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GRIFF JENKINS, FOX NEWS CHANNEL CORRESPONDENT: That does it for us. We'll see you next weekend. You might see the duck if we can save it and bring it here from --

KENNEDY, FOX NEWS CHANNEL CONTRIBUTOR: Save Wrinkle.

JENKINS: Save wrinkle.

LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN starts right now.

MARK LEVIN, FOX NEWS CHANNEL HOST: Hello, America. I'm Mark Levin and this is LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN Sunday.

Welcome.

At last night's program, I began what I call a two-part argument on why the Democratic Party is a totalitarian party, a party we've never really seen in the United States of America and not a typical American party. They've imported their ideas of Marxism, quasi-fascism, economic socialism, mostly from Europe, and in Europe, mostly from Germany.

And that's what you're seeing today with Biden, and Schumer and Hakeem Jeffries. That's what we saw with Nancy Pelosi, Barack Obama. That's what we see with our media.

So it's not a normal political party in a democratic environment. It is an autocratic party. In fact, it is a totalitarian party.

Now, as I said last night, their goal is to imprison Donald Trump. You don't bring 91 felonies in four different jurisdictions by Democrat prosecutors in mostly Democrat cities, with Obama judges, Biden judges, or Democrat elected judges if you don't mean to put somebody in prison.

I don't mean just to indict them, just to convict them. You want to put that person in prison, and they want to do it fast. Why? They want to clear the field. What are you talking about, Mark?

They actually want Joe Biden to run without a Republican opponent. This is a scenario if Donald Trump were convicted and sentenced and put in jail in November, God forbid, what would the Republicans do? How would they have a nominee? There is no convention. There's no process.

Understand America, this is what's going on. This is the logical procession of what they are trying to do. Clear the field, eliminate the Republican nominee. That is what they've been doing now for over a year. That's why they have used the most pathetic, rogue reprobate prosecutors in New York, in Atlanta, in Washington that they could possibly come up with. And don't tell me it's not coordinated. Oh, it's just happenstance.

We know it is coordinated. Joe Biden and his White House were involved in passing this on to the Justice Department at the federal level. Fani Willis and her lover, one or both, had been in communication with the White House.

The judge in the Manhattan case, was in communication with the judge in the Washington case, but they don't even actually have to have their DNA and fingerprints all over the place. They watch the news. They know what the mission is. Joe Biden tells them. Donald Trump is Hitler. If he gets elected, by God, we'll lose our country, we will lose our democracy. He'll imprison people, he must be stopped at all cost.

Message received. So our justice system has been destroyed effectively.

We have constitutional issues being litigated, because the edge of the envelope is being pushed, whether it's immunity, attorney-client privilege, whether it's the appellate processes, trying to bankrupt Trump and so forth and so on.

Well, this is the second half of the evidence that the Democratic Party is a totalitarian party. I could do a 10-part series, but I'm only going to do two.

Chuck Schumer goes to the floor of the Senate this week, you've heard about it. Now I'm going to respond to this because this is more evidence of what I'm talking about. Let's take a listen. Go.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. CHUCK SCHUMER (D-NY): The fourth major obstacle to peace is Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

As a lifelong supporter of Israel, it has become clear to me the Netanyahu coalition no longer fits the needs of Israel after October 7th.

The world has changed radically since then and the Israeli people are being stifled right now by a governing vision that is stuck in the past.

Five months into this conflict, it is clear that Israelis need to take stock of the situation and ask, must we change course?

At this critical juncture, I believe a new election is the only way to allow for a healthy and open decision-making process about the future of Israel.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

LEVIN: He says a lot more. We're not going to play at all. He tells the Israelis that if they don't have a form of coup or a new election to rid themselves of the current government, which they elected, now, once this war is over, the United States will take over and will reengineer the Middle East and determine what the Middle East will look like.

What he means by that is we will impose a two-state solution. As I speak, almost 80 percent of the Israelis oppose a two-state solution for obvious reasons that all of us know.

You will have an Iranian client state, they'll have access to missiles, they will have access to jet fighters, they'll have access to whatever they want and nobody will stop them. Certainly not Biden, and Schumer, and Blinken.

And here you have on the floor of the Senate, I must say, a Jewish senator who represents the largest population of Jews in the United States. What the hell is going on?

You have a Secretary of State who was born Jewish. What the hell is going on?

You have one of the most obsessed Israel haters at "The New York Times," Thomas Friedman, born a Jew.

And of course, you have the ownership of "The New York Times," which was Jewish, and I think through intermarriage is Lutheran or something like that.

Of course, it's not just them, plenty of Gentiles involved. But I want to read something to you very quickly.

"Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust" by David S. Wyman.

David S. Wyman was a Christian who was appalled at what he saw at "The New York Times" and had the guts to call them out. "The New York Times" at the time was owned by the Sulzberger family, still is. These are people whose ancestry, German and Jewish, but they were in the tank for Franklin Roosevelt.

Franklin Roosevelt didn't want a lot of reporting about the Holocaust, because he might actually have to do something about it. Worse, his State Department put caps on the amount of Jews who would be brought into the United States or could escaped to the United States, who were facing sure extermination, and that cap was way below the legal cap that Congress had set.

Only about 200,000 Jews came to the United States during the course of the Holocaust when hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands more were authorized by Congress. The State Department, the same State Department that Blinken runs with Islamist and others in there, that State Department was loaded with antisemites, and Franklin Roosevelt knew it.

And you had Franklin Roosevelt as the hero of the Democratic Party. He is Chuck Schumer's hero. He is Biden's hero. Everybody wants to be Franklin Roosevelt. Really interesting, isn't it?

Here's what he says in the beginning of his book: "Parts of this book are critical the American Jewish leadership in the Holocaust era. The policies of Zionist leaders are particularly questioned, in part because their movement held the greatest potential for effective Jewish action. This criticism is made reluctantly, yet it must be included if the report is to be honest and objective. Several of those leaders have since criticized their own failures in the face of the catastrophe."

What I'm doing tonight could be considered controversial and provocative. It's not intended to be. Just honest.

Each of you have your own faith or not. Some of you are Catholic, and you shake your head at what Biden does. He's the most aggressive, pro-abortion, anti-life president in our history. Yet he is Catholic, same with Nancy Pelosi. What's that all about?

And we can go down the list, right?

Well, my theory is this. You can be born a Catholic, but it doesn't mean that you're a faithful practicing Catholic. You can be born a Jew and therefore ethnically a Jew, but you're not a religious Jew. And by that, I don't mean you have to be an Orthodox Jew, you don't really practice the faith or maybe you show up at the High Holy Days and get a sugar cookie and some, you know, grape juice, but you're not really into the religion.

And so you have these conflicts, whether it's the Catholic Church, other religions of faith and then Judaism, so you can't paint with a broad brush. You have what I call the Ethnic Jews, the Schumers; you have reprobates, Marxists like Bernie Sanders who actually undermines Judaism in the state of Israel; and then you have Jews who are both ethnic, born Jews, and are practicing Jews.

The ethnic Jews like Schumer, like Thomas Friedman at "The New York Times," like Antony Blinken at the State Department despise the religious Jews. They despise the Orthodox Jews, the more conservative Jews, just like in Catholicism, and I'm not picking on any faith. I'm just giving it as an example, where the pro-abortion, anti-life radicals, who are Catholic, despise the preaching of the Catholic Church when it comes to abortion. That in my view is what's going on.

Abandonment of the Jews is what you heard when Chuck Schumer took the floor of the United States Senate. He didn't say a word to Biden and his party that we shouldn't be funding Iran, they just sent them another $10 billion indirectly, but sent it to them the same day Chuck Schumer gets to the floor and trashes the Israeli government.

Thomas Friedman has written so many articles trashing the Israeli government, trashing Benjamin Netanyahu. He is mentally unhinged and obsessed on the issue of Netanyahu as he is with other Israelis who actually represent their people.

But this is "The New York Times." The Holocaust denying, the Holocaust covering up "New York Times" that did it for ***politics***, as it is doing today. Biden? Biden is no supporter of Israel. Biden supports Israel and prime ministers when they accede to his demands. When he get them to come to him on bended knee. He did the same thing that Menachem Begin that he is doing to Bibi Netanyahu, yet he kowtows to the leaders of Iran, the bloodthirsty murderers who are trying to build a nuclear weapon, and they're going to build it, and they're going to have it. Thanks to Biden, and Blinken and Austin and the rest of this administration, because we're funding it.

Iran has gotten more money directly and indirectly, as a result of this administration's policies than Ukraine -- than Ukraine. We fight over $14 billion or $17 billion of military aid to Israel. He has given over $100 billion in aid to Iran. What have they done with it? They build up their military and their armaments. They have funded Hamas, the Houthis, Hezbollah, the PLO.

So Biden is funding terrorism. Biden is funding a regime that's building nuclear weapons, while he's putting his foot on the throat of the Israeli people and the Israeli government. I don't care what he says in public.

You know, Israel is running out of bombs and ammunition. They're trying to husband them now in case they have to go to war with Hezbollah. What's that all about? That is slime what this country this administration is doing to Israel and the Israeli people. And when Schumer goes to the floor of the Senate, and he's telling -- he is telling the Israeli people I am directing you, as Biden has, as Harris has, as Blinken, as Friedman has, to overthrow your government, to dislodge your commander-in-chief in the middle of a war they're winning. I am telling you, you do this, I'm telling you, you accept a two-state solution whether you like it or not or we will impose it from afar. We're going to organize the Arab countries, they are. We are going to organize the European countries, they are -- against you, Israel, little tiny Israel, the only force that's defending the world from Iran and the terrorists.

That's exactly what they're doing. This isn't about Bibi Netanyahu, anybody could be prime minister who stands up to this tyranny, and they'll still try to undermine them. That's the history, abandonment of the Jews. Hitler's American friends right here, "The Third Reich," "The Ivory Tower," what's going on our colleges and universities, "Buried by the Times," Mr. Friedman, that's you. "Beyond Belief," Biden, Schumer and all the rest of you. that's who you are.

Never again, Jewish people used to say, but when people like Schumer and Blinken and Friedman, never again, it is again, it's today. The enemy is not Benjamin Netanyahu. The enemy is not the state of Israel. The Israeli people are not our enemy. They are our friends, they are allies. They have supported us every way as we have supported them.

Iran is the enemy. Hamas is the enemy. The Houthis, Hezbollah. The terrorists are the enemy. And the Democratic Party is the enemy, too. The enemy within here in the United States. They're trying to imprison Donald Trump and they're trying to push a coup in Israel, because the Democratic Party doesn't believe in honest differences.

The Democratic Party doesn't believe in real elections. The Democratic Party doesn't believe in the democratic system. The Democratic Party has turned autocratic, totalitarian. That's what it is.

And so now their mission is to take out the two world leaders and will be world leaders who they oppose, not to try and defeat them honorably through an election, but destroy them. In Trump's case bankrupt him, have him defending himself multiple courts on 91 phony charges, hoping to put him in prison so Biden has a clear field and can't lose, because the American people are turning on him and Bibi Netanyahu, his policies have the massive support of a united Israel that's trying to protect itself and defend itself while it's surrounded.

They're not interested in taking out their prime minister at the direction of Chuck Schumer. Chuck Schumer who is elected a senator from New York, a Democrat state and he's worried about AOC and his left-wing flank and he will sell out the state of Israel for power. He will sell out the United States for power.

The Democratic Party is about the Democratic Party. It's about power, power, and power.

The Democratic Party has more in common with various communist and fascistic parties all over the world. That's the model, threatening parents, threatening prolifers, threatening the Catholic Church, open borders to change the citizenry.

They have their own state run media at CNN and MSNBC, at "The New York Times" and "The Washington Post." This is autocracy. This is tyranny.

And so what Joe Biden has done to the United States, they are now trying to do to the state of Israel and one friend of mine said to me the other day, it pays to be an enemy of Joe Biden, not an ally when it comes to foreign policy, and they couldn't be more accurate.

Chuck Schumer, you are a disgrace as an American, and I want the Israeli people to know and every survey has shown it, the vast majority of the American people support you, not the Democratic Party, not Biden, and not Schumer. They are trying to undermine you as they fund and empower the terrorists. The terrorists and Iran.

I'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America. I want to move on to another topic right now with our dear friend, Jim Trusty, really one of my favorite legal analysts. He was a DOJ prosecutor. He is with the Ifrah law firm, former President Trump attorney as well on the documents case.

Jim Trusty, I smell a rat in Manhattan. All of a sudden, really at the 11th hour, the 11th hour and change, suddenly the US Attorney's Office says we have 31,000 pages of documents, the DA says yes, okay. Oh, and by the way, they say we have more to deliver next week. The DA says okay, and he says to the court, we agree that the defense should have another 30 days.

And the defense, President Trump's lawyer said no, we need 90 days. This is a lot of stuff. And by the way, just because you give us this stuff doesn't mean it ends there. We may have to go back on witnesses, we may have to collect other information. We have to do our job, not just respond to you.

Am I wrong about smelling something fishy here?

JIM TRUSTY, FORMER FEDERAL PROSECUTOR: No, I think you're dead on.

Look, I mean, at the eve of trial, there are usually discovery obligations where the government turns over some material to the defense, it's usually referred to under a couple of cases, Jackson Giglio or Giglio. And it basically means witness statements as well as negative information, things that cut against the credibility of those witnesses.

So I think there's something really interesting here, probably a document dump where a lot of it is garbage, but somewhere in there, there's probably even more information about Michael Cohen, the star witness in this New York case.

I mean, remember, he's a failed prosecutor to the US Attorney's Office in Manhattan. They walked away from this steaming pile of a case. And they basically didn't even give him credit for cooperating because he lied so much of the time.

So I suspect that there's some real gems in there that may cause a need for follow up. They may cause a need for additional discovery requests, but it's not going to be all good news for Alvin Bragg's prosecution in those 31,000 pages that again, should have been turned over realistically, a long time ago. This case has been a long time coming, not much transparency on these incredibly important public corruption cases that are going to make history.

But I think we would take a wait and see. There will be something that comes out of the Trump team in coming days or weeks. It might be pretty, pretty devastating in terms of what's going on.

LEVIN: Let me suggest something that hasn't been suggested, but as an old chief-of-staff to an attorney general, I could envision my former Attorney General Ed Meese sitting here watching this and saying, we're going to intervene in this case.

What do you mean? This is interfering with a federal election. This case is bogus. Now, we have this last minute document dump. I want us, the Feds to interfere in this case and make the argument at a federal court level that should handle this case that this is nothing more than election interference.

I could see him saying, I'm not going to put up with this. There's stuff going on at a local level with a local elected Democrat judge, with a with a DA who is obviously a Soros partisan DA, with my own if I were him, US Attorney's Office dumping 31,000 -- honestly, I would say, Mark, Mr. Chief- of-Staff, let's have a conversation with the Criminal Division of the Justice Department, the Public Integrity Section, we want to intervene. This is outrageous. We need to deal with this case.

What do you think?

TRUSTY: What you're really talking about is the necessity to have character, people of character in our highest law enforcement purchase and that is what's missing right now.

You've got an attorney general who hides behind Jack Smith, although he supervises all of these federal cases. And to go back to this New York and this intervention idea, there's been an intervention in the wrong direction.

Remember, Alvin Bragg, even Alvin Bragg's office announced that they weren't going to pursue this ridiculous kind of creative prosecution against President Trump, you know, threading in federal offenses into a state charging document to avoid a statute of limitations problem.

DOJ then sent a high level official to go work is Alvin Bragg's right hand as his senior adviser, and lo and behold, their office takes a change, of course, and decides to proceed on this case that relies almost entirely on the credibility of one, Michael Cohen.

So there's a lot of problems without DOJ's acting. You don't have an Ed Meese character in that front office right now.

LEVIN: No.

TRUSTY: You've got a guy who hides behind Jack Smith, who appreciates very creative -- and I use that as a pejorative term -- prosecutions against a sitting president or former president and someone who is the number one contender against this administration.

LEVIN: I just want the public to understand, an attorney general could seek intervention on many grounds, including, we don't agree with this local prosecutor's interpretation of the Federal Election Act. We don't agree with the actions that are being taken by our own US Attorney's Office, so we're going to take over this case in Washington, DC.

We don't agree with the dumping of documents at the last second. We don't agree to the intervention in an election like this. Our policy has been that that's not to be done and we're not going to allow the abuse and misuse of federal law to do that.

I'm just telling you, I know how my attorney general would act, which underscores your point. These people are corrupt, and I don't mean they're taking money. I mean, they are corrupt. They are political partisan hacks.

They have lit a fire to our justice system in four different jurisdictions with three different Democrat prosecutors with 91 ridiculous charges against a man who was the sitting president, who is running for president.

I mean, it's just so obvious what's taking place here.

When we come back, Jim Trusty, let's move to Georgia. We have new information about Georgia, a little bizarre, in my view, quite frankly, but at least a partial win, I think for the good guys.

We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

CHRISTINA COLEMAN, FOX NEWS CHANNEL CORRESPONDENT: Welcome to "Fox News Live." I'm Christina Coleman.

Lawmakers racing against the clock to stop yet another partial government shutdown. The next critical government funding deadline is this Friday. Right now, negotiators are trying to hammer out deals on six bills. If they can't pass those bills in time funding will stop for several critical departments.

This is the fifth time since September that lawmakers have run up against a funding deadline passing stopgap bills just in time. Lawmakers already passed bills to fund several departments earlier this month.

Vladimir Putin will stay in power as Russia's president for a fifth term. He won the country's presidential election Sunday with nearly 90 percent of the vote. His win was expected with many of his opposition leaders either dead, jailed, or banned from running.

Some voters though still staged small acts of defiance to protest the election.

I'm Christina Coleman. Now back to LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN.

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

Jim Trusty, you know, I watched a lot of the goings on, on in Atlanta, as I'm sure you did and much of the country did. It seemed like a slam dunk to me, conflict of interest, the misleading under oath about when the affair started, when Mr. Wade was appointed, all of these cash transactions in order to in my view, conceal what they had, in fact been doing.

And it appears that the judge -- the judge did what? He kind of cut the baby in half. What did the judge do in your interpretation?

TRUSTY: Yes. It's a little bit of a split the baby. I mean, look, if you're waiting for a really aggressive language in the opinion, you don't get it. Like he could have basically said, we've got an elected official who came into my courtroom and perjured herself. He instead refers to an odor of mendacity. So it's kind of a softball approach, kind of a split the baby approach.

What he basically said was, I don't think the defense has proven an actual conflict of interest, but they have proven that there's appearance of impropriety and because of that bad appearance, it infects this whole process. She is going to keep her office involved, because nobody else would pick up this thing and run.

LEVIN: It's not clear to me at all, what in the hell did the judge accomplish here?

TRUSTY: Well, not a whole lot. I mean, obviously, it's shuffling the deck a little bit in terms of which people are on the prosecution team.

But I think, you know, it would be really interesting to see if the defense goes after a stay. If they go to this judge and say, you recognize this as a close call on the actual conflict, let's get it to a higher court and give it a new look, because it is pretty unchartered territory.

You know, this judge focused very heavily on the fact that for an actual conflict of interest, he would want to see some sort of intentional delay on behalf of the prosecution, so the money would keep rolling in for Mr. Wade and benefiting directly Miss Willis.

I think he sugarcoats their relationship a little bit in terms of how much she benefited. You know, ask yourself, would any other special prosecutor be taking her to Aruba? I mean, the answer is pretty obvious.

So, I think the focus should have been not can we show delay that somehow means income pouring in, but did she benefit from his appointment? And she clearly did.

So I think that's the type of thing or if I'm on the other side here on the defense team, I'm thinking about asking for a stay. I'm thinking about what's called an interlocutory appeal, trying to push this up, now not waiting for trial, and see if a higher court takes a little different look, not just that the facts, but whether or not disqualification can run from this bad appearance as well.

I mean, look, there's nothing -- politically, I would say it's a bad day for Fani Willis. She doesn't come out of this looking like anything but a disrespectful and dishonest official that she was, but in terms of the case itself, it continues to chug along perhaps with some delay, which is not a terrible thing for President Trump and the other defendants.

LEVIN: Now she is still subject to ethics investigations. She's still subject to potentially criminal investigations if there's a belief that all this cash was moving around to actually conceal the misappropriation of taxpayer dollars, no?

TRUSTY: Yes, I mean, but you're talking about a little bit of self- policing. You know, I don't have a lot of faith in state bars in terms of going after her for the ethical violations. There are times where they will be pretty harsh on prosecutors, I just don't think this is going to be one of those times.

There should be consequences on the bar that could be pretty devastating for her career. There could be something that comes out of the Fulton County Commission, which was basically ignored and was wrong by this appointment, but I'm just not holding my breath nor would I expect some sort of independent prosecutor to go after Fani for perjury and the like.

Look, she clearly misled the court, the court -- between the lines, it's clear, he knows that, but he was not inclined to tie it directly to the indictment. And that was always kind of the issue I thought there would be is, what's the remedy if you prove this affair, if you prove it was bad judgment, and a conflict of interest on some level or at least in appearance, does that necessarily affect the indictment directly? And I think that's the question that maybe an appellate court could take a look at.

LEVIN: And this is my concern up and down the judicial chain to be perfectly honest with you, Jim Trusty, which is this. In the immunity case in front of the Supreme Court, if they ruled in my view the right way, the cases go away. If they rule the right way on the obstruction issue, which I think they might, but they should, then the obstruction issues go away.

If the judge in Florida rules the right way on the Espionage Act and all the rest of it, that case goes away. If the judge in the Manhattan case ruled properly, that case would have gone away. And here my view is this judge did not do the right thing, splitting the baby in half.

When a district attorney lies to the court, misleads the court and conducts herself this way and she was very abusive even on the stand, to cut the baby in half, I think was exactly the wrong thing to do, but that's just me.

Jim Trusty, I want to thank you so much. God bless you, my friend.

TRUSTY: All right, Mark. Good seeing you. Thanks for having m

LEVIN: . We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

The next guest I have here is really intriguing and very, very important. He wrote a piece in "The Tablet" called "How the Gaza Ministry of Health Fakes Casualty Numbers." Those numbers have been used throughout our media, throughout the administration, as they use those numbers to push policy in Israel and in the Middle East and I keep saying those numbers keep coming from a terrorist organization. Why do they keep using these numbers?

Now they use to qualify the numbers by saying it came from Hamas. They don't even do that anymore. Professor Wyner, you're a professor of Statistics and Data Science at the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School director of Undergraduate Program and Statistics and Data Science, among other things, you know, this business. You wrote this piece? What is in this piece? And why did you write it?

ABRAHAM WYNER, PROFESSOR OF STATISTICS AND DATA SCIENCE, THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA: Okay, so I'll begin by telling you why I wrote it, and that has to go back a little bit in time.

There is a war going on, and that war involves a battle between Israel and its forces against a terrorist organization that's embedded inside an urban environment and there is no way that Hamas, the terrorist organization is going to be able to defeat Israel in a battle and their only hope is to convince the public that this actually isn't a battle against its fighters. But instead, it's a wrecking indiscriminate bombing attack that's essentially killing almost entirely civilians.

So that argument, that statistical argument that numbers based argument is part of the political strategy. So the Hamas Ministry of Health since the beginning of the war has been releasing data, which explains or tries to give the impression that almost all of the people getting killed are civilians. In fact, the number that they continuously recall and put out is that 70 percent of the casualties are women and children.

So I had heard that and I also had heard about the hospital that had been bombed, and the ministry had claimed that 500 Palestinian civilians were killed, and that had to be retracted, or at least it was described as not correct by both Israel and the United States.

And so the authenticity of the numbers had been swirling around greatly, and I wanted to look at the numbers to see whether or not there was evidence in the numbers themselves of problems.

So one of the big problems was, before I even looked at the numbers, well, where are the fighters? And if the fighters aren't there, then how can we have 70 percent civilians that are women and children? Where are the men?

So there were two problems in the dataset that was before I even looked at it that I was trying to ascertain how could that come about? There is no fighters, there's not enough of them. Israel claims that many, many more -- many, many of the people dying are actual fighters, Hamas terrorists, and Hamas doesn't report it. But they overwhelmingly report large numbers of civilians, mainly children and women in their daily updates of the figures in the battle.

So what I was able to do was go and find a section of daily reported casualty numbers broken up into children and women and totals. And there I was able to derive the male total from that, and see whether or not there was evidence in this data, that something wasn't right about it.

So I already knew that there wasn't something not right about it, because there's just too many, well, I should say, there was just not enough men dying and they had to be there somewhere. So I was looking in the data to find something that didn't make any sense.

So that's what I did. And I was able to find a number of attributes in the data that just didn't look right, and so that's what I wrote about in the article.

LEVIN: And very persuasively, I'll give some examples and you can elaborate. You point out that the statistics don't really weigh very much. It's like every battle, same number of women, the same number of children, even when Israel isn't fighting in areas where there's apartment buildings or schools or so forth, like that. Hamas keeps the same basic percentage of women and children who are dying, 70 percent, no matter what the battle is taking place on the ground, no matter what's taking place, period, correct?

WYNER: That's correct. In fact, so there's actually I mean, the battle has been going on for months, there's only a very short period of time where the Hamas Ministry releases breakdowns, particularly into children and women and totals. That's a very short period. It is only 16 days.

And if you look over that period of time, there's very little variability in the total number of deaths over this period. It doesn't fluctuate very much.

And as you point out, that doesn't make any sense given the battle plans, the way that war is actually fought in an urban area, there's got to be considerable amount of variation on a day-to-day basis, yet over this period of time the total casualty counts are very, very -- what we call under dispersed in statistics, just very small variations.

There are, of course, variations on a day-to-day basis, but not very many. And the percentage of women and children almost every day, kind of hovers right around the same number around 66 to 72 percent or so. And then there's other fluctuations as well, that's not accounted for.

So when you look at the data as a whole, you see that there's just isn't very much variation and that's a very puzzling observation. Taking that with a bunch of other observations, you come to the conclusion that something's not right here.

LEVIN: I want to break down these numbers a little bit more. It's very important. Your article is very compelling, because they're still using them. Thirty thousand civilians in Gaza had been killed by the Israelis, overwhelming majority are women and children. Over and over again, I hear it on CNN. I hear it on the floor by Schumer the other day. I hear it. It's regurgitated. They don't even use Hamas' name anymore.

You have a number of other very pertinent points in your article that I want to get to.

We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America. We're here with Professor Abraham Wyner, an expert on statistics, data science. He's looked at what he can look at with the Hamas data and says basically, this is crap. That's what he's basically saying. He's telling you why.

Let's continue about -- claiming that Israel is killing more civilians per terrorist. I know that sounds weird, but it is true, the per terrorist thing than historically the case, is that right?

WYNER: Yes, so they are reporting, well, on their daily numbers, they don't differentiate between civilians and actual terrorists. In fact, nowhere in the Hamas Ministry is there any indication that they're killing terrorists at all, so that's simply not part of the analysis.

Right now they're reporting over 30,000 deaths in total, and the media at large is just repeating the statement that the Ministry of -- Hamas' Ministry of Health is saying that over 70 percent of these casualties are women and children. And that, of course, leaves us with an incredible problem. If 70 percent of these are women and children, the 30 percent have to either be the men, the civilian men, and therefore there's no Hamas fighters.

So you're left with either there's no Hamas fighters dying, or all the men in Gaza are Hamas. And neither of those things make any sense. And the reason why it's so critical, is that Hamas is making the argument that, overwhelmingly, the larger the number of deaths are innocent civilians, but Israel is claiming something completely different.

Israel is saying that 13,000 at this point, approximately, are Hamas fighters. And if that's true, then it can't possibly be 72 percent civilians of the deaths are women and children, because the women and children aren't Hamas fighters, unless, of course, some of the children are fighters and they're just being categorized as children, which is a major concern.

And when you look at this data, there's crazy relationships between the number of children and the number of women and the number of men on a day- to-day basis. Something doesn't seem right.

There's a mis-categorization on the daily numbers, that has to have an explanation. Now I can say that the problem is statistics is that you can only identify concerns, you can't prove one way or another what actually is happening is what we call -- we're looking for something that's completely dispositive. We're not going to find that in the data. We actually have to just look at problems that arise and say, what can account for those concerns?

And when you put the whole thing together, all of the different pieces of information together, it is something that just doesn't make any sense. And if I were to review the data, I would have to say that 13,000 or so of the total casualties, 30,000, if that's a decently correct number, then that suggests that there's about 1.4 to one civilians dying for every Hamas terrorist.

Now, civilian dying is a terrible thing. I don't want to make anyone walk away from that fact. And Israel, my belief, is trying desperately to keep the civilian population death as low as possible. They encourage people to leave, they knock on buildings, they are not bombing indiscriminately.

So what we're looking for is a ratio that's very different than what Hamas is trying to tell us. It's not 20 to one civilians to fighters. It's probably somewhere between one to one and 1.5 to one. I can't say for sure, but it is not unreasonable within the confines of an urban war, and also actually quite a bit better, I believe, than what the United States has been able to do when it has been fighting urban warfare.

LEVIN: So just to put this all together and put a ribbon around it. You know, this, you've written about it. There's other statisticians in the world. Certainly some of them work in the federal government. I mean, they've got every sort of employee over there in the federal government.

You're the president of the United States, you're the Secretary of State, you're the Democrat leader in the Senate. Why do you keep using these numbers even if there are questions about it, and you don't know if they're accurate, unless you're trying to push an agenda, unless you're trying to push a policy. Why do you keep using these bogus numbers?

WYNER: Well, I can't get into people's heads and speak for what drives them to do things. But there's an incredible amount of --

LEVIN: Well, I can, and I'll tell you why they're doing it. They're doing it purposely because it's undermining Israel, because it's helping their position. That is the position at the State Department in the White House. They know these numbers are bogus, CNN knows these numbers are bogus. You know, these numbers are bogus. I know these numbers are bogus, but they keep doing it, because it serves their purposes. That's my view. Final word.

WYNER: Well, final word. I'm hoping that, that some of these observations come out in the public and people recognize that Israel is trying to kill Hamas. They're not trying to kill civilians. And if you actually look at the data, you realize that that's actually what's going on.

LEVIN: Well, I want to thank you. I want to thank you for writing your piece. I want to thank you for coming on the program. I pray to God that you have tenure and I want to wish you all the best, my friend.

WYNER: Thank you very much.

LEVIN: All right, God bless.

We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

You know, while the Democratic Party is trying to overthrow governments, Democrats trying to put a former president in prison while it's funding terrorists and terrorist regimes like Iran and Hamas, Schumer said something I agree with, it's time for course correction right here in America.

Not an election, a course correction.

It's time to impeach Joe Biden for his multiple high crimes against the American people including funding our enemy, Iran's nuclear program and terrorist operations, intentionally opening the border to criminal, sex slavery, killer drugs, and terrorists. Brazenly defying two Supreme Court decisions and federal immigration law, committing multiple criminal acts and violation of the Espionage Act when he wasn't president, selling classified information in exchange for an $8 million book advance, and failing to take care that our laws are upheld and enforced and the security of our country is ensured as the Constitution compels.

Course correction. There's one for you, Schumer, what do you say?

I'll see you next time on LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN.
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