

Eye on the World

April 29, 2017

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 April 29 2017.

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 Susan Jones titled "U.S. Military Identifies 'Mustard Agent' As Chemical Used by ISIS Against Iraqi Troops" was posted at cnsnews.com on April 27, 2017. Following is the article.

Last week, a U.S. military spokesman said ISIS "used chemicals in the vicinity of Mosul" in an attack on Iraqi Security Forces. U.S. and Australian advisers were nearby and uninjured.

At a news conference on Wednesday, U.S. Air Force Col. John Dorrian, the coalition spokesman, identified the chemical used in the attack:

"Well, coalition forces became aware of a chemical attack. They left the area. They donned their equipment. Where they were tested, none of them showed any negative effects from being in that area," Dorrian said.

"As far as the types of materials that the enemy used—they have low-grade capabilities and that is representative of chlorine and mustard agent. Sometimes I see that reported as mustard gas. That's not correct. It's mustard agent.

"So, it dispersed into a very small area, whenever these munitions go off. These munitions are not especially effective about anything except creating

a public narrative. So, they're not as effective even as explosive rounds, but you know, they do get some attention."

On another topic—ISIS using off-the-shelf or improvised drones to drop grenades on Iraqi troops in Mosul—Dorrian said those drones won't turn the tide of battle. He also said the Iraqis have now "turned the tables," using drones to "terrorize" the terrorists:

Drones "are not really strategic capabilities. They're not game-changers," Dorrian said. "It's not going to stop what's happening on the battlefield, which is them losing, being pushed out of areas, and getting killed. But it does present a tremendous amount of danger to people on the ground when we see these.

"The enemy has used them, sometimes where multiple drones have been used at one time. Of course, that is a capability that, you know, certainly will get attention and require the Iraqi security forces to take measures to put a stop to that.

"Most recently, though, we've been able to provide some capabilities on the battlefield to disrupt that. So that's electronic warfare capabilities."

Dorrian refused to give details about how that works, "but we can move capabilities where they need to be in order to stop the enemy from being more effective."

Dorrian said the Iraqi security forces "have turned the tables and begun to use them (drones) as well" to take out snipers and vehicle-borne improvised explosive devices that are parked—and to just sort of terrorize them.

"So, that's—that's kind of the state of play with regard to enemy use of drones, and then the Iraqis' use of drones as well."



An article by Nicholas Fondacaro titled "Nets Ignore Iranian Boat Playing Dangerous 'Game of Chicken' With US Navy" was posted at newsbusters.org on April 27, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

On Monday, the radical Iranian Revolutionary Guard harassed a U.S. Navy vessel for the seventh time this year.

"Back overseas, an Iranian navy vessel engaged in a potentially disastrous game of chicken with a U.S. destroyer earlier this week," announced Fox News' Bret Baier on Wednesday's Special Report. "It is the latest provocation that many U.S. officials worry could turn into something deadly."

Despite the uptick in Iranian aggression towards the U.S., the Big Three Networks (ABC, CBS, and NBC) ignored it.

"Tensions in the Persian Gulf continue to escalate between Iran and the U.S. The latest incident came Monday when according to U.S. officials, an Iranian

Revolutionary Guard fast attack naval vessel approached the USS *Mahan* in the Strait of Hormuz,” reported Correspondent Connor Powell.

Powell also noted that the incident again involved the *Mahan*, a destroyer that routinely operates in that area and routinely has to deal with Iranian fast attack boats. After the Iranian boats came within 1,000 yards of the ship, “The *Mahan* was forced to alter its course and sounded a danger alarm before a warning flare at the Iranian patrol ship.”

According to Powell, Iran had taken to mocking the U.S. over the incident. “Just a short while ago, Iranian Foreign Minister Zarif posted a tweet to social media, acknowledging the incident, but also sarcastically asking why the U.S. Navy was so far away from home,” he reported.

As routinely as the Iranian navy plays dangerous games with U.S. vessels, the liberal networks omit it from their coverage. On numerous occasions, the Media Research Center has documented how the networks ignore Iran’s radical actions since the signing of the nuclear deal.

Their utter failure to report Iran’s aggression originates from their effort to pretend that Obama improved U.S./Iran relations. And it’s not just these kinds of incidents they try to manipulate. When Iran captured ten U.S. sailors for straying into their territorial waters, NBC’s Andrea Mitchell whined that it “could not have happened at the worst time” because it happened just hours before Obama’s last State of the Union Address.

NBC had also criticized the Trump administration for to “officially putting Iran on notice” after they defied the U.N. and illegally test-fired missiles. MRC’s Scott Whitlock also exposed how the nets censored a “Blockbuster expose on Obama’s hidden Iran deal secrets.”

The omission is a part of an effort to preserve Obama’s failed foreign policy legacy by trying to pretend that the nuclear deal was a resounding success. It’s a failed legacy that Mitchell spent three days lobbying to keep.



An article by Patrick Goodenough titled “Who Voted Saudis Onto UN Gender-Equality Body? Democracies Still Won’t Say” was posted at cnsnews.com on April 27, 2017. Following is the article.

Fallout from Saudi Arabia’s election onto a top U.N. gender equality body continues, with lawmakers in Norway demanding to know whether their government was among a group of democracies which, under the cover of a secret ballot vote, helped to award the post to the kingdom.

Some of the democracies concerned have declined to make public their vote, although a veteran observer of the U.N. says there is no regulation prohibiting a member-state from disclosing its voting decision afterwards.

Members of two Norwegian opposition parties, the Liberals and Christian Democrats, have asked the country's foreign minister, Børge Brende, to state whether or not Norway voted for Saudi Arabia, the state-owned NRK broadcaster reported.

"I think it is important that to be open about how Norway acts internationally," NRK quoted Liberal leader Trine Skei Grande as saying. "This is an alarming enough result for there to be good reason to make [Norway's vote] public."

Last week, 47 of the 54 members of the U.N.'s Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) endorsed Saudi Arabia's candidacy for a seat on the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) for 2018-2022.

Around 25 of the 54 current members of ECOSOC are described by Freedom House as "free" democracies. Yet only seven countries out of the total 54 withheld their support for Saudi Arabia, a country that was ranked in 141st place among 144 countries in the latest World Economic Forum gender equality report.

The "free" countries in ECOSOC include the United States, Australia, Brazil, Japan, South Korea and a dozen European countries, including 10 members of the European Union. The full list appears at the end of this story.

A spokesperson for Norway's U.N. mission told CNSNews.com that, in accordance with ECOSOC's rules of procedure, "the election was held by secret ballot and thus not public."

"It's important to emphasize on a general basis that Norway is one of the foremost advocates for women's rights, in the U.N. and in the Commission on the Status of Women," she added.

The spokesperson also said the position and rights of women feature in Norway's political dialogue with Riyadh, and were brought up most recently when Brende visited the kingdom last January.

A spokesman for Ireland's U.N. mission similarly pointed to the secret ballot election, contending that the procedure "facilitates the conduct and management of sensitive international relationships."

"Accordingly, it is not our usual practice to disclose publicly how we vote in such ballots," he said.

The spokesman added, "However, I can say that our votes are deployed with a view to maximizing Ireland's international influence and our capacity to represent and advance the values and concerns of our people."

Several other U.N. missions or foreign ministries among the countries concerned have also pointed, either on the record or on background, to the secret ballot nature of the ECOSOC vote.

But Hillel Neuer, executive director of the Geneva-based NGO U.N. Watch, said Wednesday he was not aware of any U.N. rule preventing a member-state's government from disclosing to citizens or lawmakers how they voted at the U.N.

“On the contrary,” he said, “basic principles of accountability and transparency would support sharing a government’s votes on consequential elections with its citizenry.”

In response to queries, some of the relevant U.N. missions noted that Saudi Arabia had been submitted by its Asia regional group on a “closed slate”—that is, five vacancies were earmarked for Asia, and five candidates were put forward. All five (Saudi Arabia, Japan, Iraq, South Korea and Turkmenistan) were duly elected.

Critics have long argued that the absence of competition in elections for important U.N. positions makes a mockery of the “election” process and is a key reason why unsuitable candidates have won seats, especially on bodies like the Human Rights Council.

Even so, Neuer shot down the notion that a “closed slate” tied other countries’ hands in the CSW vote.

For a candidate to succeed, U.N. rules require the support of a majority of members present and voting. In the case of ECOSOC’s vote for members of the CSW, a minimum of 28 votes was necessary.

Neuer said if Saudi Arabia had received 27 rather than 47 votes, its candidacy would therefore likely have failed.

Asked why democracies would be so reluctant to make a principled stand on an issue like this, Neuer replied, “Sadly, at the U.N. the political culture is dominated by cynical, back-room deals, where Saudi oil speaks louder than the declared principles of women’s rights and human rights.”

“Remember that former U.N. chief Ban Ki-moon actually deleted a U.N. report’s references to Saudi killings of children in Yemen, after Riyadh threatened to cut their U.N. contributions,” he recalled. “The U.N. is sadly a very corrupt place.”

Queries sent to the Saudi mission to the U.N. brought no response by press time.

“Free” democracies currently in ECOSOC are listed below. Only seven countries did not support Saudi Arabia in last week’s vote:

Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Britain, Chile, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Guyana, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Norway, Peru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United States.

(Update: Belgium on Thursday became the first of a group of democracies on ECOSOC to admit voting for Saudi Arabia to join the U.N. Commission on the Status of Women. Prime Minister Charles Michel told lawmakers he regretted the decision, which was taken by a diplomat acting with proper consultation with the government in Brussels, AP reports.)



An article by James Carstensen titled "Crimes in Germany Linked to Migrants Rose 52.7 Percent in 2016" was posted at cnsnews.com on April 26, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Crimes in Germany linked to asylum-seekers and refugees jumped by 52.7 percent in 2016, according to newly-released statistics that also showed a "significant rise" in politically motivated crimes, and a 7.5 percent increase in anti-Semitic incidents.

Five months ahead of a federal election, the most controversial figures released by the Federal Office of Criminal Investigation (BKA) are those related to the rise in migrant-related crimes—174,000 criminal incidents involving asylum-seekers and refugees in 2016, compared to 114,000 in the previous year.

Interior Minister Thomas de Maiziere acknowledging the severity of the crime figures, but also argued that they did not necessarily mean the roughly 1.2 million refugees who entered Germany over the past two years have made the country unsafe.

"We are dealing with a rise in hate, lack of respect and violence in general," the minister told a press conference in Berlin. "We would not reduce that to any particular group—whether left, right, or foreigners."

Nonetheless, de Maiziere admitted there was cause for concern: "There is no sugarcoating here," he said, "Among violent crimes, there were one percent more Germans, but 90 percent more migrant suspects."

De Maiziere said that in many cases asylum-seekers were also victims of crime—including crimes committed by fellow refugees in overcrowded refugee centers.

More than one-third of all non-German suspects were connected to non-violent violations, such as entering or staying in the country illegally.

Still, the figures could provide a boost for the far-right Alternative for Deutschland (AfD) party, which saw an initial surge of support over fears relating to security and integration before it dwindled over time as migrant inflows decreased.

Germany has been shaken by deadly terror attacks—such as the killing by a Tunisian asylum seeker of 12 people at a Berlin Christmas market—or violent incidents such as those on New Year's Eve 2015, when hundreds of women were sexually assaulted and robbed by men believed to be of North African origin.

Ahead of the Sept. 24 election the anti-migrant, anti-Islam, euroskeptic AfD is attempting to reshape its image. It has swapped former lead candidate Fraue Petry with 76-year-old Alexander Gauland, a former member of Chancellor Angela Merkel's Christian Democratic Union (CDU), and Alice Weidel, 38, an openly lesbian former investment banker.

Weidel told party delegates that the AfD was the only party that could protect Germany's borders and ensure public security.

Markus Ulbig, the interior minister of Saxony state, said many of the crimes committed by asylum-seekers were carried out by a small number of repeat offenders. In Saxony, he said, just one percent of migrants were responsible for 40 percent of the crimes.

Ulbig said he expected crimes among asylum-seekers to diminish as they were moved out of mass shelters and into better living conditions.

Christian Pfeiffer, a criminologist and former justice minister of Lower Saxony state, told Deutsche Welle that rejected asylum-seekers are the biggest concern. He said a failed application cuts the individual off from financial support and essential language courses, leading to anger and resentment.

"There is a kind of a class-based society that emerges among refugees—ones who have good prospects and those who don't," Pfeiffer said.

The influx of refugees into Europe has also introduced new, difficult issues such as child marriage. Some migrants have entered the country already married to underage spouses, leading to calls for the government to annul such marriages.

Another problem is prostitution. Ralf Rötten, the director of the Hilfe für Jungs (Help for Youth) youth organization in Berlin, told Deutsche Welle that many younger refugees lack support and are forced to find ways to survive such as by entering the sex trade.

The 2016 crime statistics also found a rise in politically motivated crimes, particularly in the form of anti-Semitism, emanating from both Muslims and xenophobic far-right groups. Anti-Semitic incidents rose from 1,366 in 2015 to 1,468 last year.

The Independent Experts Group on Anti-Semitism, a body set up by parliament, reported that Jews are "increasingly concerned for their safety due to everyday experiences of antisemitism."

About 200,000 Jews live in Germany, Europe's third largest community after Britain and France.

The rise of politically motivated crimes has also been linked with tensions over the refugee crisis. Left- and right-wing protesters have clashing during demonstrations, and asylum seeker accommodation centers have also come under attack from extremists.

Of a total of 41,549 political crimes recorded in 2016, the far right accounted for 23,555 incidents.

The largest proportion of these crimes (33.5 percent) were not violent but propaganda-related—for example the use of publicly banned symbols.

The number of violent cases, including attacks on asylum-seekers' homes, dropped slightly but remained high—4,311 in 2016 compared to 4,402 in 2015.



An article by Terence P. Jeffrey titled "Trump's Border Wall Request Equals 0.035% of Federal Spending" was posted at cnsnews.com on April 25, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

President Donald Trump's request that Congress include \$1.4 billion to fund the beginning of his proposed wall on the U.S.-Mexico border equals approximately 0.035 percent of what the federal government will spend in total this year, according to the latest estimate of fiscal year 2017 federal spending made by the Congressional Budget Office.

It also equals less than the Department of Health and Human Services spends in just twelve hours and less than the Treasury collects in taxes in four hours.

That is assuming that HHS spends money 24 hours a day and the Treasury collects it 24 hours a day.

In its baseline budget projections published in January, the CBO estimated that in fiscal 2017, which runs through September, the federal government will collect \$3,404,000,000,000 in taxes and spend \$3,963,000,000,000.

On March 16, President Trump sent a letter to House Speaker Paul Ryan requesting certain items be included in the continuing resolution that Congress must pass to fund the government for the remainder of the fiscal year after the current CR expires on April 28.

This letter requested approximately \$1.4 billion for Trump's border wall project.

An OMB summary of the president's request—which was attached to his letter to Speaker Ryan—asked that the CR include: "1.4 billion for CBP [Customs and Border Protection] Procurement, Construction and Improvements, including \$999 million for planning, design, and construction of the first installment of the border wall, \$179 million for access roads, gates, and other tactical infrastructure projects, and \$200 million for border security technology deployments."

The OMB summary also calls for "\$18 million for project management, oversight and support for the border wall."

The \$1.4 billion Trump wants from Congress in this fiscal year to begin the border wall project equals 0.035 percent of the \$3.963 trillion the CBO estimates the federal government will spend this fiscal year.

By comparison, the Department of Health and Human Services alone will spend an estimated \$1,108,457,000,000 in fiscal 2017, according to the Monthly

Treasury Statement. That \$1,108,457,000,000 in annual HHS spending equals approximately \$126,546,187 for each of the 8,760 hours in the fiscal year.

In other words, HHS will spend approximately \$126,536,187 per hour this year—assuming that it spends money 24 hours a day.

That means that HHS spends in about 11 hours an amount equal to the \$1.4 billion that President Trump wants this fiscal year for the border wall project.

In half a day—12 hours—HHS spends more than Trump wants for the border wall for the entire year.

The \$3,404,000,000,000 that the Treasury will collect in taxes this fiscal year, according to the CBO estimate, equals about \$388,584,475 in tax collections per hour.

The \$1.4 billion that Trump wants for the border wall project this year equals about 3.6 hours in federal tax collections.

In just 4 hours, the federal government collects more in taxes than President Trump wants to spend for the entire year on the border wall.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled “Not Building the Wall Is a Government Shutdown” was posted at anncoulter.com on April 26, 2017. Following is the article.

Fake News’ question of the week: Will Trump risk a government shutdown over the wall?

The media flip back and forth on who’s to blame for a government shutdown depending on which branch is controlled by Republicans. But the “shutdown” hypothetical in this case is a trick question.

A failure to build the wall *is* a government shutdown.

Of course it would be unfortunate if schoolchildren couldn’t visit national parks and welfare checks didn’t get mailed on time. But arranging White House tours isn’t the primary function of the government.

The government’s No. 1 job is to protect the nation.

This has always been true, but it’s especially important at this moment in history, when we have drugs, gang members, diseases and terrorists pouring across our border. The failure of the government to close our border is the definition of a government shutdown.

This isn’t like other shutdowns. Democrats can’t wail about Republicans cutting Social Security or school lunches. They are willing to shut the government down because they don’t want borders.

Take that to the country!

As commander in chief, Trump doesn't need Congress to build a wall. The Constitution charges him with defending the nation. Contrary to what you may have heard from various warmongers on TV and in Trump's Cabinet, that means defending our borders—not Ukraine's borders.

Building a wall is not only Trump's constitutional duty, but it's also massively popular.

Although Trump doesn't need congressional approval for a wall, it was smart for him to demand a vote. Let the Democrats run for re-election on opposing the wall.

Let Sen. Claire McCaskill explain to the parents of kids killed by illegals that she thought a wall was inhumane.

Let Sen. Angus King say to the people of Maine that instead of a wall that would block heroin from pouring into our country, he thought a better plan was to sponsor a bunch of treatment centers for after your kid is already addicted.

Let Sen. Chuck Schumer tell us why it's OK for Israel to have a wall, but not us.

Let open borders Republicans like Sen. Marco Rubio tell African-Americans that it's more important to help illegal aliens than to help black American teenagers, currently suffering a crippling unemployment rate.

Republicans are both corrupt and stupid, so it's hard to tell which one animates their opposition to the wall. But the Democrats are bluffing. They're trying to get the GOP to fold before they show us their pair of threes.

Now that Trump has capitulated on even asking for funding for a wall, the Democrats are on their knees saying, "Thank you, God! Thank you, God!"

No politician wants to have to explain a vote against the wall. What the Democrats want is for Trump to be stuck explaining why he didn't build the wall.

Then it will be a bloodbath. Not only Trump, but also the entire GOP, is dead if he doesn't build a wall. Republicans will be wiped out in the midterms, Democrats will have a 300-seat House majority, and Trump will have to come up with an excuse for why he's not running for re-election.

The *New York Times* and MSNBC are not going to say, "We are so impressed with his growth in office, we're going to drop all that nonsense about Russia and endorse the Republican ticket!"

No, at that point, Trump will be the worst of everything.

No one voted for Trump because of the "Access Hollywood" tape. They voted for him because of his issues; most prominently, his promise to build "a big beautiful wall." And who's going to pay for it? *Mexico!*

You can't say that at every campaign rally for 18 months and then not build a wall.

Do not imagine that a Trump double-cross on the wall will not destroy the Republican Party. Oh, we'll get them back. No, you won't. Trump wasn't a distraction: He was the last chance to save the GOP.

Millions of Americans who hadn't voted in 30 years came out in 2016 to vote for Trump. If he betrays them, they'll say, "You see? I told you. They're all crooks."

No excuses will work. No fiery denunciations of the courts, the Democrats or La Raza will win them back, even if Trump comes up with demeaning Twitter names for them.

It would be an epic betrayal—worse than Bush betraying voters on "no new taxes." Worse than LBJ escalating the Vietnam War. There would be nothing like it in the history of politics.

He's the commander in chief! He said he'd build a wall. If he can't do that, Trump is finished, the Republican Party is finished, and the country is finished.



An article by Cortney O'Brien titled "San Francisco Attorney: Trump Needs to 'Move On' From Sanctuary City Policy" was posted at townhall.com on April 26, 2017. Following is the article.

A federal judge in San Francisco halted a President Trump executive order that would strip funding from any city that harbors illegal immigrants. It was for the administration's own good, according to San Francisco City Attorney Dennis Herrera.

The ruling, Herrera said, was issued in order to "halt the overreach of a president and attorney general who either don't understand the Constitution, or choose to ignore it."

"We have a duty to confront injustice even when it emanates from the White House," he added.

Herrera defended San Francisco's sanctuary city status, wondering why Trump wants to enforce a compassionless program.

"I can't speak for the Trump Administration, but I think they'd be well advised to move on to other issues and stop trying to divide communities and pit communities against each other."

Herrera did not mention that illegal immigrant crime has done plenty to tear families apart. An illegal immigrant who had been deported five times before murdered a young woman named Kate Steinle in 2015. Instead of cracking down on crime after the tragedy, the city voted to continue to allow illegal immigrants to escape federal authorities.

Trump is ready to defend his anti-sanctuary policy, as well as his court-challenged immigration ban - even if that means taking them all the way to the Supreme Court.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Environmentalists Are Dead Wrong" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on April 26, 2017. Following is the article.

Each year, Earth Day is accompanied by predictions of doom. Let's take a look at past predictions to determine just how much confidence we can have in today's environmentalists' predictions.

In 1970, when Earth Day was conceived, the late George Wald, a Nobel laureate biology professor at Harvard University, predicted, "Civilization will end within 15 or 30 years unless immediate action is taken against problems facing mankind."

Also in 1970, Paul Ehrlich, a Stanford University biologist and best-selling author of "The Population Bomb," declared that the world's population would soon outstrip food supplies. In an article for *The Progressive*, he predicted, "The death rate will increase until at least 100-200 million people per year will be starving to death during the next ten years." He gave this warning in 1969 to Britain's Institute of Biology: "If I were a gambler, I would take even money that England will not exist in the year 2000." On the first Earth Day, Ehrlich warned, "In 10 years, all important animal life in the sea will be extinct." Despite such predictions, Ehrlich has won no fewer than 16 awards, including the 1990 Crafoord Prize, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences' highest award.

In International Wildlife (July 1975), Nigel Calder warned, "The threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind." In Science News (1975), C.C. Wallen of the World Meteorological Organization is reported as saying, "The cooling since 1940 has been large enough and consistent enough that it will not soon be reversed."

In 2000, climate researcher David Viner told The Independent, a British newspaper, that within "a few years," snowfall would become "a very rare and exciting event" in Britain. "Children just aren't going to know what snow is," he said. "Snowfalls are now just a thing of the past." In the following years, the U.K. saw some of its largest snowfalls and lowest temperatures since records started being kept in 1914.

In 1970, ecologist Kenneth Watt told a Swarthmore College audience: "The world has been chilling sharply for about 20 years. If present trends continue, the world will be about 4 degrees colder for the global mean temperature in 1990 but 11 degrees colder in the year 2000. This is about twice what it would take to put us into an ice age."

Also in 1970, Sen. Gaylord Nelson wrote in Look magazine: "Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian (Institution), believes that in 25 years, somewhere between 75 and 80 percent of all the species of living animals will be extinct."

Scientist Harrison Brown published a chart in Scientific American that year estimating that mankind would run out of copper shortly after 2000. Lead, zinc, tin, gold and silver were to disappear before 1990.

Erroneous predictions didn't start with Earth Day.

In 1939, the U.S. Department of the Interior said American oil supplies would last for only another 13 years. In 1949, the secretary of the interior said the end of U.S. oil supplies was in sight. Having learned nothing from its earlier erroneous claims, in 1974 the U.S. Geological Survey said that the U.S. had only a 10-year supply of natural gas. The fact of the matter, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, is that as of 2014, we had 2.47 quadrillion cubic feet of natural gas, which should last about a century.

Hoodwinking Americans is part of the environmentalist agenda.

Environmental activist Stephen Schneider told Discover magazine in 1989: "We have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have . . . Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest."

In 1988, then-Sen. Timothy Wirth, D-Colo., said: "We've got to . . . try to ride the global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong . . . we will be doing the right thing anyway in terms of economic policy and environmental policy."

Americans have paid a steep price for buying into environmental deception and lies.



An article by Jay Maxson titled "Message to Imploding ESPN: It's the Liberalism, Stupid" was posted at newsbusters.org on April 26, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

ESPN is calling today's massive "bloodletting"—the layoff of 100 on-air personalities—a matter of "navigating changes in technology and fan behavior in order to continue to deliver quality, breakthrough content" that is part of "a strategic vision that will propel our vast array of networks and services forward."

Yet, as we count on popular ESPN college football analyst Lee Corso to say: "Not so fast!" Because there is much more unsaid by ESPN President John Skipper to this breaking story. Technical changes don't require the dumping of tens of millions of dollars in salary.

Corso went right to the heart of that matter when he tweeted: "What if I told you, there was a tv network that used to be completely devoted to sports?"

What's this network devoted to now? Frankly, it's the liberalism, stupid!

A new poll conducted by Barrett Sports Media, a sports media consulting company, revealed that nearly 61 percent polled say ESPN a "left-leaning agenda." A scant 3 percent mistakenly said ESPN tilts right politically!

Consumers are growing more and more disenchanted with ESPN's hard Left veer on politics and social issues. And they haven't been afraid to tell it to the network's face virtually every time ESPN.com runs a progressively biased story. Those reader comments are always there below the stories telling ESPN enough with the liberalism.

The network can claim it's all about technology, but the hard truth is that ESPN's obsession with progressive causes has put it in high-speed reverse. ESPN has lost 12 million subscribers since 2011 and one million in November and December of 2016 alone.

The network's precipitous downward spiral in ratings and subscription continues year after year. In 2013, the network pulled the trap door on some 400 employees. Then there were 300 more layoffs in 2015 and 100 today.

The network recently issued policy changes on political issues. But then it immediately yanked Sage Steele, a conservative by ESPN standards, off the NBA Countdown program. And then it very quickly ran a story on left-wing activism by the Seattle Seahawks' Michael Bennett, completing lacking in any balance. That alleged adherence to balance was a complete farce.

ESPN, espnW, its satellite blog The Undefeated, and ESPN Radio are all obsessed with stories about transgender athletes, LGBT rights, race and attacks on President Donald Trump.

Aside from the layoff trend of recent years, ESPN has also ended relationships with some big names, who left for Fox Sports and NBC. Among them are Mike Tirico, who called Monday Night Football games, Bill Simmons and current Fox Sports 1 commentators Colin Cowherd, Skip Bayless, and Jason Whitlock.



An article by Susan Jones titled "Hannity is Fighting 'Coordinated Attempt to Silence . . . Every Outspoken Conservative in This Country' " was posted at cnsnews.com on April 25, 2017. Following is the article.

In his opening monologue Monday night, Fox News's Sean Hannity addressed the "well-orchestrated effort by the intolerant left in this country," which is trying to "silence every conservative voice," including his.

Following the ouster of Fox News's Bill O'Reilly, Hannity appears to be the next target at Fox News. He said he has hired lawyers and will challenge his "serial harasser"—an individual he did not name—in court.

"In this fiercely divided and vindictive political climate, I will no longer allow slander and lies about me to go unchallenged, as I see this now to be a coordinated effort afoot to now silence those with conservative views. I will fight every single lie about me by any and all legal means available to me as an American," Hannity said.

But he also said this isn't just about him: "I'm speaking out tonight so that you, our audience, will understand what is really happening and what is really at stake when it comes to freedom of speech in this country."

Hannity noted that he has worked in radio or television for 30 years, 21 of them at Fox News.

"And during this time, there have always been efforts and attempts to smear and slander and besmirch me and other conservatives, but it has never been as intense and completely insane as it is right now."

Things got much worse after the election, said Hannity, who is and has been an outspoken supporter of Donald Trump.

"This is not about Sean Hannity, or one person," he continued. "There is now a coordinated attempt to silence the voice of every outspoken conservative in this country. If we don't stop it right now, there won't be any conservative voices on radio or television left."

"Now I'm not the only one that these liberal fascists routinely target. Like me, conservatives are monitored on radio and TV, every word they say."

He continued:

- "Liberal fascism is alive and well in America today. Their goal is simple. They want to shut up and shut down, completely silence all conservative voices by any means necessary. Here's the difference. Unlike the left, I don't have any problem with what the other side says. If you want to listen to liberals on radio or TV, read their articles, follow them on social media, go for it."

- "Now, I'll call them out for their bias. I'll explain why they're wrong. I'll debate them but I'll never, ever say they should be silenced. And I won't support boycotts to attack their advertisers, a roundabout way of silencing them."

- "So let me be clear tonight. Everyone who publicly supported President Trump is a target. This is very political. We have seen repeatedly that the left knows no limits in these efforts. They have gone after and attacked the first lady; they have attacked members of the president's family, every White House advisor. They've even attacked his daughter and his 10-year-old son."

- "Now ultimately, their goal is to cause as much collateral damage as they can to anybody who supports the president. They have tried to undermine the outcome of this election since November 9th."

- "Please note, this isn't about me. This is about the left, concocting boycotts, all in an attempt to silence prominent conservative voices. If we don't take a stand now, if we allow this to happen now, I'm telling you, America as we know it—freedom of speech as we know it—is over. Let's stop the boycotts—let's stop silencing opposition voices. Let all Americans make their own decisions."



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.”