

# Eye on the World

## Nov. 4, 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 November 4, 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 John Haltiwanger titled "North Korea on Verge of Catastrophe at Nuclear Test Site, China Warns" was posted at newsweek.com on Oct. 27, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Chinese geologists have warned North Korea that the consequences could be catastrophic if it conducts another test at the mountainous Punggye-ri nuclear facility, the *South China Morning Post* reports.

North Korea conducted its sixth nuclear test at the facility, situated roughly 50 miles from China's border, in early September. After the test, a senior Chinese nuclear scientist warned that another test could blow off the top of the mountain and lead to a massive collapse, which could allow radioactive waste to be blown across the border into China.

This warning came as a North Korean delegation met with the Chinese Academy of Sciences' Institute of Geology in Beijing on September 20.



An article by Tom Michael titled "Kim's Disaster: North Korea Nuclear Base Collapses Killing at Least 200 People, Local Reports Claim Amid Fears of

Massive Radioactive Leak” was posted at thesun.co.uk on Oct. 31, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

A tunnel at an underground North Korea nuclear site has reportedly collapsed killing up to 200 people.

The disaster happened at the Punggye-ri nuclear test site in the north-east of the country on October 10, according to Japan’s TV Asahi.

The disaster has prompted fears of a massive radioactive leak which could spark a Chernobyl- or Fukushima-style disaster.

A North Korean official said the collapse happened during the construction of an underground tunnel, South Korea’s Yonhap news agency reports.

Some 100 people are said to have been trapped by the initial tunnel collapse, with a further 100 lost in a second collapse during a rescue operation, Asahi reported Tuesday.

Lee Eugene, a spokeswoman at South Korea’s unification ministry, said: “We are aware of the report but do not know anything about it.”

The accident is believed to have been caused by Kim Jong-un’s sixth nuclear test which weakened the mountain, according to the report.

It was reported earlier this year that the mountain under which the base is believed to be hidden was at risk of collapsing and leaking radiation into the region.

Experts said if the peak crumbles, clouds of radioactive dust and gas would blanket the region, the South China Morning Post reported.

Geophysicist Wen Lianxing and his team at the University of Science and Technology of China in Hefei, Anhui province, said they were “confident underground detonations were occurring underneath the mountain.”

They posted an analysis of data collected from more than 100 seismic monitoring sites across China.

This has narrowed down the location of Pyongyang’s nuclear tests with a margin of error of just 100m. They’ve all been under the same mountain.

Seismic data showed the underground test triggered an earthquake of magnitude 6.3, around ten times more powerful than the fifth test a year ago.

Satellite images showed the blast caused numerous landslides around the Punggye-ri test site, according to the Washington-based 38 North monitoring project.

But Chinese nuclear weapons researcher and chair of the China Nuclear Society Wang Naiyan told the *Morning Post* a collapse could spark a major environmental disaster.

Wang said there are limited mountains in North Korea that are "suitable" to conduct a nuclear test.

He said if the North had simply drilled into the side of the mountain, this increased the risk of "blowing the top off."

News of the tunnel collapse comes after it emerged Russia and the US have both flown nuclear bombers near the country as tensions grow over Kim's nuke threats.



An article by Franco Ordonez titled "Nikki Haley Tells United Nations: You're Not the Boss of U.S." was posted at [mcclatchydc.com](http://mcclatchydc.com) on Nov. 1, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Ambassador Nikki Haley blasted the United Nations Wednesday in a defiant speech to the 193-member General Assembly before it adopted a resolution calling for an end to the U.S. economic embargo on Cuba.

Haley called the long-standing debate "political theater."

"Let's be honest about what we really see going on here," Haley said. "This assembly does not have the power to end the U.S. embargo. It is based in U.S. law, which only the United States Congress can change."

The United States voted Wednesday against the U.N. resolution condemning the American trade embargo against Cuba after abstaining last year, during the administration of Barack Obama, for the first time in 25 years.

The vote served as just the latest sign of a renewed chill between Washington and Havana since a string of bizarre sonic attacks against American diplomats in Cuba. Earlier this month, President Donald Trump's administration kicked nearly two-thirds of Cuba's embassy personnel out of the United States after pulling many U.S. diplomats from the American embassy in Havana out of concern for their health and safety.

While the State Department has not accused Cuba of being behind the incidents, many Latin America experts and Cuban-American officials in government see no way that the government in Havana is not at least complicit. In any event, U.S. officials say Havana is responsible for the safety of foreign diplomats on its soil under the Vienna convention on diplomatic relations.

Haley said the United States is opposing the resolution in solidarity with the Cuban people "and in the hope that they will one day be free to choose their own destiny."

"Each year, this Assembly's time is wasted considering this resolution," Haley told the assembly. "And the United States is subjected to all manner of ridiculous claims—anything to deflect attention from the regime that is actually responsible for the suffering of the Cuban people."

Cuban officials called Haley's remarks "disrespectful" and charged that she didn't have the moral authority to criticize the island nation.

She also said she wanted to clear up any questions about why the United States would change its vote on the same resolution just a year later. She acknowledged some will not understand how the United States "could passively accept this resolution last year and energetically oppose it this year."

"To those who are confused as to where the United States stands, let me be clear: as is their right under our Constitution, the American people have spoken," Haley said. "They have chosen a new president, and he has chosen a new ambassador to the United Nations."



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled "Allahu Akbar-itis: America's Deadly and Debilitating Disease" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 1, 2017. Following is the article.

---

"Shout 'Allahu Akbar,' because this strikes fear in the hearts of the non-believers."

Who knew hijacker Mohammed Atta's parting words, discovered in his journal after the 9/11 attacks, would become a national punchline? The louder and more frequently jihadists around the globe shriek their signature battle cry, the more fervently multicultural apologists deny its meaning. They've transformed the Islamic supremacists' obvious and explicit call for violence into a bland utterance of peace as indiscernible and nonsensical as "Aloha Snackbar."

With blood still fresh on the pavement in Manhattan after Tuesday's outbreak of Allahu Akbar-itis that took at least eight innocent lives, Palestinian-American propagandist and Hamas cheerleader Linda Sarsour tweeted:

"Every believing Muslim says Allahu Akbar every day during prayers. We cannot criminalize 'God is great.' "

Rice University sociologist Dr. Craig Considine mourned: "It begins. CNN reports murderer said "Allahu Akbar." Queue the Islamophobia."

And confused former director of national intelligence James Clapper mused: "It's hard to comprehend . . . what moves a human being to do that to another human being."

Instead of striking fear, "Allahu Akbar!" has unleashed collective foolishness.

"Allahu Akbar!" screamed Amor Ftouhi just five months ago at Bishop Airport in Flint, Michigan, before stabbing a police officer in the neck.

"Allahu Akbar!" Ftouhi chanted repeatedly in multiple court hearings throughout the summer.

"Motive still unknown," the experts declared.

"Allahu Akbar!" fulminated militant Muslim black separatist Kori Ali Muhammad in April after shooting and killing three white people in downtown Fresno, California.

"It's too early to say" whether the motive was "terrorism," law enforcement officials opined. The Associated Press whitewashed Muhammad's declaration, helpfully obscuring his exact exclamation to the Islam-free translation, "God is Great."

"Allahu Akbar!" spewed Dahir Adan at St. Cloud's Crossroads Center mall in Minnesota, before plunging kitchen knives into 10 shoppers. Last month, on the anniversary of the bloodbath, the head-scratchers at the Minneapolis Star-Tribune announced:

"One year later, motive of St. Cloud mall attacker remains unclear."

From the Muslim monsters who decapitated American hostage Nick Berg, to the Fort Dix, New Jersey, attack plotters, to convicted al-Qaida scientist Aafia Siddiqui, to Fort Hood assassin Nidal Malik Hasan, to Times Square bomber Faisal Shahzad, to the machete-wielding murderers who beheaded a London soldier on a busy street, to the truck and stabbing jihadists in Dijon and Nantes, to the Charlie Hebdo-targeting jihadists in Paris, to the ISIS gunmen at Bataclan, to double-stabber Wasil Rafat Farooqui in Roanoke, Virginia, the message of "Allahu Akbar" is unmistakable:

Kill all infidels.

But to those who pretend that "Islamophobia" and the imagined "backlash" against Muslims are greater threats than the hijackers and head-choppers, "Allahu Akbar" is Arabic for "The death and destruction committed in the name of Islam have nothing to do with Islam."

As Islam scholar and author Dr. Robert Spencer told me: "Every time there's a jihad terror attack and every time there's an uncovered plot for jihad terror attack, the news media is filled with stories about anti-Muslim backlash. (The) local mosque asks for police protection. The imam says we're afraid of right-wing yahoos who are going to come and victimize innocent people."

And every suspicious sneeze and sideways glance at oversensitive Muslims is definitively interpreted by the grievance-mongers of the Council on American-Islamic Relations and their ilk as a "hate crime."

When homicidal warriors for Allah are maiming and murdering non-Muslims according to the plain directives of the Quran —and spelling out their celebration of Islam-inspired violence word (ALLAHU) for word (AKBAR)—it is crazy and delusional to say their actions cannot be understood.

Stop the whitewash. Stop the insanity. Jihad denial is suicidal.



An article by Cheryl K. Chumley titled "Muslims to Soon Beat Out Jews in U.S. Population" was posted at [washingtontimes.com](http://washingtontimes.com) on Nov. 1, 2017. Following is the article.

---

There are about 3.35 million Muslims in the United States right now, according to recent Pew Research Center's Factank figures.

But by 2050, that particular population is projected to grow—from about 1 percent of the U.S. population to about 2.1 percent. If it does, that means America will be home to more Muslims than Jews.

Just something to think about, post New York City terror attack—a terror attack that we now know was committed by a radicalized Muslim who professed allegiance to ISIS.

President Donald Trump, in a tweet, wrote: "We must not allow ISIS to return, or enter, our country after defeating them in the Middle East and elsewhere. Enough!"

And of course, all sane Americans are with him on that point.

But truth is: How do we reel back the radicalization of those Muslims in America now—of those who are yet to come?

From Pew: Of the 3.35 million Muslims in America right now, 2.05 million are adults—and "a majority of them, 58 percent, are migrants."

In other words, they weren't born here. They were let in the gate.

It's only common sense to do as Trump also tweeted, and bolster border security.

"I have just ordered Homeland Security to step up our already Extreme Vetting Program," he tweeted. "Being politically correct is fine, but not for this!"

Exactly.

Terror attacks committed in the name of Allah aren't welcome in America. That's the obvious.

But let's remember, too, our nation was founded on Judeo-Christian principles—not Islamic ones. Do we really want that to change?

"Our demographic projections," Pew wrote, "estimate that Muslims will make up 2.1 percent of the U.S. population by the year 2050, surpassing people who identify as Jewish on the basis of religion as the second-largest faith group in the country (not including people who say they have no religion). A 2013 Pew Research Center report estimated that the Muslim share of immigrants granted permanent residency status (green cards) increased from about 5 percent in 1992 to roughly 10 percent in 2012, representing about 100,000 immigrants in that year."

And once here, these Muslim families usually get busy—well, getting busy.

"Muslims have more children than members of other religious groups," Pew reported.

Muslim women, for example, have an average 2.9 children, compared to 2.2 children from women of all other faith groups. On top of that, Muslim women

have children at younger ages than women of other religions, fueling Muslim population growth even further.

Between migration and birth rates, Muslims are seeing a significant jump in cultural influence in America. Don't forget the conversions—and don't forget the fact that the cultural influence often leads to political influences, as well.

Political correctness dictates that talking about Muslim population surges in the context of Islamic terror attacks is out of order—is discriminatory, stereotypical, an offense to the peaceful Muslims of the world.

But this latest terror strike in New York City should be a foot-down moment for America. How many more terror attacks should innocents suffer until the left, the amnesty-loving and Islamic apologetic left, gets it through its head—Islam and terror are tied at the hip.

Trump's temporary bans on migrants and refugees entering America from known terror hotspots in the world is common sense safety. Sending in intelligence agents to monitor mosques around the country is similarly security oriented—similarly, sensible. The time has come to cast political correctness to the wind and launch a full-frontal assault on the leftists of the country who would argue that monitoring mosques and keeping out radicals are outrageous acts of discrimination.

The time has come to recognize that yes, indeed, America is at war with an enemy that doesn't play by rules of combat, that uses deception and deceit and infiltration by population as regular tools of take-over. Trump's the right no-nonsense commander-in-chief to lead this fight.

Now it's up to the rest of us to support what must be done, to rage against the politically correct machine and make the leftists who want to drag America toward destruction to go silent.



A Reuters article by Ben Blanchard titled "China Considers Three-Year Jail Terms for Disrespecting National Anthem, Flag" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 30, 2017. Following is the article.

---

China's largely rubber-stamp parliament is considering jail terms of up to three years for people who disrespect the national anthem or flag in public, while an existing anthem law will be applied in Hong Kong, state media said on Tuesday.

Xi Jinping has ushered in new legislation aimed at securing China from threats both within and outside its borders since taking over as president in 2013, as well as presiding over a sweeping crackdown on dissent and free speech.

China passed a new law in September mandating up to 15 days in police detention for those who mock the "March of the Volunteers" national anthem, a law that also covers the Chinese territories of Hong Kong and Macau.

Parliament is now looking at whether to amend China's Criminal Law to include criminal penalties for disrespect of the national anthem, including intentionally distorting the lyrics or tune, Xinhua said.

The tougher penalties also apply to desecration of the national flag, or emblem, including burning, defacing or trampling on it in public, the report said. That, too, had previously been punishable by up to 15 days' detention.

A draft amendment has been submitted for deliberation at a bi-monthly session of parliament's standing committee, which started on Monday.

"Violators in this regard may face punishments of up to three years of imprisonment, according to the draft," it said.

It was not clear when the amendment might be passed but it could be at the end of the week, when parliament's standing committee closes its current session.

The National Anthem Law, which went into effect on Oct. 1, will also be included in an annex of Hong Kong's Basic Law, or mini constitution, Xinhua added, though it's not clear if that will include three-year jail terms.

The national anthem law has fueled concern in Hong Kong, whose residents have grown nervous over China's perceived encroachment of the city's autonomy following such events as the disappearance of booksellers who later emerged in mainland Chinese custody.

In 2015, Hong Kong football fans booed the Chinese anthem during a World Cup qualifier, prompting a fine for the territory's football association from world body FIFA.

"In recent years, incidents of disrespecting the national anthem had occurred in Hong Kong, challenging the bottom line of the principle of 'one country, two systems' and social morality and triggering rage among Chinese including most Hong Kong residents," said Zhang Rongshun, deputy head of parliament's Legislative Affairs Commission, according to Xinhua.

"It is urgent and important to apply the national anthem law in Hong Kong, in a bid to prevent and handle such offences."

The Asian Football Confederation on Tuesday warned the Hong Kong Football Association about their fans' behavior at a match against Malaysia on Oct 10. in Hong Kong, where some booed the national anthem.



An article by Craig Giammona and Eben Nevy-Williams titled "Papa John's Blames the NFL for Hurting Pizza Sales" was posted at bloomberg.com on Nov. 1, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Papa John's International Inc. founder John Schnatter is going after NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell, saying weak handling of the league's national-anthem controversy has hammered sales of his pizza.



“The NFL has hurt us by not resolving the current debacle to the players’ and owners’ satisfaction,” Schnatter, who serves as the pizza chain’s chairman and chief executive officer, said on a conference call. “NFL leadership has hurt Papa John’s shareholders.”

The remarks follow a controversy over NFL football players protesting during the national anthem, a movement that started last season. The demonstrations have sparked calls for a boycott and raised concerns among league sponsors. But Schnatter’s comments mark the highest-profile example of an NFL partner publicly blaming the outcry for hurting business.

Goodell, whose contract is up for renewal, has taken flak for not resolving the controversy more quickly.

It’s hard to quantify the connection between the NFL and pizza sales, but Papa John’s did post disappointing results in the latest quarter. Its shares fell as much as 13 percent on Wednesday—the most in two years—after same-store sales missed analysts’ estimates. The Louisville, Kentucky-based company also trimmed its revenue and profit forecasts for the year.

The NFL declined to comment.



An article by Terri Cullen and Jeff Cox titled “US Private Sector Added 235,000 Jobs in Oct., Vs. 200,000 New Jobs Expected: ADP” was posted at [cnbc.com](http://cnbc.com) on Nov. 1, 2017. Following is the article.

---

The number of private-sector jobs created in October rose more than expected, with construction jobs surging in the wake of destructive hurricanes Harvey and Irma.

The ADP National Employment showed private-sector businesses added 235,000 jobs in the month. ADP was expected to show private employers added 200,000 jobs in October, up from 135,000 in September.

Goods-producing companies benefited strongly with 85,000 new jobs, 62,000 of which came from construction. Manufacturing also saw 22,000 positions added.

Overall, the service sector accounted for the bulk of the job creation, adding 150,000 jobs. Professional and business services added the most positions, up 109,000. Job losses were seen in the trade, transportation, and information sectors, as well as education.

“The job market rebounded strongly from the hit it took from Hurricanes Harvey and Irma,” Mark Zandi, chief economist of Moody’s Analytics, said in a statement. “Resurgence in construction jobs shows the rebuilding is already in full swing. Looking through the hurricane-created volatility, job growth is robust.”

Leisure and hospitality contributed 45,000 to the total while health care and social assistance grew by 44,000.

In terms of business size, job gains were spread evenly, with companies that have more than 500 employees hiring 90,000 while those with fewer than 50 added 79,000.

The ADP count comes two days ahead of the government's nonfarm payrolls report. Economists largely expect a sharp rebound for the official count, which showed a loss of 33,000 jobs in September. FactSet estimates payrolls increased by 309,000.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Let's Help Our Media Friends" was posted at [jewishworldreview.com](http://jewishworldreview.com) on Nov. 1, 2017. Following is the article.

---

I am not nearly so coldhearted and unsympathetic toward the mainstream media as some of my conservative friends, such as Rush Limbaugh, Mark Levin, Sean Hannity, Tucker Carlson, Chris Plante and Ann Coulter.

In fact, my heart goes out to them.

As evidence of the same, if I had President Donald Trump's ear, I'd urge him to declare this coming Tuesday, Nov. 7, 2017, a day of remembrance and order that flags be flown at half-staff on all federal buildings.

Why? It will be the anniversary of what must have been a most traumatic day for mainstream media people and the political pundits they interviewed.

I am not a psychologist; however, I did take several courses in psychology and sociology as an undergraduate. Thus, I have enough training to analyze the continuing trauma resulting from last year's presidential election.

- Days before the election, ABC News anchor George Stephanopoulos gleefully asked his guests about it. All except one predicted an Electoral College and popular vote landslide for Hillary Clinton (<http://tinyurl.com/yaxyu44u>).

- On one MSNBC talk show, the panelists predicted a historic defeat for Donald Trump (<http://tinyurl.com/y9gbjfw9>).

- MSNBC host Rachel Maddow confidently and laughingly made predictions about Trump's trouncing defeat at the hands of Clinton (<http://tinyurl.com/ycj838aj>). Not to be left out, there were Republicans who confidently predicted that Trump wouldn't even win the party's nomination, much less the presidency (<http://tinyurl.com/y9ggevqv>).

There were many other highly confident election predictions of Trump's defeat all over the internet and in the media, both national and international.

- Take the gleeful discussion between Maddow and Chris Matthews just prior to the election (<http://tinyurl.com/h3sk6ef>). It would have to be pure torture to make them watch their pre-election broadcasts.

Then, as election returns began to come in, showing Trump becoming the next president, there were many instances of emotional crackups. If you check out the internet, you will find dozens of instances featuring people crying and screaming and cursing the election results (<http://tinyurl.com/y8pp7zuu>).

Some colleges responded to Trump's victory by having cry-ins and primal screams. Some provided their students with therapy dogs, coloring books, Play-Doh and videos of playful kittens and puppies, as well as serving snacks such as tea and chocolate. Some college administrators encouraged or allowed faculty to cancel or postpone exams because of the election results.

Certain people have come up with a name for the ongoing liberal response to Clinton's defeat. They call it Trump derangement syndrome. I might point out that it's not only leftist Democrats who are in a tizzy over the election results but also quite a few establishment Republicans.

Evidence of continuing Trump derangement syndrome can be found in the calls for his impeachment by members of Congress such as Maxine Waters, Al Green and Brad Sherman. There is a treatment for TDS.

- Instead of watching MSNBC, CNN, ABC News, NBC News and CBS News, one can turn to Fox News Channel and watch Bret Baier, Tucker Carlson and Sean Hannity.

- For newspapers, pick up *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Washington Times* or the *Washington Examiner*.

- Try listening to Rush Limbaugh's and Mark Levin's radio shows. By no means do I recommend that liberals go cold turkey on the mainstream media. They should start out by listening to conservative media for only about five minutes per day to avoid shock. I am normally against any kind of insurance for a pre-existing medical condition, but I'd make an exception for TDS.

Finally, when I think of some of the wacky presidential predictions, my mind immediately turns to 1997, when the comet Hale-Bopp appeared. Art Bell's paranormal radio talk show, "Coast to Coast AM," claimed that a spacecraft was following the comet. That inspired 39 members of a San Diego cult named Heaven's Gate, who believed that their souls could escape the doomed Earth on the spacecraft, to kill themselves. Unfortunately for the predictors of Clinton's landslide win over Trump, they haven't been spared the embarrassment of being wrong.



An article by Kyle Smith titled "Ferguson: A Dramatist Corrects Journalists" was posted at [nationalreview.com](http://nationalreview.com) on Nov. 2, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Playwright Phelim McAleer has done a public service in depicting how all the destruction that the town rained down on itself sprang from one man's errant decision.

Missouri declared itself under a state of emergency on two occasions, months apart, after the fatal shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Mo., on August 9, 2014, and there were many other outbursts of violence and property destruction.

All of this unrest was based on a lie started by Brown's unreliable friend Dorian Johnson and amplified by an eager, credulous media: That Brown was unresisting, had his hands in the air and was begging not to be shot when he was killed by police officer Darren Wilson.

Sometimes it falls to a dramatist to correct journalists, and the journalist-turned-filmmaker-turned playwright Phelim McAleer has done a public service in sifting out the truth in Ferguson, a breathless 90-minute courtroom drama in which all dialogue is taken verbatim from the 25-day grand-jury proceedings that resulted in a decision not to charge Wilson. (The current production closes November 4 at the 30th Street Theatre in Manhattan but the play, which is being funded via crowdsourcing, will be restaged later in a different venue if interest is sufficient.)

Thirteen actors, some performing multiple roles, play the witnesses and the prosecutors who question them in a case everyone is aware the world is watching.

Brown, routinely described in the media as an "unarmed teen," as if the fists of an enraged 289-pound man do not constitute a threat, was under the influence of a large dose of marijuana when he and his friend Johnson were stopped by Wilson because they were walking down the double yellow line in the middle of the street.

In Brown's right hand, the officer noticed, was a box of cigarillos, which was of interest because he had just heard over the radio that a man matching Brown's description had just robbed a small convenience store of a box of cigarillos and angrily shoved a clerk who tried to stop him.

McAleer and director Jerry Dixon begin the play, which takes place on a single set representing the grand-jury room, in an unassuming manner.

Secondary witnesses describe unimportant encounters with Brown in the hours before he lost his life at noon.

One laborer remarks that Brown was mentally "slow."

A cop who trained Wilson describes him as eager to work with the mostly black community and says he enjoyed buying meals for young people.

The testimony of one sketchy witness, a white woman, falls apart when she says she walked through a passage that was physically blocked, and denies having read newspaper accounts of the shooting. In fact, she has posted Facebook comments beneath one such story, comments expressing such sentiments as "They need to kill the f\*\*\*\*\*g n\*\*\*\*\*s."

Another witness, a black man, has told the FBI he saw Wilson standing over the prone body of Brown pumping many bullets into his back.

A prosecutor drily informs him that as he has a) given a statement inconsistent with the autopsy report and b) changed his story, he stands no chance of being invited to testify at any trial in the matter.

When it comes time for the principal witnesses to relate their stories, the play becomes tense, even spellbinding. Once things get going, you won't look at your watch.

Toggling between the recollections of Wilson (who volunteered his testimony) and Johnson, who was by Brown's side throughout the encounter with the officer, creates a broad picture of what happened, but there is a spectacular divergence in the two men's testimony when it comes to the final couple of minutes of Brown's life.

Johnson insists that his friend was well clear of the car when Wilson first grabbed, then shot him. But physical evidence supports Wilson's claim that Brown leaned into the police vehicle to punch the seated officer repeatedly and grab his gun, on which Brown's DNA was found.

As Wilson, Ian Campbell Dunn is a standout, growing sweaty and panicky as he relives the terror of fighting Brown for control of his gun.

As Johnson, Cedric Benjamin is urgent, pleading, agitated for a different reason: His version of events will not stand up to scrutiny. Johnson's story falls apart when the play's last witness, Ciara Jenkins (underplayed to wonderful effect by Renika Williams), begins to speak.

A black woman, she is a disinterested observer who happened to be behind Brown and Wilson as their confrontation escalated. She recalls Brown angrily charging at Wilson like a football player, at no point raising his hands in submission. Perhaps the wounded Brown was staggering? No, she says, he was charging while the officer repeatedly shouted at him to stop before finally shooting him.

Could the encounter have ended a different way? Yes, she offers. Brown could have just stopped running.

"I don't understand why he just didn't stop," she says, quietly, sensibly, devastatingly.

All of the destruction Ferguson rained down on itself for the year that followed sprang from that one errant decision: An incensed 18-year-old, his mind addled by cannabis, gave a police officer no choice.



An article by James Delingpole titled "An Impertinent Pup From Shoppes Tried to Fact-Check Me of Global Warming; Here's My Reply . . ." was posted at [breitbart.com](http://breitbart.com) on Oct. 26, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

As I predicted, my piece "400 Scientific Papers in 2017 say 'Global Warming' is a Myth," is causing greenie heads to explode like watermelons struck by hollow-point bullets.

Here is an email I got shortly afterwards from a guy at the completely unbiased and apolitical (lol) fact-checking organization Snopes.

Hello James,

■ I'm a science writer for the fact checking website Snopes.com reporting on your '400 studies say climate change is a myth' exposé. I had a couple of questions about your process:

- Did you read all (or a fraction) of the 400 studies listed in that post personally or talk to any of the scientists involved?
- How long did it take to research this piece?
- Were you able to get an early look at the No Tricks Zone post from 23 October before it was published?

This Alex is an impertinent pup, isn't he?

Since I make it my business not to respond to snarky little tics asking irrelevant questions designed to smear and belittle rather than enlighten, I thought I'd instead deal with the issues he raises here at Breitbart.

I do this for two reasons.

- First, because publicly humiliating one's enemies is always fun.
- Second, because these climate alarmists use the same old tricks again and again to prop up their junk science scam.

It's always a good idea to expose these tricks, to show the guy behind the curtain pulling all the levers, because once you know what these people's game is, their dark magic loses its power.

That's how I became one of the world's most notorious and widely-read climate skeptics: not because I have a science degree—which I don't—but because I am able to explain this dogs breakfast of a shambles of a conspiracy to defraud the taxpayer in language that normal people can understand.

For people like the guy from Snopes who sent me that impertinent email, my tell-it-like-it-is approach is a form of *Lèse majesté*. It doesn't treat their beloved Consensus with the unthinking respect they require. It's the little boy pointing at the Emperor and saying he is wearing no clothes.

They hate that. Hence the contempt dripping from Snopes Boy's questions, which I'm going to answer in reverse order.

- Snopes's question: Were you able to get an early look at the No Tricks Zone post from 23 October before it was published?

- My answer: No.
- Snopes's question: How long did it take to research this piece?
- My answer: As little time as I possibly could.

You don't think I enjoy doing this stuff do you? When you're a climate skeptical journalist, every day is Groundhog Day. Same old grant-troughing junk scientists spouting the same old junk science lies and propaganda and drivel; same old rent-seeking corporate vultures trying to make mega bucks by screwing the rest of us; same old eco-fascist progressives pushing their anti-human, anti-liberty globalist agenda.

Someone's got to put these people back in their box, sure. But it's a necessary chore—like pouring RoundUp on your weeds, putting out the trash, shooting rats, that kind of thing—rather than something you'd want to spend too much valuable life on.

- Snopes's question: Did you read all (or a fraction) of the 400 studies listed in that post personally or talk to any of the scientists involved?
- My answer: I see what you're trying to do there. And I'm not playing. Let me explain why.

The other day I read a long book called *Life and Fate* by the Soviet Russian author Vasily Grossman. Now I don't actually speak Russian so I had to take it on trust that the English translation was a fair and reasonable reflection of what Grossman actually wrote.

Yeah, for the full authenticity of the experience I suppose I could have done the scholarly thing and spent a few years learning Russian then read it in the original. But instead I just cheated. "Life's too short" I said to myself.

I apply this aphorism to lots of other things too. For example: I get my milk in a bottle rather than squeezing it from a cow's udders; I send my kids off to boarding school so I don't have to discipline them or teach them everything they know (just most of it); I get my cars from motor manufacturers rather than trying to build them from scratch myself; if the cat or dog need medical attention I tend to take them to the vet's rather than attempt surgery on them myself.

And I also applied it when I came upon an article by Kenneth Richard at a website I've come to know and trust called No Tricks Zone.

Richard—bless his cotton socks—had taken upon himself the achingly tedious task of wading through these 400 science papers, assessing their skeptical position on "climate change," and then highlighting the key passages that supported his argument.

In other words, he'd done all my homework for me.

Yes, I suppose I could have spent days (weeks?) reading all the papers myself, then many more weeks ringing up all the scientists responsible to see whether they still stood by the words they wrote in those papers.

But I didn't—see milk; schools; cars; Russian novels, cats, dogs, etc above—because that would have been utterly and dumb and pointless.

Obviously, if it turns out that Kenneth Richard has misrepresented these papers, then yes, I can be criticized for having lazily helped promulgate a lie.

If Snopes can demonstrate this to be the case—viz that the quotations from the papers I quoted are themselves misquotations—then clearly I will apologize.

Otherwise, it seems to me, I'm bullet proof on this one. If this is what the papers say—as illustrated by the quotations—then it is what they say.

And no, it doesn't at all undermine my case some of the scientists who wrote these papers object to the context in which I have framed their research.

There are lots of reasons why someone involved in climate science might not want to feature in a Breitbart story with the glaring, clickbait headline "Now 400 Scientific Papers in 2017 say 'Global Warming' is a Myth."

- One is naked fear.

As we know from the Climategate emails, the global warming Establishment is a cabal of bullies. Not only is dissent not tolerated but it is ruthlessly crushed. Skeptics are rarely published, except in obscure journals not controlled by the Alarmist Mob; almost never granted tenure. As a result, no scientist in this field would wish to be seen visibly going against "the Consensus."

- One is dishonesty. (Or, if you prefer to be more generous, cognitive dissonance).

I discuss this in some detail here. Basically, some alarmists are so determined never to admit that they're wrong that they'll actually go so far as to deny the evidence of their own papers. This is what happened with the Nature Geoscience paper I wrote about here. It admitted that the computer models were wrong and that—therefore—their doomsday predictions were overdone. But when people like me pointed this out, the authors furiously denied it.

- One is dimness.

Yes, I dare say it's true that literally none of those 400 scientific papers uses the phrase "'global warming' is a myth." Anyone who read the piece beyond the deliberately provocative, attention-grabbing headline, however, would find it hard to dispute the premise because it's bang on the money.

When I used the phrase 'global warming', I employed it in the way in which it is most commonly employed by climate alarmists and their friends in the liberal media and people generally these days, viz: the unprecedented and catastrophic phenomenon driven primarily by anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> which we must at all costs prevent by replacing fossil fuel energy with renewables.

Only an imbecile—or a professional climate alarmist or someone fact checking for Snopes, if there's any difference—could possibly be so blinkered and stupid as to imagine otherwise.



Happy, now, my little Snopes pupster?



An article by Adelle M. Banks titled “What These Conservative Black Clergy Have to Say to LGBT Activists” was posted at lifezette.com on Oct. 24, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Conservative African-American clergy accused LGBT activists of hijacking the civil rights movement and launched a campaign to support a Colorado baker who refused to create a cake for a gay wedding.

The Rev. William Avon Keen, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference of Virginia, told reporters on Monday, October 23, that the civil rights movement’s efforts to gain equal facilities for schooling and health care do not equate with a gay couple’s wedding cake request.

“We had to fight for equal treatment because of the color of our skin,” he said, standing with other black clergy at a news conference held outside the Supreme Court. “Christians should not be forced to support sin.”

Using provocative videos and images, the “We Got Your Back, Jack” campaign’s message is that the African-American civil rights struggle and LGBT rights are not comparable, adding to the fierce debate surrounding the case scheduled to be heard by the court on December 5.

One of the images depicts “white” and “colored” water fountains along with an “LGBT” rainbow-colored bubbler—all topped with the words, “One of these never happened.”

The Rev. Dean Nelson, chairman of the Frederick Douglass Foundation, a public policy group mostly composed of Republicans, said the aim of the campaign is the “support of Jack Phillips and all people of faith and conscience who simply want to live their lives, who simply want the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”

“The government exists to protect those who have diverse opinions and viewpoints, not to punish them,” added Nelson, who also is a senior fellow for African-American affairs at the Family Research Council.

The high court case, *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*, stems from a request in 2012 by David Mullins and Charlie Craig, a Denver gay couple, who wanted a wedding cake from Phillips’ shop. Phillips, the owner, refused, saying baking such a cake would violate his deeply held Christian beliefs.

The couple filed discrimination charges against him and won before the Colorado Civil Rights Commission and in the state courts.

The clergy were joined by staffers from Alliance Defending Freedom and Family Research Council Action, advocacy groups siding with Phillips, as well

as Janet Boynes, founder of a Minneapolis-based ministry that offers “spiritual guidance for those who choose to walk away from homosexuality.”

Boynes, who described herself as an “ex-lesbian,” also objected to activists’ efforts to equate the civil rights and gay rights movements.

“I resent having my race compared to what other people do in bed,” she said. “There is no comparison. It only trivializes racial discrimination.”

Reached after the press conference, the Rev. Cedric Harmon, executive director of Many Voices—a pro-LGBTQ black church movement—rejected the premise of the campaign.

“As a believer myself and a Christian, I don’t believe that anyone in business should be using their religious beliefs to discriminate against any member of one marginalized community because to do so would open the door to discriminate against all other marginalized communities,” he said.



An editorial by Pat Buchanan titled “That Other Plot—to Bring Down Trump” was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 31, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Well over a year after the FBI began investigating “collusion” between the Trump campaign and Vladimir Putin, Special Counsel Robert Mueller has brought in his first major indictment.

Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort has been charged with a series of crimes dating back years, though none is tied directly to President Donald Trump or 2016.

With a leak to CNN that indictments were coming, Mueller’s office stole the weekend headlines. This blanketed the explosive news on a separate front, as the dots began to be connected on a bipartisan plot to bring down Trump that began two years ago.

And like “Murder of the Orient Express,” it seems almost everyone on the train had a hand in the plot.

The narrative begins in October 2015.

Then it was that the *Washington Free Beacon*, a neocon website, engaged a firm of researchers called Fusion GPS to do deep dirt-diving into Trump’s personal and professional life—and take him out.

A spinoff of Bill Kristol’s *The Weekly Standard*, the *Beacon* is run by his son-in-law. And its Daddy Warbucks is the GOP oligarch and hedge fund billionaire Paul Singer.

From October 2015 to May 2016, Fusion GPS dug up dirt for the neocons and never-Trumpers. By May, however, Trump had routed all rivals and was the certain Republican nominee.

So the Beacon bailed, and Fusion GPS found two new cash cows to finance its dirt-diving—the DNC and the Clinton campaign.

To keep the sordid business at arm's length, both engaged the party's law firm of Perkins Coie. Paid \$12.4 million by the DNC and Clinton campaign, Perkins used part of this cash hoard to pay Fusion GPS.

Here is where it begins to get interesting.

In June 2016, Fusion GPS engaged a British spy, Christopher Steele, who had headed up the Russia desk at MI6, to ferret out any connections between Trump and Russia.

Steele began contacting old acquaintances in the FSB, the Russian intelligence service. And the Russians began to feed him astonishing dirt on Trump that could, if substantiated, kill his candidacy.

Among the allegations was that Trump had consorted with prostitutes at a Moscow hotel, that the Kremlin was blackmailing him, that there was provable collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia.

In memos from June to October 2016, Steele passed this on to Fusion GPS, which passed it on to major U.S. newspapers. But as the press was unable to verify it, they declined to publish it.

Steele's final product, a 35-page dossier, has been described as full of "unsubstantiated and salacious allegations."

Steele's research, however, had also made its way to James Comey's FBI, which was apparently so taken with it that the bureau considered paying Steele to continue his work.

About this "astonishing" development, columnist Byron York of the *Washington Examiner* quotes Sen. Chuck Grassley:

"The idea that the FBI and associates of the Clinton campaign would pay Mr. Steele to investigate the Republican nominee for president in the run-up to the election raises . . . questions about the FBI's independence from politics, as well as the Obama administration's use of law enforcement and intelligence agencies for political ends."

The questions begin to pile up.

What was the FBI's relationship with the British spy who was so wired into Russian intelligence?

Did the FBI use the information Steele dug up to expand its own investigation of Russia-Trump "collusion"? Did the FBI pass what Steele unearthed to the White House and the National Security Council?

Did the Obama administration use the information from the Steele dossier to justify unmasking the names of Trump officials that had been picked up on legitimate electronic intercepts?

In testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee, Clinton campaign chair John Podesta and DNC chair Debbie Wasserman Schultz claimed they did not know that Perkins Coie had enlisted Fusion GPA or the British spy to dig up dirt on Trump.

Yet, when Podesta testified, the lawyer sitting beside him in the committee room was Marc Elias of Perkins Coie, who had engaged Fusion GPS and received the fruits of Steele's undercover work.

Here one is tempted to cite Bismarck that, if you wish to enjoy politics or sausages, you should not inquire too closely how they are made.

Thus we have Free Beacon neocons, never-Trump Republicans, the Hillary Clinton campaign, the DNC, a British spy and comrades in Russian intelligence, and perhaps the FBI, all working with secret money and seedy individuals to destroy a candidate they could not defeat in a free election.

If future revelations demonstrate that this is what went down, it is not only the White House that has major problems.

If you wish to know why Americans detest politics and hate the "swamp" that has been made of their capital city, follow this story all the way to its inevitable end. It will be months of unfolding.

The real indictment here is of the American political system, and the true tragedy is the decline of the Old Republic.



An article by Michael W. Chapman titled "Atty. Toensing on Uranium Scandal: Obama was Briefed on Russian Bribery, Kickback Operation" was posted at cnsnews.com on Nov. 1, 2017. Following is the article.

---

Although President Barack Obama apparently was briefed in 2009-2014 about a bribery and money laundering scheme involving a Russian official and Russian subsidiary involved in the transportation of uranium in the United States, the Obama administration, with the blessing of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, agreed to selling the Vancouver-based Uranium One company to Rosatom (Russia's State Atomic Energy Corporation), which gave the Russians (and President Vladimir Putin) control over 20% of U.S. uranium production.

Prior to, during, and after this sale in October 2010, at least nine investors in Uranium One gave \$145 million to the Clinton Foundation. Bill Clinton personally received \$500,000 for a speech sponsored by a Russian bank that supported the purchase of Uranium One.

An attorney, Victoria Toensing, who represents an undercover informant who helped the FBI in its investigation of the kickback and money laundering scheme, said her client has information on how bribery money came from Russian oper-

atives, and how these Russians were seeking to expand their holdings in the uranium market and “peddle influence with the State Department and the Clintons.”

Toensing, speaking on the Oct. 25 edition of Hannity, also said that her client “was being told by the FBI that President Obama was being briefed on this matter” as the investigation was occurring 2009-2014.

Investigative reporters John Solomon and Sara Carter, also on the Hannity program, confirmed some of Toensing’s statements and stressed that the money being used to buy influence was “coming from Moscow.”

“There is no doubt that the color of money that was raining down during this period was noticeably red,” said Solomon. “It was coming from Moscow. I have been working on a project just putting all the different money that’s came in from Russia. It is over \$40 million over a two-, three-year period going to people around the Clintons. That can’t be an accident.”

President Bill Clinton (Screenshot YouTube)

That money does not include the multi-million-dollar donations made to the Clinton Foundation.

Further, the informant apparently has emails, documents, and tapes that “show the bribery, the racketeering, the corruption, the money laundering and the extortion,” noted Hannity, and Victoria Toensing said, “Yes.”

She added, “And he can put a lot of meat on those bones that Sara and John have built for us. He can give context and he can tell about conversations, the Russians had, about what they were doing with various piles of money and the Uranium One.”

When asked by Hannity where the money came from, Toensing said, “Russia.”

Hannity then asked Carter and Solomon, “So, for four years, this FBI informant, Victoria’s client, worked undercover and he discovered a network, if you will, evidence that showed not only did they use money laundering, kick-backs, bribery, extortion, but that they also had the evidence that this was a network that was being built and designed by Moscow and Vladimir Putin to corner uranium market in this country. He knew that. He knew that at the time. Is that what you’re saying?”

Carter said, “That’s exactly what I’m saying.”

She continued, “I mean, one of the biggest issues was that Vladimir Putin wanted to penetrate the U.S./uranium market as well as our energy market. This was a huge deal for him. He wanted to move this through. It was a main, main point. And all of the things that he did.”

Commenting on the Russian official, Vadim Mikerin, and two other people—Daren Condrey and Boris Rubizhevsky—who were convicted in the bribery and money laundering scheme, Solomon said that the sentencing documents show

“there is no doubt that this compromised America’s nuclear security. With no doubt that it was a corrupt scheme that could have put uranium in danger.”

The informant worked undercover for the FBI in the Mikerin case. As explained by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in August 2015, two U.S. conspirators—Condrey and Rubishevsky—paid over \$2 million to influence the Russian nuclear energy official, Mikerin, and to secure business with the state-owned Russian nuclear energy company, Rosatom.

“According to court documents,” said the DOJ, “Mikerin was the president of TENAM Corporation and a director of the Pan American Department of JSC Techsnabexport (TENEX). TENAM, based in Bethesda, Maryland, is a wholly-owned subsidiary and the official representative of TENEX in the United States.

“TENEX, based in Moscow, acts as the sole supplier and exporter of Russian Federation uranium and uranium enrichment services to nuclear power companies worldwide. TENEX is a subsidiary of Russia’s State Atomic Energy Corporation [Rosatom].”

The conspiracy essentially involved Mikerin providing uranium transportation contracts bid-free to a transportation firm run by Condrey. In exchange, Condrey paid kickbacks to Mikerin. Rubishevsky, according to the DOJ, acted as a middle man to launder the payments to Mikerin.

“Court documents show that between 2004 and October 2014, conspirators agreed to make corrupt payments to influence Mikerin and to secure improper business advantages for U.S. companies that did business with TENEX, in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA),” stated the DOJ on Dec. 15, 2015.

“Mikerin admitted that he conspired with Daren Condrey, Boris Rubizhevsky and others to transmit approximately \$2,126,622 from Maryland and elsewhere in the United States to offshore shell company bank accounts located in Cyprus, Latvia and Switzerland with the intent to promote the FCPA violations. Mikerin further admitted that the conspirators used consulting agreements and code words to disguise the corrupt payments.”

In December 2015, Vadim Mikerin was sentenced to 48 months in prison for conspiracy to commit money laundering “in connection with his role in arranging more than \$2 million in corrupt payments to influence the awarding of contracts with a Russian state-owned nuclear energy corporation,” stated the DOJ. Condrey and Rubizhevsky pleaded guilty, respectively, to conspiracy to commit wire fraud and conspiracy to commit money laundering.

Some of the lead investigators in the case included Rod J. Rosenstein, who is now deputy attorney general of the United States and Andrew G. McCabe, who is now the deputy director of the FBI. During the bulk of the investigation, Robert Mueller was the FBI director; in September 2013, James Comey became the FBI director.

In 2017, Rod Rosenstein appointed Mueller as Special Counsel to investigate alleged collusion with Russia by the 2016 Trump campaign.

Tony Podesta, the brother of long-time Bill and Hillary Clinton adviser John Podesta—who ran Hillary Clinton’s 2016 presidential campaign—resigned from his lobbying firm, the Podesta Group, apparently because the firm has been drawn into the Russian collusion investigation headed by Special Counsel Robert Mueller, as the New York Times reported on Oct. 30, 2017.

“No charges have been brought against Mr. Podesta or officials from the Podesta Group or Mercury,” reported The Times. “But both firms have been subpoenaed for records and testimony about their work on behalf of a client referred to them in 2012 by Mr. Manafort and Mr. Gates, the European Center for a Modern Ukraine, a nonprofit group based in Brussels.”

Incidentally, the database at OpenSecrets.org shows that the Podesta Group has done some lobbying work for Uranium One. In 2012, the Podesta Group was paid \$40,000 by Uranium One for lobbying expenses; in 2014, \$80,000; and in 2015, \$60,000.

On his Oct. 25 broadcast, Sean Hannity asked Sara Carter, “Let’s go to 2009, what did the FBI know and why would people like Robert Mueller, the director of the FBI at the time, or Rod Rosenstein, who was the head in the investigation, why would they have ignored this and then, also, the Department of Justice, Eric Holder had to know what the FBI had. Why would he ever sign off on giving Putin 20 percent of our uranium when the evidence shows he was trying to corner market here?”

Carter said, “Back in 2009, they were well aware of money laundering, kick-backs connected to the Russian uranium industry and connected to firms here inside, you know, inside the United States . . . . [W]here did that money go and who they were bribing? And how real a National Security threat was this? I mean, was this just kind of covered up?”

“I think right now the House Intelligence Committee, the House Oversight Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee and hopefully, a special counsel will look into this and connect all of those dots,” said Carter.

Last week, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) called on the Justice Department to appoint a special counsel to investigate the Uranium One scandal. Also, according to Toensing, she is working out details for her client to brief members of Congress on what he knows.



An article by Kelly McLaughlin titled “Hillary Clinton Falls From World’s Second Most Powerful Woman to 65th After Defeat to Trump, With Theresa May Taking Her Place and Angela Merkel Still the No. 1” was posted at [daily-mail.co.uk](http://daily-mail.co.uk) on Nov. 1, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Hillary Clinton fell a shocking 63 spots to 65 on the Forbes list of the world’s most powerful women just a year after her US presidential election loss to Donald Trump.

Newcomer to the list UK Prime Minister Theresa May took Clinton's spot at No 2 on the list, while German Chancellor Angela Merkel remained at No 1 on the Forbes list for another year.

Hillary Clinton fell a shocking 63 spots to 65 on the Forbes list of the world's most powerful women after her 2016 presidential loss to Donald Trump

The former First Lady and former Secretary of State may sit 65 on the world's most powerful women list, but on a list of solely women in politics, Clinton is No 20.

Clinton has moved to the sidelines of politics since her election loss and is now building her organization, Onward Together, which works to recruit future political candidates.

Meanwhile, Merkel and May sit atop both the overall and politics-focused lists of the world's most powerful women.

Merkel, who has been in office since 2005, won a fiercely contested election this year in which she held off the growing far-right influence of the anti-immigration Alternative for Germany (AfD) party.

May, the conservative Prime Minister of the UK, moved into her role after Britons voted to leave the European Union in June 2016, prompting then-Prime Minister David Cameron to resign.



***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."