enjoys the give-and-take with the despicable Never-Trump media figures.

■ Angry Democrats

The Democrats, on the other hand, all come off as angry scolds suffering from mass hysteria. Even after two years of digging into Trump and his associates, they haven't been able to dredge up a single impeachable offense, but that only seems to infuriate them and make them want to impeach him all the more.

They call the President a racist, but it's only because they insist that's the worst thing you can call someone, not because they can come up with proof he is one.

They even call him an anti-Semite, in spite of the fact that his son-in-law, Jared Kushner is an observant Jew and his wife, the President's beloved daughter Ivanka, converted to Judaism, making three of Trump's grandchildren Jewish. And this from a political party that can't even bring itself to pass a resolution denouncing anti-Semitism, fearing blowback from two toxic members of Congress and the Muslims who elected them.

■ Excluding Fox

DNC Chairman Tom Perez, who's even dumber than he looks, broke the news that Fox News will not be allowed to participate in the 2020 Democratic pri-

mary debates. Presumably, the Democrats fear that Fox is not capable of adopting the neutral, non-partisan, objective approach for which NBC, ABC, CBS, CNN and MSNBC, are so famous.

■ Short-sighted

Sarcasm aside, it is just this sort of narrow-minded, short-sighted, decision-making that will help cost the Democrats any chance of unseating Donald J. Trump.

We're all darn lucky that Liberals are not only wrong on the issues, but stupid as well. Otherwise, they could be really dangerous.

■ Ignoring border crisis

While the oafs in Congress run around denying there is a crisis at the border, other than the one that involves keeping hordes of illegals from invading our country, Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen reported to a congressional committee that Mexicans have been smuggling enough Fentanyl into the U.S. to kill every American twice over.

Moreover, in February, 76,000 illegal aliens entered this country, promising to show up for their court hearings in a couple of years. Naturally, the Democrats don't view that as newsworthy, let alone troubling. But, February is the shortest month of the year, so that number of invaders averaged out over 365 days, would bring the 2019 total to 988,000. Do you think Schumer, Pelosi and the rest would find even that number concerning? No, me, neither.

■ Colorism exists

One of the dirty little secrets of American blacks is that there is a hierarchy among them when it comes to skin tones. Those who are lighter skinned tend to look down on their darker brothers and sisters.

These days, as one might expect, a reverse bigotry has come about. It's called colorism and it recently came to light that there's been a backlash or perhaps, more appropriately, a backlash, at Will Smith's being signed to portray Richard Williams in an upcoming movie about the father of the tennis-playing sisters, Venus and Serena. What has some morons riled up is that Williams has a darker skin than the Oscar-winning actor.

Perhaps it will lead to a sequel to the best seller "Fifty Shades of Gray" to be called "Fifty Shades of Black."

■ U.N. and Muslim resettlement

It should come as no big surprise that the U.N. has a big say in not only which Muslims will be granted admittance to the U.S. but plays a major role in determining where they will be re-settled.

It was Mohammad's religious command, identified as the Hijra, that the faithful scatter across the globe and spread the word, by whatever means necessary, to conquer and convert the infidels.

The U.N., being the criminal organization we all know it to be, has seen to it that the majority of the Muslims they have sponsored come from nations that have a particular hatred of America; namely, Afghanistan, Syria and Somalia.

The outfits in charge of this migration are paid billions of dollars to sponsor these people who may be fleeing from war zones, but that doesn't mean they like America or Americans. It means they accept the cursed Hijra as the word of God.

■ List of puns

Maggie VanderWoude, who clearly doesn't groan at puns, sent me a batch of them, starting with "Those who jump off a bridge in Paris are in Seine."

"A man's home is his castle, in a manor of speaking."

"Practice safe eating . . . always use condiments."

"Condoms should be used on every conceivable occasion."

"Dijon vu . . . the same mustard as before."

"A hangover is the wrath of grapes."

"Dancing cheek-to-cheek is really a form of floor play."

"Does the name Pavlov ring a bell?"

"When two egotists meet, it's an I for an I."

"What's the definition of a will? It's a dead give-away."

"A chicken crossing the road is poultry in motion."

"A midget fortune-teller who escapes from prison is a small medium at large."

"Acupuncture is a jab well done."

"Once you've seen one shopping center, you've seen a mall."

"Bakers trade bread recipes on a knead-to-know basis."

"Time flies like an arrow. Fruit flies like a banana."

Th-th-th-th-that's all, folks!



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "A Study in Pathology" was posted at patriotpost.us on March 18, 2019. Following are excerpts of the article.

In the world of psychology, there is something known as projection. It occurs when a person accuses others of sins, crimes or shortcomings of his own. Today, there is an entire political party that suffers from this condition.

If you guessed it was the GOP, you're mistaken. Their major problem is one of cowardice. Even senators and House members who know they will never be voted out of office tend to shrivel up at the mere thought of the *NY Times* or the *Washington Post* insulting them in print.

It's the Democrats who accuse their Republican colleagues of racism and call President Trump treacherous, dictatorial and just plain nasty. But they can't even bring themselves to pass a resolution condemning anti-Semitism or censuring Rep. Ilhan Omar.

Actually, when I first heard that a resolution had been passed in the House 407-23, and that the 23 were all Republicans, I was dismayed. But that was before I discovered that the original resolution had been diluted into a feel-good message that suggested it was equally despicable to say negative things about Muslims, Catholics, Latinos, Atheists, Gays, Vegans. Eskimos and your Mother-in-Law.

The 23 Republicans, to their credit, simply balked at voting for a resolution that wasn't worth the paper it was written on, and I applaud them. If I were a member of the House, the number would have been an even two dozen.

■ Martin County, Kentucky

As Tucker Carlson recently pointed out, it's bad enough that Martin County, Kentucky, is so poor that the sheriff recently had to send out notices to the locals that his department could no longer afford to provide the community with 24/7 protection. He seriously advised the folks to lock their doors, load their guns and get barking, biting dogs.

What makes it much worse is that while these poor, but loyal, tax-paying Americans can't afford full-time protection, America has spent \$78 billion building up the military and the police in Afghanistan. After 18 years, Trump and I both think it's time to re-direct the cash flow, diverting it to places like Martin County.

■ Ignoring our children

Noted horticulturalist Luther Burbank (1849-1926) once said: "If we had paid no more attention to our plants than we have to our children, we would now be living in a jungle of weeds."

Unfortunately, at some point, we began paying far more attention to our plants, leaving the cultivation of our offspring to left-wing teachers, obscene rap artists and Socialist propagandists like Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren, A O-C, George Soros, Jimmy Kimmel, Stephen Colbert and the doped-up writers of "Saturday Night Live."

■ A couple of cartoons

I received a couple of cartoons. In the first, a donkey in a suit, sitting at a news anchor's desk, is saying: "Don't look on this as a national emergency on the southern border. Look on it as a Democratic voter registration drive."

In the other, Nancy Pelosi is standing next to Adolf Hitler, saying: "Sure, he's made some questionable comments, but I don't think it was intentional."

■ Michigan and Minnesota

Penny Alfonso sent me a picture of the two new Muslim members of the House, the Jew-baiting Ilhan Omar and the foul-mouthed Rashida Tlaib, and posed the rhetorical question: "How did we let this happen?"

The first answer that comes to mind is that we allowed so many Muslims to enter the country after 9/11 that they now control certain congressional districts, especially in Michigan and Minnesota, and can easily elect those who reflect their own perverted beliefs.

The second answer is that the rest of us paved the way by electing a schmuck named Barack Hussein Obama a scant seven years after 9/11.

■ Malaprops

In case you are unaware, a malaprop (named after Mrs. Malaprop, a character in Richard Sheridan's play, "The Rivals") is the verbal mistake in which a word is substituted with another word that sounds similar but means something entirely different. An example would be if, on a visit to Argentina, you asked a cab driver to take you to see flamingo dancers when you had floorstompers in mind and not tall, pink lawn ornaments.

A young Miss Malaprop would be likely to recite: "Mary had a little lamb, its fleas as white as snow."

■ Spoonerisms

Although often confused with malaprops, a spoonerism (named after an actual clergyman, William Archibald Spooner (1844-1930), involves the transposition of the initial sounds of words.

Apparently Dr. Spooner was notorious for saying such things as "Is the bean dizzy?" (Is the dean busy?) "The Lord is a shoving leopard." (The Lord is a loving shepherd.) "A toast to our queer old dean." (A toast to our dear old queen.) "At a wedding, it is kisstomary to cuss the bride." (At a wedding, it is customary to kiss the bride.) And in a fantastic example of verbal legerdemain, he somehow managed to turn "Pardon me, madam, you are occupying my pew. May I show you to another seat?" into the remarkable "Mardon me, padom, you are occupewing my pie. May I sew you to another sheet?"

If you ever saw "Four Weddings and a Funeral," you might recall Rowan Atkinson's Dr. Gerald and his brilliant send-up of the pixilated Rev. Spooner.

If only the nonsensical jibberish uttered by our politicians were even slightly this amusing, we'd all be a lot happier.



An article by Jay Wei titled “UPS vs. FedEx: What’s the Difference?” was posted at investopedia.com on March 19, 2019. Following is the article.

United Parcel Service, Inc. (UPS) and FedEx Corp. (FDX) are two leading delivery services companies and main competitors to each other, at least in the public eye. However, to those following them closely, the two companies are quite different in their business models and strategies.

While UPS is widely known for its domestic ground package delivery, FedEx is mostly recognized for its global air express freight.

The two companies also differ in terms of their approaches to serving customers, how they have fared in the e-commerce environment, and the different business structures unique to each company.

Package delivery and express service are where the two companies have made names for themselves. Although each company has other delivery services that make everything they do seemingly overlap.

UPS is also a common carrier in air freight, and FedEx has a similar package delivery unit called FedEx Ground. In reality UPS’ ground package business and FedEx’s air express operations are, respectively, the bread and butter for each company.

■ UPS

UPS delivers packages worldwide on every day except Sunday. In 2017, UPS delivered around 20 million packages and documents each day, which totaled 5.1 billion—a number unmatched by anyone else in the business.

The UPS Store and FedEx Office are retail outlets set up by the two companies to bring in individual shipping orders for their respective package delivery and express services. Having such stores and offices also represents the different approaches by UPS and FedEx to serve their customers.

While both outlets provide shipping, packaging and certain office supply services such as copying and printing, they attract different kinds of customers because of the different nature of each company’s underlying delivery business.

The UPS Store is often a relatively small retail setting, independently owned by franchisees. It primarily serves retail customers and small businesses for their small package delivery needs plus certain postal and shipping-related services.

The ongoing e-commerce development has played right into UPS’ core business of small package delivery. As more people make purchases regularly online, merchants on the internet are increasingly pressured to make their offline delivery of goods on time to customers.

They see logistics as having a much bigger role in retail success, and to help themselves better navigate through the e-commerce way, online merchants

rely on package delivery companies such as UPS to make the final connections to their customers.

As a result, UPS has seen increased demand for its business and even struggled to keep up its capacity during times of heavy shipping orders.

UPS manages all its businesses, such as air, ground, domestic, international, commercial and residential, through a single pickup and delivery network. The single network structure has allowed UPS to gain competitive strengths by maximizing network efficiency and asset utilization.

■ FedEx

FedEx in its own right generates more than half of its revenue from its flagship FedEx Express division by flying about 6 million packages a day to more than 220 countries and territories around the world.

When it comes to business models, the two companies have each found their different business niches, with UPS focusing on small package delivery and FedEx specializing in time-sensitive express service.

As for stores, FedEx Offices usually occupy large spaces, really resembling big offices, and are corporate owned. FedEx Office can provide sophisticated equipment such as digital photo kiosks, laser printers or desktop access with an image scanner and Adobe design software. FedEx mostly attracts retail customers and corporate clients who prefer and can afford, the kind of express service offered.

FedEx has not felt the positive e-commerce effect. The company's package delivery unit, FedEx Ground, is less than half the size of its main business, FedEx Express. In terms of sales—18.4 billion compared to 36.2 billion, respectively, in its fiscal year 2018.

Online purchases require mostly regular local and regional deliveries as opposed to express, long-haul deliveries, something that FedEx does the best. With cost-efficiency in mind, online merchants are more likely to sell through their regional fulfillment centers or local chain stores to avoid long-distance deliveries that can be time-consuming and cost-laden.

As a result, FedEx's strength does not play into e-commerce development. To catch on with e-commerce's demand for shorter-distance delivery, FedEx may have to realign its business model more toward its FedEx Ground while keeping its express advantage.

FedEx's strategy is for its different business units, such as express, ground, freight, and services, to operate independently. However, 96% of FedEx's clients use two or more of the company's separate operating units, providing a different kind of competitive advantage.

Because FedEx has more dissimilar operations, from express to ground to freight, a single network strategy would not work. However, for UPS, the different businesses it has are essentially all about small package delivery, and sharing a single network makes the most sense.

It may be surprising to see that two delivery services companies can be so different in so many aspects of their operations. To many people, they look the same.

■ Key Takeaways:

UPS and FedEx have both been pioneers in the express package delivery service.

UPS specializes in domestic ground delivery services.

FedEx specializes in time-sensitive international air freight.



“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.

Deficit

■ An article by Damian Paletta and Erica Werner titled “The Government Set a Record With a \$234 Billion Deficit in February” was posted at washingtonpost.com on March 22, 2019.

Green New Deal

■ An article titled “Students Around the World Skip Class to Demand Action on Climate” was posted at france24.com on March 15, 2019.

■ An article by Cassidy Randall titled “US Judge Halts Hundreds of Drilling Projects in Groundbreaking Climate Change Ruling” was posted at theguardian.com on March 20, 2019.

■ An article by George S. Bardmesser titled “Why the Right Should Adore Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez With Every Fiber of Their Beings” was posted at thefederalist.com on March 21, 2019.

Illegal immigration

■ An article by Christian Britschgi titled “House Votes [245-182 With 13 Republicans] to Terminate Trump’s National Emergency” was posted at reason.com on Feb. 26, 2019.

■ An article by Joe Setyon titled “12 Republicans Join Dems [59-41] to Block Trump’s National Emergency at the Border” was posted at reason.com on March 14, 2019.

■ An article by Katie Pavlich titled “President Trump Vetoes Resolution That Ends His National Emergency Declaration” was posted at townhall.com on March 15, 2019.

■ A Reuters article by Mica Rosenberg titled “U.S. Immigration Arrests Fall Under Trump As Resources Shift to the Border” was posted at reuters.com on March 21, 2019.

- An article by Timothy Meads titled "Border Patrol Arrests More Than 400 Illegal Aliens in 5 Minutes" was posted at townhall.com on March 20, 2019.
- An article by Stephen Dinan titled "ICE Releasing 1,000 Illegal Immigrant Family Members a Day" was posted at washingtontimes.com on March 21, 2019.
- An article by Paul Bedard titled "Immigration Court Backlog Up 300%, System 'On Brink of Collapse' " was posted at washingtonexaminer.com on March 21, 2019.

Comments about weapons

- An article by Katie Pavlich titled "Bernie Sanders Calls for Stripping of Second Amendment Rights Overnight" was posted at townhall.com on March 21, 2019.

Comments about Trump support

- An article by Claire Chretien titled "U.S. Town [Roswell, New Mexico] Becomes 'Sanctuary City for the Unborn' " was posted at lifesitenews.com on March 15, 2019.
- An article by Gabby Orr titled "Biden Will Be a Bust, Trump Aides Assure Their Boss" was posted at politico.com on March 15, 2019.
- An article by James S. Robbins titled "Democrats' Civil War Between Progressives and Moderates Will Bring 2020 Trump Victory" was posted at usatoday.com on March 18, 2019.

Comments about Trump opposition

- A Reuters article by Nathan Layne titled "Ex-U.S. Attorney Bharara to Trump: Don't Mess With Manhattan Probes" was posted at reuters.com on March 19, 2019.
- An article by Yaron Steinbuch titled "New Jersey Senate Approves Bill That Could Keep Trump Off State's 2020 Ballot" was posted at nypost.com on Feb. 22, 2019.
- An article by Marc Caputo and Gary Fineout titled "[Andrew] Gillum's 'Red Flag' Plan to Stop Trump: 1M More Florida Voters" was posted at politico.com on March 20, 2019.
- An article by Mary Papenfuss titled "Chris Wallace: No Way Trump Will Win in 2020 With Just His Base" was posted at huffpost.com on March 15, 2019.
- An article by Devan Cole titled "Jeb Bush Says a Republican Should Challenge Trump in 2020" was posted at cnn.com on March 15, 2019.
- An article by Heather Caygle titled "Obama to Meet With Freshman Dems Next Week" was posted at politico.com on March 21, 2019.
- An article by Brian Slodysko and Juana Summers titled "Hollywood Power Elite Hosting Kamala Harris Fundraiser" was posted at apnews.com on March 21, 2019.

- An article titled "Booker Says He Would Reverse Transgender Ban" was posted at apnews.com on March 17, 2019.
- An article by Peter Fimrite titled "SF Meets Andrew Yang, a Presidential Candidate Who's Attracting Support From Millennials" was posted at sfchronicle.com on March 19, 2019.
- An article by Will Sommer titled "Andrew Yang, Upstart Democratic Presidential Candidate, Comes Out Against Circumcision" was posted at thedailybeast.com on March 19, 2019.
- An article titled "Stacey Abrams Considers 2020 Presidential Campaign on Race and Voter Suppression As Democratic Field Grows" was posted at independent.co.uk on March 17, 2019.
- Looking back to November, an article by Brenda Arredondo titled "Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez Names Chief of Staff [Saikat Chakrabarti]" was posted at thebeatdc.com on Nov. 27, 2018.
- An article by Aziz Haniffa titled "Rightwing Targets AOC's Chief of Staff Saikat Chakrabarti" was posted at indiaabroad.com on March 13, 2019.

Irishman Robert Francis (Beto) O'Rourke

- An article by Cortney O'Brien titled "Former Hillary Aide [Jess McIntosh] Not Happy That Beto Is Getting the [Favorable] Media Treatment Her Boss Deserved" was posted at townhall.com on March 14, 2019.
- An article by Amber Athey titled "Reuters Journalist [Joseph Menn] Withheld Damaging Info About Beto O'Rourke Until After Senate Race" was posted at dailycaller.com on March 16, 2019.
- A Reuters article by Joseph Menn titled "Beto O'Rourke's Secret Membership in America's Oldest Hacking Group" was posted at reuters.com on March 15, 2019.
- An article titled "Reuters Admits It Sat on a Story About Beto O'Rourke [Computer Hacking] for Two Years" was posted at foxnews.com on March 17, 2019.
- An article titled "[Mark] Steyn: It's Hard to Get Any More White Privileged Than Bovine Poet and Middle-Aged Skateboarder Beto" was posted at foxnews.com on March 15, 2019.
- An article titled "2020 Democratic Hopeful Beto O'Rourke Is Calling for an AR-15 Ban" was posted at foxnews.com on March 16, 2019.
- An article by Alanna Vagianos titled "Beto O'Rourke Says Late-Term Abortions Should Be a Woman's Decision: 'I Trust Her' " was posted at huffpost.com on March 19, 2019.
- An article by Jack Crowe titled "Beto Doubles Down on Support for Third-Trimester Abortions" was posted at nationalreview.com on March 19, 2019.

News about the media

- An article by Nicholas Fondacaro titled "ABC Panel: The GOP Is Too Far to the Right, Dems Closer to the Center" was posted at newsbusters.org on March 17, 2019.
- An article by Nicholas Fondacaro titled "ABC, NBC Hype Joe Biden 'Leaving Easter Eggs' for His 2020 Run" was posted at newsbusters.org on March 17, 2019.
- An article by Antonia Blumberg titled "Rep. Devin Nunes Sues Twitter for Supposedly Censoring Conservatives" was posted at huffpost.com on March 18, 2019.
- An article titled "Fox News Pulls Jeanine Pirro's Show [on March 16] After Controversial Remarks [on March 10] About Rep. Ilhan Omar's Hijab" was posted at usatoday.com on March 17, 2019.
- An article by Jon Levine titled "Jeanine Pirro's Show Off Fox News Schedule for a 2nd Week" was posted at thewrap.com on March 21, 2019.
- An article by Paul Farhi titled "Fox News Hires Former DNC Chair Donna Brazile Who Left CNN After Tipping Off Clinton About 2016 Debate Questions" was posted at independent.co.uk on March 19, 2019.
- An article by Lee Moran titled "Fox News Hosts Tear Into Donald Trump Over John McCain Attacks" was posted at huffpost.com on March 21, 2019.

General interest

- An article by Frank Luerweg titled "The Internet Know You Better Than Your Spouse Does" was posted at scientificamerican.com on March 14, 2019.
- An article by David Nath titled "Therapists Explore Virtual Reality to Help Patients" was posted at foxnews.com on March 15, 2019.
- A Reuters article titled "U.S. College Admissions Scandal Sparks \$500 Billion Lawsuit" was posted at reuters.com on March 14, 2019.
- A Reuters article by Gabriella Borter titled "Historic Floods Hit Nebraska After 'Bomb Cyclone' Storm" was posted at reuters.com on March 16, 2019.
- An article by Joel Shannon titled "A Texas Homeowner [near Abilene] Saw a 'Few' Rattlesnakes and Called for Help; the Removal Company Found 45 of Them" was posted at usatoday.com on March 20, 2019.
- Looking back to September, an article by Marisa Guthrie titled "LeBron James: 10 Projects on His Growing Hollywood Slate" was posted at hollywoodreporter.com on Sept. 20, 2018.
- An article by Brian T. Smith titled "With Lakers [Basketball Performance] in Free Fall, LeBron James Not So Kingly" was posted at houstonchronicle.com on March 5, 2019.
- A video titled "LeBron James Has Given Up on the Lakers As He Sits Far Away [From the Team on the Bench] and Doesn't Care" was posted at youtube.com on March 17, 2019.



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.”