

Eye on the World

Dec. 29, 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 Dec. 29, 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 Samantha Maitra titled "3 Questions to Ask Before the Next Open-Ended Foreign Intervention" was posted at thefederalist.com on Dec. 27, 2018. Following is the article.

A recent *Washington Post* article, citing a Chicago Council poll, suggests President Trump's base is arguably opposed to a drawdown from Syria. That seemed counter-intuitive to me, because in the last four U.S. presidential elections the candidate who promised to draw down from endless foreign entanglements has won.

Of course, none of them followed through. President George W. Bush wanted to focus on China, and opposed the humanitarian interventions in the Balkans, only to face the September 11 attacks, which put the United States into overdrive. At least he had a genuine excuse in the early days of Islamist militancy. President Obama had none.

After promising a restrained, realist foreign policy based on national interest and not values promotion, Obama was blindsided by three, er, advisors—Hillary Clinton, Susan Rice, and Samantha Power—who pushed to double down in regime changes in the Middle East. The results altered the geopolitics and demographics of North Africa and Europe for decades to come.

As I delved deep into the Chicago Council Poll, it became a lot clearer. The key, you see, is in the question's framing. The question asked is so vague and diluted that it is almost meaningless.

It asked: Would Americans support the deployment of U.S. troops "to fight against violent Islamic extremist groups in Iraq and Syria"?

Well, of course, no rational individual would oppose that. But that doesn't really give you much.

Imagine if this same question was turned on its head, to—"Would you support and pay taxes to champion the open-ended deployment of your cousin or colleague from Michigan to see that the Turks and Kurds don't fight over Manbij?"

The answer would be a lot more complicated.

Yet you would still see polls and surveys being shared by "journalists" that attest to the confirmation bias of the publications they write for.

Why is this skullduggery tolerated?

To paraphrase Peter Hitchens, polls and surveys have ceased to be objective ways to measure public opinion and instead aim to influence and channelize them. But the public deserves to know and deliberate, which is one of the beauties of democracy, unlike certain authoritarian countries, where bodies of soldiers are buried in the dark.

With that in mind, let us do a simulation, and discuss some key questions to ask any time someone is suggesting a foreign intervention.

1. Where Should One Intervene, and Why?

Are interventions for humanitarian purposes? If so, where and which countries deserve an intervention, and for how long?

There are currently 17 civil wars going on in the world, other than the four one often hears about in Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan. There are severe civil wars going on in Darfur, Somalia, Burkina Faso, Philippines, Eastern Ukraine, Libya, Nigeria, Central African Republic, Mali, and Myanmar.

Should we intervene in all of these? If not, which, and why?

Last year, more than 14,000 people were killed by drug gangs in Mexico.

What determines the criteria for intervention?

Is it the job of American (and British, while we are at it) taxpayers to fund counter-insurgency operations and humanitarian interventions wherever there is evil in the world?

Does that reflect the classical American grand strategy of "not seeking monsters to destroy" and "peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none" realpolitik?

What happens when humanitarian interests collide with strategic interests?

In Syria, for example, there are no friendly forces, but a trilateral proxy war between Saudi-Qatari backed Islamists, ISIS, and Assad-Iran-Russia axis. So the only forces America can realistically back are the Kurds, who intend to establish a Stalinist statelet.

But is the United States willing to create a Kurdish state, even in the face of hostility and threat of invasion of Turkey and Iran, both of whom would lose portions of their country if Kurdistan turns independent?

The cynic in me doubts the prudent U.S. foreign policy would risk a scenario of Turkey drifting towards Iran and Russia, opposing an independent, U.S.-backed, Kurdish state.

2. What Constitutes a 'Win'?

What are the end goals of intervention? Is it establishing civil society and liberal democracy in regions that have historically never been liberal or democratic?

Every single region on the planet has its own system of governance influenced by history, geography, and culture.

The examples of Germany and Japan after the Second World War are often given, but Germany and Japan were both westernized advanced societies, even prior to the world war. The institutions were already there. In feudal and tribal regions, the way that could be changed is through hundreds of years of colonization.

An example might be India, which was feudal in the last days of the Mughal Empire but turned into a parliamentary democracy, even if not fully liberal. But it took more than 300 years of British colonization to set up and consolidate those institutions.

So, to put it simply, are American taxpayers willing to fund the cost to colonize large swathes of Middle East, North Africa, and Central America to see if they turn to liberal paradises?

That would entail establishing colonial outposts and permanent constabulary forces to maintain law and order in frontiers like El Salvador, Honduras, Afghanistan, and Iraq. It is theoretically a valid strategy but, like everything else, it would need explicit approval of the majority of Americans and their representatives in the Congress, after careful cost-benefit analysis.

If the end goal is anything but this, I'm afraid there's disappointment ahead. It is unlikely there's going to be a geostrategic change on the ground, and that justifies greater Russian and Iranian interest in the region.

Simply put, Russia and Iran had a client state in Syria since the 1970s, which is key not just to their naval and air bases, but also to their geostrategy in the region.

To use a Vietnamese phrase, when we fight to win, they fight to survive. Their will to escalate will always be more than ours, simply because we have noth-

ing to lose in that region. The American regional footprint, to give an example, is more than 50,000 soldiers, and three naval bases.

No matter the humanitarian cost, Syria isn't strategically important to the United States. Losing Syria for Russia, however, would mean they would not have a single naval base in the Mediterranean.

The question, therefore, is this: Should we escalate and see how far this goes, over a cancerous and hostile hell on earth that is insignificant to greater American geostrategy?

3. Do We Have the Requisite Brutality to Finish Any Insurgency?

This is the most important question one can hear in talks in strategic circles. A recent research paper, for example, suggests that the Western way of a counterinsurgency operation is simply not brutal enough to end insurgencies permanently.

Post-WWII, the rules of engagement by Western military forces broadly follow the dictates of human rights. It's broadly because sometimes it gets impossible, like the evacuation operations in Raqqa.

But overall, the dogma is one of winning "hearts and minds"—that is, setting up institutions—to counter insurgencies. Research suggests otherwise.

Of the recent successful counterinsurgency operations, the ones that succeeded, like against the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka, Malaya by Great Britain, Punjab by India, and Grozny by Russia, didn't aspire to win hearts and minds, but a more medieval, "Carthage must be destroyed" clean-up operations with minimal respect to rights-based engagement.

In sum, the evidence overwhelmingly suggests that instead of winning "hearts and minds," extreme and prejudicial punitive deterrence, circling and walling off the cancerous region, and establishing strongman client rules instead of liberal institutions has ended insurgencies.

The alternative to that is this whack-a-mole forever war, which the West and especially the United States have been continuing since 1993.

These questions are admittedly more difficult than the sham surveys one can see justifying open-ended interventions and talking points in the media. Nor is it in the scope of this article to answer all these questions.

But these are necessary nevertheless and needed to determine the course of a future conservative, restrained, and realist foreign policy, strictly based on narrow national interests and not some utopian, open-ended, idealistic endeavor to change the course of history.



An article (a satire) by Hans Fiene titled "Church of England's Transgender Baptisms Blaze Trail for 3 More Blasphemous Rites" was posted at thefederalist.com on Dec. 20, 2018. Following is the article.

Note: Ever the ecumenical fellow, throughout my life, I have made a multitude of friends from a variety of faith traditions. After learning that the Church of England has offered congregations some guidelines for affirming transgender identities, I was flummoxed. So I sought my progressive Anglican priest friend, Victoria Vivian Jambutter, hoping she might explain what's happening across the pond. What follows are the thoughts and predictions of Rev. Jambutter, who is a totally real person.

Wonderful news, lads, ladies, and gender-nonconforming sentient organisms!

As Helena Horton put in a recent article for *The Telegraph*, "the Church of England has encouraged its clergy to create baptism-style ceremonies for transgender people to welcome them into the Anglican faith."

Or, to state things a bit more thoroughly, the Church of England has released some guidelines for using a ceremony known as the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith to indicate God's, and the church's, acceptance of those identifying as transgender.

If a man declares that he is actually a woman, the guidelines essentially say, let's augment the Affirmation of Baptismal faith in such a way as to include her new name and pronouns as an indication that both God and the Church of England accept her new identity.

"Now, wait a second," you might be asking yourself if you're one of those stuffy traditionalists who falls somewhere on the "actually Christian" spectrum of Christendom, "if the Church of England accepts Reginald's claim that he is now a she known as Regina, isn't this a gnostic rejection of the Triune God who created Reginald as a male, redeemed him as a male, and will resurrect him as a male?"

Why, yes! Yes, it is!

"Why, then," you may respond, "are Church of England progressives placing social justice inclusivity above biblical faithfulness?"

The answer is quite simple: Because that's how we resolve our religious anxiety.

Divided Christendom

Divided Christendom is a stressful thing, forcing all who dwell within it to ask themselves "How do I know that my group is right instead of one of the other ones?"

There are many ways to answer this question.

- Catholics resolve this anxiety by pointing to the pope and saying, "The Catholic Church is the true church because it's the only church that has him."
- Baptists point to the Bible and say, "the Baptist Church is the right one because we teach what the Bible really teaches."
- For progressive Christians like me, however, the purpose of Christianity is not so much to find God in his supposed representative on earth or in his unchanging word but by moving beyond the bigotry of the apostles.

Christianity, you see, is not about faithfulness. It's about evolution. For progressives, the best way to convince ourselves that we are the most evolved Christians is to embrace every sin that's condemned by the fundamentalist fuddy-duddies around us.

This is why we progressives in the Church of England embraced women's ordination in the 1990s, despite St. Paul prohibiting it. It's why we stuck it to St. Paul again and embraced gay marriage a few years ago. It's why we've casually swatted away that whole "male and female He created them" bit from Genesis 1 in order to embrace the chief tenet of genderism, the new progressive religion that's all the rage these days.

It's also why we're not done tweaking old liturgies or inventing new ones to embrace the culture war's latest sin du jour. At some point, we'll get bored with the transgender cause. We'll look for another morally marginalized group to defend. When we find it, we'll give them our complete and unconditional acceptance in an attempt to convince ourselves that we're far better at following Jesus than the cretins who still believe the stuff he said.

In fact, I'll be so bold as to make a few predictions. Here are three new ceremonies to expect from the Church of England (and other progressive church bodies) in the years to come.

1. Holy Throupling

"God instituted marriage as the union of one man and one woman for the purpose of procreation." This mindset was responsible for the patriarchal oppression that hindered human progress for millennia. But after God liberated us from biology through the birth control pill, things began to move in the right direction.

First, we realized that marriage and childbearing needn't be a package deal.

Next, we realized that there was no reason to exclude same-sex couples from receiving God's marital blessing.

But now, through the prophets of Eros, God is revealing that marriage need not be limited to two people. Ladies, if you want to transfer sexual duties to a new husband after you cease being attracted to your stay-at-home, child-raising husband, you deserve our praise, not our condemnation.

You have the right to make marriage in your own image. And in a few years, when we need to ease our "Maybe I'm a heretic" anxiety with another "True Christianity Is Woke Christianity" pill, we'll be happy to bless your "he + he + me = we" relationship through a rite known as Holy Throupling.

It will be a beautiful ceremony, quite similar to that of Holy Matrimony. The only major difference will be leaving out the "if anyone objects" bit in order to prevent your parents, neighbors, or any random passersby from screaming about your moral bankruptcy and the death of western civilization during the service.

2. Blessing Of Incestuous Relationships

According to the apostles and prophets, God expects us to avoid a laundry list of sexual taboos—adultery, sex before marriage, pornography, lust. Evolved Christians, on the other hand, confess the truth that God has revealed through the sexual revolution, namely, that you can do whatever you want, as long as the other person (or people) are up for it (or down with it).

Because “consent” is our only sexual ethic, and because we’re always looking to intensify our progressive credentials by embracing something that Christianity has always opposed, in a few years, expect us to have a service blessing the sexual union of two (or three or 25) closely related, consenting adults.

If you’re thinking to yourself, “Hang on a minute, incest is almost universally reviled. There’s no way the Church of England would embrace it,” you haven’t been paying attention to how we progressives fight the culture wars.

All we had to do was shout “bigot” at people for a few years and, voila, now we pretend that a 6 feet 4 inches tall man rocking breast implants, size 16 pumps, and a five o’clock shadow is the paragon of female beauty.

The same trick will work with regard to incestuous relationships. In a decade or so, a sizable chunk of English folks will obediently praise the bravery of brother-sister couples and the like.

When this happens, the Church of England will gladly welcome them into our congregations, inviting them to pledge loyalty to their lover from the same mother.

3. Fur Baby Dedications

It’s high time the Church of England moved beyond its idolatry of the traditional family and embraced all kinds of households, including those where pets take on the role traditionally filled by human offspring.

“Hold on a moment,” you might be thinking. “Shouldn’t we see procreation as a good thing? Doesn’t Psalm 127 state ‘Behold, children are a heritage from the Lord?’ ”

Why, yes! Yes, it does! But if you had a bachelor’s in Ancient Palestinian Grievance Studies, as I do, you’d realize that the psalmist doesn’t identify the species of the children in question. It could be human children, but it’s just as likely that she’s referring to dogs, cats, or emotional support peacocks.

Also, in many ways, fur babies are a far more ethical choice than traditional children. They’re less destructive to the environment, less burdensome on taxpayers, and far more easily euthanized after birth, should they become a burden.

On account of this, we progressives will eventually want to signal our moral superiority by welcoming the puppies or piglets of our non-procreating parishioners into the family of God.

Granted, we won’t baptize the little fuzzballs. Out of love for the powerless traditionalists in the Church of England, we’ll compromise with them by

inventing a new ceremony that just as effectively violates their beliefs without technically desecrating one of the sacraments Christ instituted.

So, in the near future, get ready for another innovation, a ceremony known as the Dedication of a Fur Baby.

Of course, that's presuming that the Church of England still exists in the near future—hardly a safe assumption.

In every church body, whenever we progressives cast off our dogma to impress the secular world, it drives away far more people than it draws in, leaving us with precious little to do besides using the sacred space our pious ancestors left us for abortion advocacy photo ops and the occasional birthday bash for God-hating, self-worshipping pop stars.

But don't worry. It doesn't matter if our pews are empty. You see, building the First Church of Wokery isn't our way of doing evangelism. It's our way of doing therapy.

And it won't bother us a bit if no one shows up on Sunday morning, as long as we've successfully convinced ourselves that our doctrine is pure and our hearts are acceptable to our Father in Heaven. Or Mother in Heaven. Or however God identifies.

If only we had some way to find out Zir preferred pronouns.



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

-
- A video and an article titled "Dramatic Video Shows Tsunami Crashing Into Rock Concert [in Indonesia's Sunda Strait]" were posted at aljazeera.com on Dec. 23, 2018.
 - An article titled "News Wrap: Tsunami Death Toll Climbs to 429" was posted at pbs.org on Dec. 25, 2018.
 - An article by Mollie Hemingway titled "Trump's Syria Withdrawal Policy Is Correct, But Communicated Horribly" was posted at thefederalist.com on Dec. 21, 2018.
 - An article by James Carstensen titled "Turkey Gears Up for Anti-Kurdish Offensive Once US Troops Leave Syria" was posted at cnsnews.com on Dec. 26, 2018.
 - An article by Nektaria Stamouli titled "Recent Explosions in Greece Spark Worries of Emerging Urban Violence" was posted at wsj.com on Dec. 27, 2018.
 - An article by Faycal Benhassain titled "French 'Yellow Vests' Now Mulling Registering As a Political Party to Run in 2019 Euro Elections" was posted at cnsnews.com on Dec. 26, 2018.

- An article titled "Boy [Age 12] Survives 40-Minute Burial After Avalanche in French Alps" was posted at rte.ie on Dec. 26, 2018.
- An article by Timothy Meads titled "Venezuelan Women Forced to Sell Hair, Sex and Breast Milk to Escape Socialism" was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 23, 2018.
- An article by Joey Miller titled "Venezuela Earthquake: Carabobo Rocked by 5.6 Quake" was posted at express.co.uk on Dec. 27, 2018.
- A Reuters article titled "China to Remove Some Import, Export Tariffs Including Alternative Feed Meals" was posted at reuters.com on Dec. 24, 2018.
- A Reuters article titled "China Imports Zero U.S. Soybeans in November for First Time Since Trade War Started" was posted at reuters.com on Dec. 24, 2018.
- An article by Julian Gehman titled "Are the Chinese and Russians Listening to Your Phone Calls?" was posted at thehill.com on Dec. 24, 2018.



An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled "Feds Spent More in 1 Month on Food Stamps Than Trump Wants for Year on Wall" was posted at cnsnews.com on Dec. 21, 2018. Following is the article.

The federal government spent more money on the food stamp program in October, which was the first month of fiscal 2019, than President Donald Trump now wants the Congress to approve for the border wall for the entirety of fiscal 2019.

In October, according to the Monthly Treasury Statement, the federal government spent \$5,892,000,000 on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), which is also known as the food stamp program.

In November, according to the statement for that month, the federal government spent another \$5,428,000,000 on the food stamp program, bringing the total so far for fiscal 2019 (after only two months) to \$11,320,000,000—or an average of \$5,660,000,000 per month.

In fiscal 2018, which ran through September, the federal government spent \$68,493,000,000 on the food stamp program.

By contrast, the continuing resolution passed yesterday by the House of Representatives, which includes the money Trump wants for the wall, provides \$5,710,357,000 for that purpose.

That is \$181,643,000 less than the federal government spent on the food stamp program in the month of October alone and about one twelfth (or 8.3 percent) of the amount the government spent on the food stamp program for all of fiscal 2018.

The \$5,710,357,000 that the continuing resolution passed by the House provides for the border wall is for fiscal 2019 but stipulates that it is "to remain available until September 30, 2019."

On the Senate floor on Wednesday, Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer (D.-N.Y.) said that \$5 billion for the wall is “exorbitant.

“The president held out for \$5 billion for his wall, at the exorbitant cost of \$31 million per mile, straight from the American taxpayer’s pocket,” said Schumer.



An editorial titled “Remember Your Rights And How We Got Them” was posted at news-journal (Longview, Texas) on Dec. 19, 2018. Following is the article.

In the hustle and bustle of our preparations for Christmas on Dec. 25, we tend to forget the significance of Dec. 15.

Not sure what we’re talking about? Dec. 15 is Bill of Rights Day, the anniversary of the day in 1791 when our Founding Fathers ratified the first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

Unfortunately, far too many Americans know little about the history of the Bill of Rights and struggle to identify the amendments, which define what it means to be American. They guarantee our freedoms of religion, speech, press, to peaceably assemble and petition our government, and protect our right to bear arms, our private property rights, our right to a fair trial, and our right against unreasonable searches and seizures.

In short, the Bill of Rights is a convenient list showing how the basic rights of U.S. citizens are protected against their own federal government.

If you haven’t, please read them. If you have, read them again. We will paraphrase them here:

- Congress can’t pass any law about your religion or keep you from practicing that religion. Congress can’t restrict what you say or publish. If you want the government to change something, citizens can gather peacefully and express their thoughts as a group.
- You can own and carry weapons.
- Soldiers can’t live in your house, unless Congress approves it during wartime.
- You, your house or your possessions can’t be searched unless a judge cites a specific probable cause.
- You can’t go on trial for a serious crime unless a jury says there’s enough evidence. If you’re found innocent, the government can’t retry you. You don’t have to say anything during your trial. You can’t be punished unless a jury convicts you. Unless the government compensates you fairly, it can’t take your possessions.
- If you’re arrested, either you get a quick public trial or the government can’t unfairly detain you. A jury of your peers can help try you, and you get

a careful explanation of what you're accused of and who's accusing you. And the government provides you a lawyer.

- You have the right to a jury in a civil case, too.
- Excessive bail or fines, and cruel and unusual punishment, are prohibited.
- You have other rights, even if they're not spelled out in the Constitution.
- Any power not specifically given to Congress rests with the states or the people.

All that sounds obvious, doesn't it? Not so in other countries (North Korea, Iran and Venezuela jump to mind) where citizens wear yokes of oppression instead of shields of protective freedoms.

Please don't take those precious amendments for granted. And don't forget them, either. Too many people already have.

A survey last year by the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg Public Policy Center found 37 percent of Americans couldn't name any of the five First Amendment rights. Almost half correctly identified the freedom of speech but none of the others (religion, press, peaceable assembly, right to petition).

How sad. Think about the last political or religious opinion you posted on social media. Would you have the freedom to do that in China? Or Saudi Arabia?

You have that freedom here—and many more. Take some time during this festive season to cherish that fact.



An article by Walter Williams titled "Disparities Galore" was posted at jewish-worldreview.com on Dec. 26, 2018. Following is the article.

Much is made about observed differences between sexes and among races. The nation's academic and legal elite try to sell us on the notion that men and women and people of all races should be proportionally represented in socio-economic characteristics.

They make statements such as "Though African Americans and Hispanics make up approximately 32 percent of the US population, they (constituted) 56 percent of all incarcerated people in 2015" and "20 percent of Congress is women. Only 5 percent of CEOs are."

These differences are frequently referred to as disparities.

Legal professionals, judges, politicians, academics and others often operate under the assumption that we are all equal. Therefore, inequalities and disparities are seen as probative of injustice. Thus, government must intervene, find the cause and engineer a policy or law to eliminate the injustice.

Such a vision borders on lunacy. There's no evidence anywhere or at any time in human history that shows that but for some kind of social injustice, people would be proportionally represented across a range of socio-economic attributes by race and sex.

Indeed, if there is a dominant feature of mankind, it's that we differ significantly over a host of socio-economic characteristics by race, sex, ethnicity and nationality. The differences have little or nothing to do with any sort of social injustice or unfair treatment.

Let's examine some racial, ethnic and sex disparities with an eye toward identifying the injustice involved. We might also ponder what kind of policy recommendation is necessary to correct the disparity.

- Jews constitute no more than 3 percent of the U.S. population but are 35 percent of American Nobel Prize winners.

As of 2017, Nobel Prizes had been awarded to 902 individuals worldwide. Though Jews are less than 2 percent of the world's population, 203, or 22.5 percent, of the Nobel Prizes were awarded to Jews. Proportionality would have created 18 Jewish Nobel laureates instead of an "unfair" 203.

What should Congress and the United Nations do to "correct" such a disparity?

Should the Nobel committees be charged with racism?

Jews are not the only people taking more than their "fair share" of things.

- Blacks are 13 percent of the U.S. population but, in some seasons, have been as high as 84 percent of NBA players. Compounding that "injustice," blacks are the highest-paid basketball players and win nearly all of the MVP prizes.

- Blacks are also guilty of taking 67 percent, an "unfair" share, of professional football jobs. Blacks are in the top salary category in every offensive and defensive position except quarterback. But let's not lull ourselves into complacency. How often do you see a black NFL kicker or punter?

- Laotian, Samoan and Vietnamese women have the highest cervical cancer rates in the United States.

- The Pima Indians of Arizona have the highest reported prevalence of diabetes of any population in the world.

- Tay-Sachs disease favors Ashkenazi Jews.

- Cystic fibrosis haunts white people.

- Blacks of West African ethnic origin have the highest incidence of sickle cell anemia.

- The prevalence of prostate cancer is lower in men of South Asian ethnicity than in the general population.

- Black American men have the highest prostate cancer rates of any racial or ethnic group in the United States.

- Black males are also 30 percent likelier to die from heart disease than white men.

There are some highly fatal sex disparities.

- An Australian study found that sharks are nine times likelier to attack and kill men than they are women.

- Another disturbing sex disparity is that despite the fact that men are 50 percent of the U.S. population and so are women, men are struck by lightning six times as often as women. Of those killed by lightning, 82 percent are men.

There are loads of other disparities based upon physical characteristics, but it would take a fool to believe that we are all equal and any difference between us is a result of some kind of social injustice that begs for a societal remedy.

The only kind of equality consistent with liberty is equality before the law—which doesn't require that people be in fact equal.



An article by Carl Jackson (a black journalist) titled "It's LeBron James Who Has the 'Slave Mentality' " was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 27, 2018. Following is the article.

Lebron James has it too good. If he's ever pulled over by cops, chances are they'll ask him for his autograph, not his ID. If he believes NFL team owners are comparable to slave masters that would make the players slaves. If that's the case, someone please tell me where to go to change my name to Kunta Kinte.

Lebron James is either a racist or he's an elitist that feels so guilty that he's amassed so much wealth and fame that he needs to invent ways to relate to average black people. Personally, I suspect it's the latter.

If you haven't heard by now, the NBA superstar and mogul stuck his foot in his mouth last Friday on his HBO show called "The Shop." Here's what he said:

"In the NFL they just got a bunch of old, white men owning teams and they got that 'slave mentality.' And it's like, this is my team. You do what the f**k I tell ya'll to do, or we get rid of y'all." Huh?!

Apparently, Lebron is upset that the league adopted rules that prevented players from kneeling on the sideline and expressing themselves politically during game time after the Colin Kaepernick debacle caused NFL ratings to dip. Lebron's comments were asinine, uninformed and racist. Again, they're also illustrative of how out-of-touch he is with everyday people. Many of whom are NFL fans.

Lebron received backlash over his comments. After all, can you name a single corporation outside of the NFL or the NBA that has produced more black

millionaires in America? Many of their players will earn more in one season of football than most couples will make in a lifetime.

Here's some perspective:

- The NFL's minimum salary is \$465K annually based on the players experience. That's nearly eight times more than the median household income of \$59K.
- Furthermore, the average NFL player salary in 2017 was \$2.7 million. That's nearly forty-six times the median household income in the U.S.
- Therefore, NFL players that remain in the league for the average career length of just 3 years, making the minimum salary of \$465K, will earn more within those 3 years than the average American household earns in over twenty years.
- Furthermore, unlike slaves, NFL players get to choose their profession, they're not beat with whips by their owners for non-compliance and they get paid handsomely for their work. Again, where can I sign up for that gig?

When you consider the numbers above, it's clear that it isn't NFL team owners who are guilty of holding on to a "slave mentality." It's LeBron James himself who has the slave mentality because he wants us to believe that black men that are college educated and that are a part of the top income earners in America are victims. Give us a break!

What makes an icon like LeBron James act like a victim and use the race card so readily?

Can you imagine the positive impact he'd have on race relations in America if he used his platform to unite us on issues?

There was no need to criticize NFL team owners by implying they're slave masters? The NFL operates like any other business. Besides, there are plenty of white men in the NFL that don't get guaranteed contracts and they're given minimum contracts too.

Is that racism? Of course not!

The truth is LeBron has been blinded by his social justice warrior glasses to the point he can't see straight.

As I mentioned earlier, America has been so good to LeBron James that he has to find reasons to be mad at white America in a feeble attempt to relate to poor blacks.

The problem is, he'll never relate to most blacks because of his God-given ability to play basketball better than most that ever played the game. Not to mention, he's so rich that he's isolated from the struggles that average people go through. And that's okay.

But seriously, how hard is it to understand that it's not a good look for the NFL when players kneel during the national anthem while our troops are dying on the battlefield to protect their rights to do so?

Never mind the fact soldiers earn a fraction of what NFL players do.

The case can be made that NFL team owners were protecting the earning potential of their players by putting a stop to the kneeling nonsense. Kneelers alienated half of their fans!

Many fans, like myself, stopped watching the NFL altogether because we were sick and tired of the sport being politicized. The NFL used to be an escape from the troubles of life that brought Americans together regardless of race, politics or wallet size.

I don't know of anyone who's against paying NFL players more money. But we're not the owners!

And that's not a racial conversation! It's a business conversation!

If America is ever going to grow past our racial divides, we need to bring serious brokers to the table to have the hard discussions. Although I respect LeBron James, and I'll defend his right to say whatever he wants, he isn't one of those people.



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "Let the Battle Royal Begin" was posted at patriotpost.us on Dec. 22, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

It was odd to hear a couple of talking heads on Fox handicapping the 2020 Democratic primaries the other evening and declaring Robert O'Rourke the front-runner.

The reason it struck me as odd isn't because he recently lost the Texas Senate election to Ted Cruz. Texas, after all, is big, but it's not the entire nation. After all, a conservative like Cruz couldn't get elected in most places, whereas O'Rourke would surely have won if he'd been able to run in a great many other states.

What struck me as peculiar about the conclusion the two pundits came to was that they explained that unlike Elizabeth Warren, who has advanced herself over the years by passing herself off as a Cherokee, O'Rourke was, of all things, "authentic."

Because the interviewer didn't follow up with the obvious question, I was left to wonder by what conceivable standard they could determine the authenticity of someone named Robert Patrick O'Rourke who called himself "Beto" during the campaign in the hope of convincing Hispanic voters in Texas that he was one of their own.

I mean, just how stupid would someone have to be to believe that someone with a name one would normally associate with being the archbishop of Boston was in fact Mexican?

■ Entirely of Democrats

Although we have been led by the Democrats and their puppets in the media to believe that Robert Mueller is a registered Republican and as pure as the driven snow, how is it that he went out of his way to invite skepticism of his investigation by putting together a team composed entirely of Democrats? And not just Democrats, but Democrats who had contributed to Hillary Clinton's campaign. You would have thought that Mueller would at least have tried to conceal his bias by sprinkling in a few actual Republicans who might have kicked in a few bucks to the Trump war chest.

It certainly wouldn't be allowed to empanel a jury in a criminal case that was so openly biased against the defendant and let there be no mistake that the target of this two-year fiasco is none other than Donald J. Trump, although it's looking more and more like the best that these great white witch hunters can do is bring down a few of the more vulnerable members of the herd, such as Paul Manafort, George Papadopoulos, Michael Flynn and Michael Cohen.

■ Over-population

It wasn't that long ago that liberals used to be extremely concerned about over-population and the negative effect it would have on the environment and our quality of life. But that was when any increase in the population would be the result of Americans having babies.

Their concern ebbed enormously once the increase was attributed to the numbers of Latinos sneaking into the country.

■ Seeking Democrat voters

It wasn't that they had a special fondness for people speaking Spanish, but, instead, was based on the fact that 70% of them could be relied upon to vote for Democrats.

It was as if, overnight, all those heart-felt concerns about air quality, water purity, noise pollution, traffic and over-crowding, vanished, all thanks to political partisanship.

■ Welfare state

No longer did dedicated environmentalists cry themselves to sleep at night over the plight of snail darters and the rest of the endangered critters. Instead, there was a constant drum beat of lies, telling us how fortunate we were that so many millions of low-skilled or no-skilled ignoramuses were dying to come here and become beneficiaries of the welfare state. The claim was that they somehow represented a boon to the U.S. economy, even though they had quite recently represented a disaster to the economies of Mexico, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua and El Salvador.

■ Criticizing Christians instead of Muslims

Thanks to Tucker Carlson, I now know that whereas in the past, liberals were content to attack schools for calling Christmas vacations Christmas vacations,

instead of winter breaks; threatening to boycott companies whose employees persisted in wishing customers a Merry Christmas; and taking cities and towns to court for placing Christmas creches in public spaces; they have broadened their targets to include the following: Rudolph the Red-Nosed Reindeer; the song "Baby, it's Cold Outside"; the traditional colors of the season, red and green; and now, even candy canes.

Why candy canes, you might very well ask? It's because they are shaped like the letter "j," which—and don't pretend you don't know—stands for Jesus.

The reason behind all this unmitigated folly isn't that in a Christian (though not theocratic) country that was founded on Judeo-Christian verities, there are a certain number of rational atheists.

Rather, it's because in a nation of 320 million people, it's inevitable that there will be a large number of loud-mouthed idiots who just want to ruin things for the rest of us, including the kids.

It can't help but make you wonder why these God-hating pinheaded party poopers never raise a stink about Ramadan or Kwanzaa. Could it be they fear having their asses handed to them by belligerent Muslims and blacks, but figure the cheek-turners will merely voice their frustration?

■ Politicians prosper

Sen. Dick Durbin, in explaining why President Trump hasn't leaped aboard the bandwagon in condemning Saudi Arabia for killing Jamal Khashoggi: "I don't know any president or administration that has profited the way this current one has."

It led me to question if Sen. Durbin might be suffering from the early onset of Alzheimer's. For whereas the President is obviously going easy on the Saudis for both economic and security reasons beneficial to both the U.S. and Israel, it was the Clintons who during Obama's reign of destruction sucked up tens of millions of dollars from Russia, thanks to over-compensated speeches and bribes paid in exchange for the Uranium One deal.

The Clintons, by the way, were equal opportunity profiteers, taking in about \$30 million from these very same Saudis during Hillary's four-year tenure as Secretary of State, and Bill topped that during his presidency when he accepted untold millions from China in exchange for delivering technology the Chinese didn't have to bother stealing.



An article by Burt Prelutsky titled "Churchill & Carlson" was posted at patriotpост.us on Dec. 24, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

I've had Elizabeth Warren on my mind lately because she is said to be questioning her chances of garnering her party's presidential nomination in 2020 because of the controversy over her ludicrous claim to be a Cherokee. She feels it has wrecked her chances of obtaining the support of minorities.

That would certainly set her back in spite of Deval Patrick's dropping out of the race because, in spite of their playing coy about their intentions, Cory Booker and Kamala Harris are definitely seeking the brass ring.

So far as Warren's cultural appropriation goes, passing herself off as an Indian definitely got her a professorship at Harvard, where a premium is placed on certain minority groups; all of them in fact, except the Chinese.

Why anyone would be particularly invested in having a Cherokee represented on the faculty is something that only virtue-signaling ignoramuses who have managed to transform an Ivory Tower into an ivy-covered Tower of Babel can explain.

In any case, while pondering the mysterious success of Senator Warren, I suddenly flashed on another phony Indian, Ward Churchill.

As you may recall, the publicity junkie came to fame when he wrote an article in which he blamed America for the attack on 9/11, claiming that it was our foreign policy that had brought the chickens home to roost. In the piece, he referred to the victims as the "technocratic corps" who worked in the World Trade Center, labeling them "little Eichmann's."

Naturally, when the University of Colorado (Boulder), where his courses dealt with the mistreatment of Native Americans by the U.S. government, investigated him for fraudulent research (aka plagiarism), and concluded he was guilty and fired him, Churchill naturally accused them of punishing him for his intemperate remarks.

He sued the school for unlawful termination. Two years later, a Denver jury actually ruled in his favor, but only awarded him one dollar in damages. The university appealed the decision, and later that year, a District Court judge reversed the decision and returned the dollar to its proper owners.

Churchill then spent the next four years fighting and losing in one court after another. The farce ended in 2013, when the Supreme Court declined to hear the case.

He fared no better when, at the age of 56, in 2003, he declared himself to be Creek and Muscogee on his father's side, Cherokee on his mother's. At various times, the percentages of his various ancestries changed. Sometimes he insisted he was one-eighth Creek and one-sixteenth Cherokee; other times, he claimed to be three-sixteenths Cherokee. But, he never quit identifying himself as an authentic Native American, even when the various tribes branded him a fraud.

In his defense, he said: "I never claimed to be goddamned Chief Sitting Bull!"

More like Chief Cock and Bull.

■ Tucker Carlson

I happen to like Tucker Carlson, although, as I have mentioned, I could do without a lot of his stupid time-wasting guests, and I am getting a little tired of that phony laugh he adopts when someone like Richard Goodstein, Eric Swalwell, Chris Hahn, Ethan Bearman or Kathy Areu, says something extraordinarily dumb.

Still, I credit him with providing the likes of Mark Steyn, Heather MacDonald, Dan Bongino, Mollie Hemingway, Tammy Bruce, Jonathan Turley, Brit Hume, Mike Rowe, a megaphone on a somewhat regular basis.

I also appreciate the fact that he focuses on such matters as the border crisis, China's villainy, the despots of Silicon Valley and the fraudulent nature of the Robert Mueller investigation.

But until Nancy Thorner called it to my attention, I had no idea he was so antithetical towards President Trump. But if we can assume that nothing was lost in translation, I found the interview he gave to the German-language weekly, *Die Weltwoche*, during a recent visit to Switzerland, exposed Carlson as a Never-Trumper in sheep's clothing.

Urs Gehwiger, an editor with the weekly, opened the interview by asking Carlson what he thought about Trump's first two years in office.

Carlson replied that he can't stomach Trump's self-aggrandizing and boasting. The truth is, neither can I. I also disapprove of Trump's adultery and his often-boorish comments.

But I think that Carlson was way off base when in response to Gehwiger's asking him if he thought Trump had kept his campaign promises, the usually verbose Carlson said, "No."

When prompted by Gehwiger, Carlson expanded: "His chief promises were that he would build the wall, defund Planned Parenthood and repeal Obamacare, and he hasn't done any of those things," and attributed Trump's failures to "his inability to retain focus."

He added that he didn't think Congress or his agencies supported him. Well, duh, as we used to say in the fourth grade. But instead of laying the blame on Congress and those corrupt agencies, Carlson said: "It's mainly Trump's fault that he hasn't achieved what he promised. He knows very little about the legislative process, hasn't learned anything, hasn't surrounded himself with people that can get it done, hasn't done all the things you need to do."

My reaction is that I'm surprised that Carlson, who generally supports Trump on his show, would wait until he was several thousand miles away from his desk to dump on the President. It strikes me as being as hypocritical as Barack Obama, who made it a practice to demean America whenever he was on foreign soil and trying to curry favor with those who shared his true feelings about this country.

It also seems stupidly myopic. For one thing, it's not for want of trying that Trump hasn't been able to carry through on those three particular promises.

It's up to Congress to defund Planned Parenthood, just as it is up to Congress to finance the building of the border wall. Trump would have at least been able to repeal Obamacare if John McCain hadn't crawled out of his sick bed and fly to Washington in order to cast the deciding vote against the repeal.

It is also short-sighted and mean of Carlson to ignore the other promises that Trump was able to keep, in some cases because he didn't require Congress's cooperation.

I refer to the following.

1. Cutting of business-killing EPA regulations.
2. Cutting federal taxes.
3. Moving the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.
4. Revising trade treaties.
5. Greenlighting oil pipelines.
6. Upgrading the military.
7. Pulling us out of the Paris Climate Accords and the Iran nuclear deal.
8. Defending religious rights.
9. Doing his best to improve the V.A.
10. Seating two conservatives on the Supreme Court.
11. Trying to seriously slow the flow of incoming Muslims before they have the opportunity to commit their usual mischief.

Frankly, unlike Carlson, I find it an impressive array of kept promises, especially in the wake of earlier broken promises by presidents who swore there would be no new taxes; that he had not had sex with a White House intern; and that if we liked our doctors and our health insurance, we could keep them both.

We can only hope that Tucker Carlson was temporarily discombobulated by a combination of Switzerland's high altitude and perhaps a tad too much schnapps.



An article by Tom Elliott titled "18 Most Mortifying Media Moments of 2018" was posted at grabien.com on Dec. 19, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

In the second year of the Trump Administration, the media went all in.

This was the year when reporters, in the race to claim a scalp, began loosening the usual boundaries governing journalism.

It was the year "corroborating evidence" became the most hotly contested term in America, Michael Avenatti was unleashed on an unconsenting public,

on-air profanity was normalized, and reporters worked overtime as Democratic cheerleaders, frequently urging lawmakers to deliver them the media event of the millennium—the impeachment of President Trump.

Whatever Trump was for, the media came out against. When Trump nominated Brett Kavanaugh to become the next justice on the Supreme Court, the media went to war, digging through every trace of his existence, even combing through notes he sent in high school—anything that might turn up the silver bullet that sank his nomination.

There was so much, in fact, that we had expand our normal custom of compiling the “Top 10 Most Mortifying Media Moments” and expand it to a more befitting “Top 18.”

So now, without any further ado, here are the 18 most mortifying media moments from 2018.mmm

(18) Beto O’Rourke Is a Rock Star Who’s Making People Horny (July-Nov., 2018)

Starting circa July, the media came down with a fever, and the only prescription was more Beto O’Rourke. The major media effectively offered Beto an open-invite to receive a glowing profile whenever his schedule permitted. He was featured on the cover of virtually every publication covering politics, and likewise received effusive praise in the broadcast media. In one representative moment, ABC’s Paula Faris, traveling with Beto on the campaign trail, marveled at his adoring fans and gushed aloud, “You’re a rock star!” Things got so heated, in fact, that the Daily Dot “reported” that an Instagram video of Beto making dinner was “making people horny.”

(17) Cheering on North Korea at the Olympics (Feb. 10, 2018)

The American media went gaga for the sister of North Korea’s dictator, Kim Yo-jong, a younger sibling to Kim Jong Un, and the North Korean cheer squad, during the 2018 Winter Olympics. Yo-jong, who attended the games on behalf of North Korea, is the deputy director of the Propaganda and Agitation Department of North Korea’s Worker’s Party and a member of the Politburo.

CNN offered the most excited praise, publishing an article titled, “Kim Jong Un’s sister is stealing the show at the Winter Olympics.” The article began, “If ‘diplomatic dance’ were an event at the Winter Olympics, Kim Jong Un’s younger sister would be favored to win gold.” The Washington Post was likewise smitten with Kim Jung Un’s sister, likening her to the “Ivanka Trump of North Korea.”

The North Korean cheer squad, who appeared at both the joint South/North Korean women hockey team’s game and the joint Korean speedskating performance, also received glowing reviews in the American media. A Wall Street Journal article triumphed: “North Korean Cheerleaders: 100 Olympic Stars Are Born.” The article describes the cheer squad as the highlight of the speedskating event: “The surprise came when the South Koreans on the ice were upstaged from the stands by over 100 of their neighbors from over the border, the North Korean cheer squad.” During NBC’s coverage of the Olympics,

reporter Mary Carillo excitedly described watching the North Korean cheer squad. "I've never seen anything like that," she said. "It was a remarkable scene."

(16) CNN Harassed a Random Old Lady for . . . Doing the Same Thing CNN Did (Feb, 2018)

For some reason CNN at one point tracked down a senior citizen Facebook user who, apparently, shared a meme that had originally been posted by a Russian troll farm. CNN's Drew Griffin tracked her down and essentially accused the unsuspecting grandma of acting as an agent of a foreign government. It was painfully awkward for her, for Griffin, and for all of the viewers at home. But what was especially ironic was that the woman's "crime" was doing . . . exactly what CNN itself had itself done: inadvertently promoted an event in part organized by the aforementioned Russian troll farm. After Trump won the 2016 election, CNN enthusiastically reported from an anti-Trump "Love Rally" in New York City, which Robert Mueller later reported to have been organized by Russians.

(15) Networks Let Michael Avenatti Use Them to Spread Smears (Sept. 26, 2018).

After celebrity TV attorney Michael Avenatti began claiming he had a secret client who would upend Brett Kavanaugh's confirmation process, the media effectively extended him an open invitation to spread his scurrilous smears. Once he unveiled his client, Julie Swetnick, and her bizarre claims of drugs, drinking, and gang rape, he was invited onto ABC, CNN, MSNBC, where he presented no evidence against Kavanaugh, but helped add to the circus atmosphere by challenging Kavanaugh to a lie detector test. NewsBusters reported that Avenatti was treated to more than 170 interviews from March to November. CNN's media reporter, Brian Stelter, even promoted Avenatti as a "serious" contender for the 2020 Democratic nomination.

NBC tried to corroborate Avenatti's gang-rape claims but could not, yet the network let the accuser spread them anyway. Later, when fame-thirsty attorney was arrested for beating up his girlfriend and was evicted from his office for non-payment and was sued by his former partners for refusing to pay previous settlements . . . the media lost all interest in Michael Avenatti.

(14) Steve Schmidt Loses Touch with Reality, MSNBC Keeps Inviting Him on Anyway (Jan.-Dec., 2018)

Like many others in the media, the Trump Era has severed Steve Schmidt from any sense of perspective. His appearances on MSNBC can now be reliably counted on for serving up hefty portions of hilariously detached hyperbole. Schmidt, we often wonder, must surely be running out of ways to express how much he hates Trump—but somehow he keeps managing to up the ante. In September, he said of Trump: "On any given moment, the combination of his erratic behavior, his ignorance could pose a profound danger to every single person in this country and literally every inhabitant of the planet Earth." In a December segment on Michael Cohen pleading guilty to a campaign finance violation, Schmidt wondered aloud: "Look, we're at this

moment in time right now where we have enough information to sit and wonder, might this be the greatest crime in American history?"

(13) In Naked Attempt at Destroying Kavanaugh, Ronan Farrow Torches Credibility (Sept. 14-Oct. 4, 2018)

Pulitzer Prize winning journalist Ronan Farrow partnered with his New Yorker colleague Jane Mayer to publish a series of anti-Kavanaugh articles that failed every reasonable standard of journalistic fact-finding. As both Ford and the second accuser, Deborah Ramirez, first took their story to Farrow, it appeared they sought leveraging the credibility he earned in starting the #MeToo movement to compensate for their own lack of corroborating evidence. Farrow's first article on the so-called "second accuser," Deborah Ramirez, was widely panned for its elevation of an allegation that the accuser herself admitted only recalling a week before the article ran (more than 30 years after the night in question, a night during which she admits being extremely intoxicated and having only a hazy recollection of). When she first spoke to The New Yorker, she wasn't even sure Kavanaugh was responsible. However, after "assessing" her memory for five days—as the New Yorker helpfully put it—she decided Kavanaugh had exposed himself during a drunken Yale dorm party their freshman year. The article, and another that came a week later, failed to find any eyewitness accounts to buttress her claim; in fact, those who would have been in the room of such a party all denied Ramirez's account. The New York Times said it had also investigated the story, but after speaking with "dozens" of Kavanaugh's Yale classmates and failing to find a single supporting witness—and, indeed, learning that Ramirez had reportedly been asking friends if Kavanaugh had done anything wrong—the Times passed on the story. But after The New Yorker published it anyway, Farrow and Mayer went on a media tour, elevating Ramirez's unsupported claim further.

(12) CNN Goes Dumpster Diving in Bid for Russia Collusion Clues (Feb. 19, 2018)

Perhaps hoping to somehow uncover the missing link that would enable Robert Mueller to pin conspiracy charges against Trump, CNN dispatched a reporter, Matthew Chance, to St. Petersburg, Russia, to literally dig through garbage outside the infamous troll farm from which 13 Russians had recently been indicted. Unsurprisingly, this bit of intrepid reporting failed to yield any clues, but what it lacked in helpful information it more than made up for in comic relief.

(11) CNN Flies to Thailand to Interview Prostitute Who Claims to Have Dirt on Trump. (March 5, 2018)

Digging through dumpsters was hardly CNN's nadir for the year. The network also sent a reporter to Thailand, where a prostitute claimed to have the goods on the Trump camp's alleged collusion with Russia. The catch? The woman, Anastasia Vashukevich, who is also a self-described "sex coach," is imprisoned, and hoped America (and/or CNN) would offer her asylum in exchange for her story. CNN's Ivan Watson appeared miffed she wouldn't offer up any of her apparent intel without first being sprung from jail, and thus not much

came from his assignment. As of August 31st, the New York Times reported she's still in jail, but is now facing a much longer jail sentence after her bizarre bid for freedom "badly backfired."

(10) The 'Bombshells' that Turned out To Be Duds (2017 – 2018)

The overeagerness of the media to finally land on hard, incriminating evidence against Trump led many to prematurely declare minor news developments as bombshells. Even worse, many developments originally hyped as "bombshells" turned out to be . . . totally wrong (a trend that began in 2017). Here are but a few examples:

CNN reported in July that Michael Cohen told Robert Mueller that Trump knew of the infamous Trump Tower meeting in advance. Cohen's lawyers later recanted and said that's untrue, but somehow CNN never retracted or apologized for this fake "bombshell."

In another "bombshell," NBC reported that Michael Cohen's calls were being monitored, including at least one with the White House. That, however, was untrue, and the story was retracted.

Virtually every time the aforementioned Avenatti appeared on TV, he claimed he was bringing forth some new "bombshell." (Avenatti is currently fending off criminal charges for interfering with Senate business, namely that his "bombshells" were "materially false.")

(9) NBC Sat on Information that Undermined Brett Kavanaugh's Accusers—Until He Was Confirmed (Oct. 1-Oct. 23)

After the Avenatti carnival turned the Kavanaugh confirmation upside down, NBC attempted to report the bizarre claims his client was leveling. NBC spoke with a supposed corroborating witness Avenatti produced, but that woman instead debunked most of the client's claims. When confronted, Avenatti told NBC the woman debunking his client's claims was in fact his corroborating witness, but after being told she didn't corroborate anything, he shot back: "How about this, on background, it's not the same woman [as the corroborating witness]. What are you going to do with that?" There was more back and forth and the "corroborating witness" ultimately said Avenatti was lying about everything, yet despite all of this happening before Kavanaugh's confirmation vote, NBC didn't actually publish the story until weeks later. The Daily Wire published a helpful overview.

(8) After Calling for Dialing Down Rhetoric, The Media Ramped It Up

After two horrific terror attacks shortly before the midterm elections, the media reincarnated a familiar narrative: "It's time to dial down the rhetoric." Politics, they said, was becoming too hot, and people were being driven to dangerous ends. The only problem was that they didn't think this dictum ought to apply to themselves. After all, over this same two-week time span, the major media referred to Trump as "evil" no fewer than 12 times, likened him to Adolf Hitler at least 10 times, warned that Republicans risk eternal damnation for not sufficiently "taking on" Trump, and even said that the pres-

ident “poses a profound danger to . . . literally every inhabitant on Planet Earth.” MSNBC contributor Elie Mystal said Trump could be ushering in a “1,000 year reich.” And on . . . and on . . . and on . . .

(7) NYT Exclusive: As a College Student, Brett Kavanaugh May Have Once Thrown Ice (Oct. 1, 2018)

In perhaps the most widely mocked article from Kavanaugh’s confirmation process, The New York Times credulously reported on a bar fight after a UB40 concert in 1985 in which it was rumored that Kavanaugh may have thrown ice at another patron. In journalism its customary to not report on a police response when no arrest was made, but the Times ignored this custom to ostensibly help feed the narrative of Kavanaugh being an out-of-control drunk prone to sexually abusing women.

(6) CNN Goes on Profanity Bender (July 6, 2018)

For all of CNN’s talk about President Trump coarsening American culture, the network is hardly blameless. Over the last year, the station went on something like a profanity rampage, using virtually every imaginable expletive on the air. Things started after Trump was reported to have referred to some countries in Africa as “sh*tholes” in a private meeting with aides. The hosts on CNN used that an opportunity to then repeat the word, uncensored, dozens of times over the next few days. Once the seal was broken, CNN’s anchors and contributors were let loose. And “sh*t” was hardly the only obscenity CNN’s hosts voiced on air. They pretty much . . . covered the gamut, as you’ll see in the (consequently NSFW) montage above.

(5) GQ Reporter: Trump’s Radicalized More People than ISIS

While this one could have been included in the “media ramp up the rhetoric” item above, we thought it deserved its own spot, being such a bizarre TV moment that captured so much attention. After a madman shot up a Pittsburgh synagogue, GQ’s Julia Ioffe went on her own rampage, first garnering tons of attention for effectively blaming Jews for the attack, and then later accusing Trump of “radicalizing more people than ISIS.” Her comments came as many in the media attempted to paint Trump as the leader of America’s anti-Semitism movement, thus suggesting he bore responsibility for the synagogue attack.

(4) The New York Times Canvasses for Kavanaugh Opposition (Oct. 3, 2018)

In another unusual diversion from ordinary journalism, *The New York Times* began canvassing for law professors to sign an open letter opposing Kavanaugh’s nomination for the court. Unsurprisingly, they found a lot, and as the number of signatories increased, the Times triumphantly tweeted updates. We certainly can’t recall newspapers coordinating opposition campaigns during Elena Kagan or Sonya Sotomayor’s nominations, least of all The New York Times.

(3) CNN's Lemon: "The Biggest Terror Threat in This Country Is White Men"

Speaking of not dialing back the rhetoric, no one in the TV news dialed it up more than CNN's Don Lemon. In the days after Pittsburgh shooting, the night-time anchor told his colleague, Chris Cuomo, that "we have to start doing something about" the imminent terror threat from white Americans.

"We have to stop demonizing people and realize the biggest terror threat in this country is white men, most of them radicalized to the right, and we have to start doing something about them," Lemon lectured. "There is no travel ban on them. There is no ban on—you know, they had the Muslim ban. There is no white guy ban. So, what do we do about that?"

That Lemon's comments actually began with a call for greater unity created an irony that was evidently lost along the way.

(2) Media Urge Dems to Impeach Trump, Kavanaugh

Continuing a trend that began last year, the media frequently invited on Democratic lawmakers and urged them to deliver the media event of the millennium—the impeachment of President Trump. After the bid to sink Kavanaugh failed, the media likewise urged impeachment hearings against the forthcoming Supreme Court justice.

MSNBC's Alex Witt, interviewing Rep. Suzan DelBene (D-Wash.), asked if Democrats will "protect the rule of law" and seek impeachment proceedings against Kavanaugh. "Do you think it is a good move for Democrats—politically, strategically, ethically, morally—to pursue, potentially, an investigation that could lead to impeachment?" she asked.

MSNBC's Katy Tur, interviewing a California congressional candidate, Ammar Campa-Najjar, asked: "There is talk about the 'I' word, impeachment, when it comes not just the President any longer, but now Brett Kavanaugh. Is that something that you would support if you were elected to the Congress?"

After The New York Times report that President Trump wanted his Department of Justice to charge Hillary Clinton and James Comey, the media immediately seized on the story to suggest impeachment.

NBC's Ken Dilanian, the Washington Post's Carl Bernstein, and CNN's Toobin all said the story echoes the second impeachment charge brought against Richard Nixon. "Today I read the articles of impeachment against Richard Nixon," Bernstein said. "Everybody should read article 2 and how similar it is to what we've seen Trump do here."

"It opens him up to impeachment, no question about it," MSNBC contributor and former Watergate prosecutor, Jill Wine-Banks, said. Another Watergate attorney and frequent TV personality, John Dean, said Trump's behavior was straight out of a "banana republic" and was "autocratic." [Related montage]

(1) Media Turning Trump Voters into Public Enemy No. 1

But if we have to choose one moment among all of the others that should go down as the media's most mortifying of the year, we actually can't, because there were many. We're referring to the media's new tendency of taking out their anti-Trump animus on . . . his voters and supporters. Whether it was calling these Americans racist, sexist, or "Nazis," there's no question that this preoccupation with Trump is having cascading consequences in the form of a more divided America.

During the controversy over family separation at the border, CNN and MSNBC became a platform for attacking conservatives. MSNBC's Donny Deutsch said Trump supporters are the "bad guy" in America and are akin to Nazis.

"If we are working towards November, we can no longer say Trump's the bad guy," Deutsch said on Morning Joe. "If you vote for Trump, you're the bad guy. If you vote for Trump, you are ripping children from parents' arms."

He continued: "If you vote for Trump, then you, the voter, you, not Donald Trump, are standing at the border, like Nazis going, 'You here, you here.' I think we now have to flip it and it's a given, the evilness of Donald Trump. But if you vote, you can no longer separate yourself. You can't say, 'Well, he's okay, but . . .' And I think that gymnastics and that jiu-jitsu has to happen."

When news hit that some elderly Americans inadvertently shared a Facebook meme originally created in Russia, CNN tracked down one such senior citizen and harangued her on national TV. CNN likewise threatened to "dox" or publish the address, of another Trump supporter who had created a meme mocking CNN.

"All" Trump supporters are racist, CNN contributor Michaela Angela Davis, recently said: "Tens of millions of people voted for him after he showed his cards for years." When the anchor, John Berman, asked her to clarify if she's calling all Trump voters racist, she replied, "Yes, yes." Labeling almost half the country bigoted did not earn her a rebuke from the hosts or other panelist.

Frequent MSNBC guest and Hollywood filmmaker Rob Reiner said "those people who are supporting" America's immigration policy are "racist—PERIOD!"

Many conservatives this year said that frequent media invocations of "racism" and "Nazi" to describe Trump supporters risks an increase in organized harassment and violence.

When the Virginia restaurant, The Red Hen, kicked out Sarah Huckabee Sanders and her family over her affiliation with the Trump Administration, some in the media defended the provocative act. CNN's Symone Sanders, for example, endorsed the Red Hen's actions and said people "calling for civility need to check their privilege."

"I believe movements and people talking and speaking up for things, whether we're talking about the civil rights movement, whatever else," Sanders continued, "those movements should be nonviolent but not nonconfrontational."

MSNBC contributor Zerlina Maxwell likewise endorsed refusing service to conservatives.

"These policies that this administration is putting forth are intentionally cruel," she said Monday. "They are racist. It is our job as citizens to speak out against that. Now, does that mean that we are going to be violent? No. But does that mean that Sarah Sanders can have a nice quiet dinner with her family when she is taking our tax dollars to implement this policy? I don't think so."



"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.

Federal deficit

- An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled "Federal Debt Up \$1.37 Trillion Since Last December 25; \$10,743 Per Household" was posted at cnsnews.com on Dec. 24, 2018.

Finances

- An article by Michael Sheetz and John Melloy titled "Dow Dives 600 Points to Below 22,000, S & P 500 Enters Bear Market—Worst Christmas Eve Ever" was posted at cnbc.com on Dec. 24, 2018.

- A Reuters article by Lewis Krauskepf titled "Dow Notches Record Point Surge in Dramatic Rebound" was posted at reuters.com on Dec. 26, 2018.

- An article by Fred Imbert titled "Dow Rallies 1,000 Points, Logging It's Biggest Single-Day Point Gain Ever" was posted at cnbc.com on Dec. 26, 2018.

- An article by Fred Imbert titled "Dow Drops More Than 400 Points After Historic 1,000-Point Surge" was posted at cnbc.com on Dec. 26, 2018.

- An article by Julianna Rennie titled "Low Gas Prices Are Leading to Record Holiday Travel" was posted at charlotteobserver.com on Dec. 24, 2018.

- An article by Sarah Nassauer titled "U.S. Holiday Retail Sales Are Strongest in Years, Early Data Shows" was posted at wsj.com on Dec. 25, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- An article by Beth Baumann titled "Dems Are Threatened by the Possibility of a Citizen-Funded Border Wall" was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 23, 2018.

- An article by Robert Moore titled "Hundreds of Asylum Seekers Being Released on El Paso Streets Over Christmas" was posted at texasmonthly.com on Dec. 24, 2018.

- An article by Niv Elis titled "Ocasio-Cortez Sends Christmas Greeting to 'Refugee Babies in Mangers' " was posted at thehill.com on Dec. 25, 2018.

■ An article by Saager Enjeti titled "DHS Calls CDC to Investigate Growing Number of Sick Migrants" was posted at dailycaller.com on Dec. 26, 2018.

Comments about weapons

■ An article by Zachariah Bryan titled "The Plan Was to Steal Tools, Then Customers Drew Their Guns [in Maryville, Washington]" was posted at heraldnet.com on Dec. 24, 2018.

Comments about Trump support

■ An article by Jeffrey M. Jones titled "Trump Approval More Stable Than Approval for Prior Presidents" was posted at gallup.com on Dec. 21, 2018.

■ An article by Nicholas Riccardi titled "Defying Pundits, GOP Share of Latino Vote Steady Under Trump [at 32%]" was posted at apnews.com on Dec. 27, 2018.

■ An article by Kurt Schlichter titled "The War on Trump Is All About Keeping Liberals And Their Lackeys in Power" was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 27, 2018.

Comments about Trump opposition

■ An article by Jonathan Allen and Alex Seitz-Wald titled "Inside Bernie-World's War on Beto O'Rourke" was posted at nbc.com on Dec. 23, 2018.

■ An article by Brian Schwartz titled "Mike Bloomberg Prepared to Spend at Least \$100 Million on a 2020 Campaign for President If He Decides to Run" was posted at cnbc.com on Dec. 27, 2018.

■ An article by Michael R. Bloomberg titled "Trump Rings in the New Year in the Worst Possible Way" was posted at bloomberg.com on Dec. 23, 2018.

■ An article by Terry Jeffrey titled "Party of the Rich: Democrats Hold the 20 Wealthiest Congressional Districts" was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 27, 2018.

■ An article by Jeffrey M. Jones titled "Michelle Obama Ends Hillary Clinton's Run As Most Admired" was posted at gallup.com on Dec. 27, 2018.

News about the media

■ An article by L. Brent Bozell III titled "Little Migrant Girl Dies, Media Pounce" was posted at cnsnews.com on Dec. 19, 2018.

■ An article by Michael W. Chapman titled "Rev. Graham: 'News Media' Attacks on Trump As 'Vicious and Relentless'—'Sickening' " was posted at cnsnews.com on Dec. 26, 2018.

■ An article by Katie Pavlich titled "Obama Signed Stuff [Personal Items] for Troops, Too" was posted at townhall.com on Dec. 27, 2018.

General interest

■ An article by Michelle Singletary titled "Should a Megachurch Pastor Be Lamblasted for Buying His Wife a \$200,000 Lamborghini?" was posted at washingtonpost.com on Dec. 20, 2018.

- An article by Brooks Jarosz titled "Cannabis is a Big Hit for Christmas Gift-Giving [in California]" was posted at fox5ny.com on Dec. 24, 2018.
- An article by Ian Livingston titled "2018 Will Be the First Year With No Violent Tornadoes in the United States" was posted at washingtonpost.com on Dec. 26, 2018.
- An article by Regina Garcia Cand titled "Las Vegas to Welcome 2019 With Superstars, Fireworks Show" was posted at apnews.com on Dec. 27, 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."