

Eye on the World

Nov. 25, 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 25, 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 Adham Youssef titled "Egypt Mosque Attack: Death Toll Raised to 235" was posted at theguardian.com on Nov. 24, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

At least 235 people have been killed and scores more injured in a bomb and gun assault on a mosque in Egypt's north Sinai, in the deadliest attack in the country in recent memory.

A bomb ripped through the mosque as Friday prayers were finishing, before militants in four off-road vehicles approached and opened fire on worshippers, a military source told the Guardian. Some witnesses said they had seen around 20 attackers.

More than 50 ambulances ferried casualties from al-Rawdah mosque in Bir al-Abed, about 25 miles (40km) west of the city of Arish, to nearby hospitals. Pictures from the scene show rows of bloodied victims inside the mosque, and at least 130 people were reported to be injured.

No group claimed responsibility for the attack, but it marks a major escalation in a region where for the past three years Egyptian security forces have battled an Islamic State insurgency that has killed hundreds of police and soldiers.

The Egyptian president, Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, delivered a defiant television address on Friday evening, vowing to respond with "brute force" and offering condolences to the families of victims.

"This act will only increase our will and unity," he said. "The police and military will avenge our martyrs and restore peace and security."

He added: "We will respond with brute force to combat these terrorists and deviants . . . This is an attempt to deter us from fighting terrorism and to destroy our will, but we are steadfast, and I say to all Egyptians, the battle you are fighting is the most honourable."

Hours after the attack, Egypt's military launched airstrikes on targets in mountainous areas around Bir al-Abed, security sources and witnesses said.



A Reuters article titled "Saudi Crown Prince Calls Iran's Supreme Leader 'New Hitler' " was posted at reuters.com on Nov. 24, 2017. Following is the article.

Saudi Arabia's powerful Crown Prince called the Supreme Leader of Iran "the new Hitler of the Middle East" in an interview with the *New York Times* published on Thursday, sharply escalating the war of words between the arch-rivals.

The Sunni Muslim kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Shi'ite Iran back rival sides in wars and political crises throughout the region.

Mohammed bin Salman, who is also Saudi defense minister in the U.S.-allied kingdom, suggested the Islamic Republic's alleged expansion under Ayatollah Ali Khamenei needed to be confronted.

"But we learned from Europe that appeasement doesn't work. We don't want the new Hitler in Iran to repeat what happened in Europe in the Middle East," the paper quoted him as saying.

Iran reacted harshly by saying that Salman was discredited internationally by his "immature" behavior, state television reported.

"No one in the world and in the international arena gives credit to him because of his immature and weak-minded behavior and remarks," Iran's Foreign Ministry spokesman Bahram Qasemi was quoted as saying.

"Now that he has decided to follow the path of famous regional dictators . . . he should think about their fate as well."

Tensions soared this month when Lebanon's Saudi-allied Prime Minister Saad Hariri resigned in a television broadcast from Riyadh, citing the influence of Iran-backed Hezbollah in Lebanon and risks to his life.

Hezbollah called the move an act of war engineered by Saudi authorities, an accusation they denied.

Hariri has since suspended his resignation.

Saudi Arabia has launched thousands of air strikes in a two-and-one-half-year-old war in neighboring Yemen to defeat the Iranian-aligned Houthi movement that seized broad swaths of the country.

Salman told the *Times* that the war was going in its favor and that its allies controlled 85 percent of Yemen's territory.

The Houthis, however, still retain the main population centers despite the war effort by a Saudi-led military coalition which receives intelligence and refueling for its warplanes by the United States. Some 10,000 people have died in the conflict.

The group launched a ballistic missile toward Riyadh's main airport on Nov. 4, which Saudi Arabia decried as an act of war by Tehran.

Bin Salman said in May that the kingdom would make sure any future struggle between the two countries "is waged in Iran."

For his part, Khamenei has referred to the House of Saud as an "accursed tree," and Iranian officials have accused the kingdom of spreading terrorism, an accusation it denies.



A Reuters article by Maria Ramirez titled "Venezuelans Suffer As Malaria Outbreak Spreads in Drug-Short Nation" was posted at reuters.com on Nov. 24, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

On a recent morning in Venezuela's southern jungle state of Bolivar, Amanda Santamaria, her two sons, one daughter-in-law, and a granddaughter lined up in front of a shabby community health center in the hope of receiving treatment for malaria.

All five of them are afflicted by the mosquito-borne disease, which is rapidly spreading through Venezuela as an economic meltdown strips the country of medicine and doctors.

"We don't know if this is a curse, but the entire area is awash in malaria," said Santamaria, 56, suffering her second bout of the illness in the last three months and relying on palliative herbal teas because she has not found regular drugs.

The family was waiting with some 500 others under the scorching sun in the hope of receiving treatment.

Unsanitary conditions in Bolivar are thought to have led to a recent flare-up in malaria, a life-threatening disease that had been largely brought under control in Venezuela in the 1990s.

The outbreak was likely initially caused by illegal mining. The miners cut down rainforests and often work in pools of stagnant water, which favors the spread of mosquitoes and malaria.

In a rare release of data earlier this year, government statistics showed there were 240,613 cases of malaria last year, up 76 percent compared with 2015, with most in Bolivar.

The former Health Minister was fired after the data was published, and it has not been updated since.

The government did not respond to a request for comment on the malaria outbreak.

But health activists and doctor groups estimate that around 200 people have died from malaria over the last year nationwide, and fear the illness is starting to afflict populated urban centers.

The regional arm of the World Health Organization last month announced the arrival of over one million anti-malarial pills, which doctors deem insufficient. Patients must visit their nearest health center up to four times to complete treatment in what officials say is an attempt to avoid feeding the black market for drugs.

Still, in Venezuela's shortages-hit economy, there is a black market for nearly everything.

"In the mines they offer you pills for a gram and a half of gold," said Yudith Sanchez, a 28 year-old cook in an illegal gold mine.

Others have turned to brewing bark from cinchona trees, which was popular during the colonial era for its antiseptic properties.

"We're going to die because there is no treatment," said homemaker Yaritza Figuera, 29. Suffering from malaria, her nine year-old son sat on the floor in a health center because the waiting room was full.



A video and an article titled "Tucker Rips Marshawn Lynch for Standing for Mexican Anthem, Sitting for US Tune" were posted at foxnews.com on Nov. 20, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Tucker Carlson said Oakland Raiders back Marshawn Lynch acted in a "grotesque" manner when he stood for the Mexican National Anthem but sat for the Star-Spangled banner.

Lynch's Raiders lost to the New England Patriots at an NFL outing in Mexico City on Sunday.

Carlson said Lynch, 31, appears to be "under the impression that Mexico is a more virtuous country than his own."

He told sports agent Anthony Tall that Lynch must not know about Mexico's history of racial unrest which he said is exponentially worse than America's past sins.

Tall said Lynch is "evidence" of "how difficult it is to be black in America," adding that NBA star LeBron James shares the sentiment.

"Have you seen the people who run Mexico?" Carlson asked. "How did Afro-Mexicans do [throughout history]?"

“That’s insane,” he said of Lynch’s actions.



Looking back to 2016, here is an article by Rogelio Saenz titled “A New Book Targets Deadly Racism—in Mexico” that was posted at mysanantonio.com on Nov. 19, 2016.

“Mexico is a racist country,” Federico Navarrete proclaims at the beginning of his recently published Spanish-language book, *México Racista: Una Denuncia* (Racist Mexico: A Denunciation).

Navarrete, a prominent historian at Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, known as UNAM, cites some of Mexico’s most cherished ideals as the source of the nation’s racism. Navarrete’s provocative book has generated much discussion in Mexico.

For more than a century, Mexico has prided itself on being a *mestizo* nation, one where the mixing of Spanish men and indigenous women during the Spanish Conquest produced a blended offspring.

This is the story that all Mexican children learn in school.

Navarrete argues that this declaration is not accurate—it is a fable that has been recited for generations.

Navarrete argues that the myth was created as Mexico sought to whiten its population away from its indigenous countenance. There was great pressure on indigenous people to shed their language, culture, dress and lifestyles—to become *mestizo*. Many, of course, did not do so.

Mexicans of African descent were also omitted from the *mestizo* club as Mexico, like many other Latin American countries, denies its African roots.

Navarrete identifies the numerous venues—family and home, adages, jokes, commercials and the mass media—where racism is propagated on a daily basis. For example, there is a preference for lighter skin within the bosom of the family, and indigenous and dark-skinned people are often the butt of jokes.

Navarrete argues that when people are accused of being racist, they tend to deny or minimize their racism. People frequently downplay their racist statements or thoughts because they occur in private or are done in jest—no one is hurt.

Particularly noteworthy, according to Navarrete, is that Mexicans claim they cannot be racist because everyone in the country belongs to the same *mestizo* race. People criticized for their racism also tend to draw attention away from themselves by accusing others of being racist because they are the ones calling attention to race.

Navarrete argues forcefully that racism in Mexico is not merely idle talk. Rather, it is pernicious and noxious. The result of racist talk, actions and behavior among Mexicans is the social exclusion and devaluation of indige-

nous people and persons of African origin who are seen as not really part of Mexican society—they are the “other,” people who do not count.

Navarrete advances the concept of “necropolitics of inequality,” reflecting great disparity in the probability of death with impunity.

“The ease and impunity in which so many Mexicans are murdered, disappeared, tortured and kidnapped signify that the right to life and other fundamental human rights are not distributed in an equal manner among Mexican citizens,” Navarrete writes.

Put simply, the lives of some people are more valuable than those of others. Navarrete lists sectors of Mexican society that are most vulnerable to such death and violence: “marginalized youth, women, persons with nontraditional sexual identities, journalists, peasants whose territories contain valuable natural resources.”

A recent study of the 35 countries forming the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, or OECD, found that Mexico had the second highest level of inequality in 2014. Racism and inequality intersect to marginalize the lives of many Mexicans.

Navarrete asserts that some of the most heinous murders over the last couple of decades in Mexico show the minimization of the lives of Mexicans who live on the margins of society.

He draws attention to the impunity and the Mexican government’s lack of concern for the disappearance and murder of the 43 student teachers in Ayotzinapa, Guerrero, in September 2014; the killings of hundreds of women in Ciudad Juárez in the 1990s and 2000s; the mass murder of 200 Central and South American migrants in San Fernando, Tamaulipas, in 2010 and 2011; and the mass murder of 22 individuals assumed to be narco-traffickers at the hands of Mexican soldiers in Tlatlaya on June 30, 2014.

Navarrete asserts that the indigenous roots, the darker skin and the low socioeconomic standing of these victims made their lives invisible and expendable. He avers that there would be an uproar in the government and mass media, and among the elite if the victims were “beautiful” people from privileged classes.

In the case of the 22 people killed by soldiers in Tlatlaya, Navarrete points out that the Mexican newspaper *El País* aptly described how much the Mexican government valued the lives of the victims in its headline “Only 12 Words for Each Dead Person,” referring to the government’s terse 273-word announcement of the incident.

Navarrete’s book is a valuable addition to the growing body of scholarship calling attention to racism in Mexico. The book aims to provoke dialogue in the country to make the invisible visible, and to ultimately better the social, economic and political position of the marginalized.

We can also draw on Navarrete’s book to understand the similarities of racism in Mexico and the United States. They are numerous. In both countries we see the link between the value of one’s life, and the color of one’s skin and one’s socioeconomic standing.

In Mexico, people of indigenous and African origins are the poorest, least educated, most marginalized and most invisible in the country; in the U.S., Native Americans, African-Americans and Latinos hold this unfortunate distinction.

Over the last several years in the U.S., there has been a surge in the killing with impunity of unarmed African-Americans by police officers. Activists have needed to remind us that "Black lives matter."

In addition, the racial inequalities found in both countries are long-standing, going back for centuries. In both countries the mainstream vehemently denies the existence of racism. Mexico denies it along the lines of its own brand of colorblindness—"We are all mestizos," therefore we cannot be racists.

The U.S. disavows the existence of racism through its own form of colorblindness—"We do not see color differences in people"—and proclamation of reaching postracial status, where race is no longer important in the lives of people; after all, "we have elected a black president."

In the end, it is this denial of the role that race plays in long-standing racial inequality that helps perpetuate racial inequality.

Society is inculcated with the fables of race and racism that Mexico and the United States exalt. The "normal" and "what we all see" set the stage for people to wear blinders concerning racial matters and racism—namely, that race has nothing to do with one's societal position.

Naysayers who insist that racism exists are discounted as the real racists, with the dialogue coming to a halt. It is important to recognize that racism is not just about individuals but a system—in our institutions, laws, customs and attitudes—that perpetuates racial inequality.

In the U.S. legal system, even with statistical evidence, racial disparities—associated, say, with voting rights, redistricting and the death penalty—are substantiated only when there is a visible smoking gun bearing actual intent to commit racial discrimination.

Such conditions regenerate racial inequality.



An article by Rick Moran titled "ESPN Anchor Accuses Internet Critics of Being 'Chickens***s' " was posted at americanthinker.com on Nov. 18, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

ESPN Sportscenter anchor Scott Van Pelt thinks anyone who stops watching ESPN because of the political controversies generated by its far-left bias is a "chickens---" and are "so dumb that I can't even pray for you because you're beyond hope."

Van Pelt rejects the idea that people have legitimate grievances with the network.

Sports Illustrated:

■ “This make-believe world where everyone talks [s—] ... this [s—]-talking, poke-you-in-the-chest virtual whatever it’s just there’s nothing more chicken [s—] than that, because it’s the easiest thing in the world to do and again, if that’s how people really felt, somewhere along the line, I would’ve intersected with someone that felt that way and came up and said, ‘Hey, I think your show sucks. I think ESPN sucks and I think you guys are doomed.’ Never. Not once.”

This is hysterical. A guy who lives and works in one of the most liberal states in the union—New Jersey—has never come in contact with someone who says he stinks and the network stinks? Duh.

No doubt he hasn’t come in contact with too many people who voted Republican either.

■ “If you truly wanna boycott the NFL and you wanna boycott ESPN, the notion that some guy sitting out there, or gal, and they decide, ‘you know what, I’m gonna cut my entire cable package because ESPN gave an award on a made-up show in July because there’s no sports, to a woman who used to be a man, so I’m now not gonna have any cable TV at all and I’m gonna sit around at night and read books by candlelight like olden times because of that,’ that’s not happening. And if you did that, then you’re so dumb that I can’t even pray for you because you’re beyond hope. If that was your reaction to this, was to deny yourself the ability to watch television, I mean that just hasn’t happened and didn’t happen, so I boycott them.”

Hey, Scott: What about those of us who simply refuse to watch or rarely watch ESPN? You don’t have to “cut the cord” to avoid being included in Nielsen ratings. You make a conscious decision not to watch anything on ESPN if you can help it.

I am a sports fanatic and used to turn on ESPN when I got up in the morning and watch numerous broadcasts of live sporting events. No more.

Van Pelt doesn’t understand that the network has become unwatchable—even for fanatics. Nobody wants to have some know-nothing ex-jock or empty-headed host get in his face about one political issue or another. If I want ignorant political opinions, I will visit a far-left or far-right website.

Van Pelt has set up a straw man and knocks it down expertly. He has chosen to respond to the most extreme ESPN critics who fantasize about the end of the network. ESPN is a Walt Disney company—one of the richest media conglomerates in the world. It is not going under anytime soon, if ever.

What Van Pelt doesn’t address is the very real and very serious loss in viewers—and not just for NFL broadcasts. ESPN fired 100 on-air personalities, and word on the street is that they are going to fire dozens more before the end of the year, for Pete’s sake. That isn’t a sign that the network is bleeding viewers and revenue?

Since he’s so isolated and cocooned in his little liberal bubble and oblivious to the massive damage done to the network’s brand by its relentless inclusion of politics in sports programming, I certainly hope Van Pelt doesn’t wake up one day soon and find himself a casualty of the network’s stupidity.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Diversity Obsession" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Nov. 22, 2017. Following is the article.

A common feature of our time is the extent to which many in our nation have become preoccupied with diversity.

But true diversity obsession, almost a mania, is found at our institutions of higher learning.

Rather than have a knee-jerk response for or against diversity, I think we should ask just what is diversity and whether it's a good thing. How do we tell whether a college, a department or another unit within a college is diverse or not? What exemptions from diversity are permitted?

Seeing as college presidents and provosts are the main diversity pushers, we might start with their vision of diversity. Ask your average college president or provost whether he even bothers promoting political diversity among faculty. I'll guarantee that if he is honest—and even bothers to answer the question—he will say no.

According to a recent study, professors who are registered Democrats outnumber their Republican counterparts by a 12-1 ratio. In some departments, such as history, Democratic professors outnumber their Republican counterparts by a 33-1 ratio.

The fact is that when college presidents and their diversity coterie talk about diversity, they're talking mostly about pleasing mixtures of race. Years ago, they called their agenda affirmative action, racial preferences or racial quotas. Not only did these terms fall out of favor but also voters approved initiatives banning choosing by race.

Courts found some of the choosing by race unconstitutional. That meant that the race people had to repackage their agenda. That repackaging became known as diversity. Some race people were bold enough to argue that "diversity" produces educational benefits to all students, including white students.

Nobody has bothered to scientifically establish what those benefits are. For example, does a racially diverse student body lead to higher scores on graduate admissions tests, such as the GRE, LSAT and MCAT?

By the way, Israel, Japan and South Korea are among the world's least racially diverse nations. In terms of academic achievement, their students run circles around diversity-crazed Americans.

There is one area of college life where administrators demonstrate utter contempt for diversity, and that's in sports. It is by no means unusual to watch a Saturday afternoon college basketball game and see that the starting five on both teams are black.

White players, not to mention Asian players, are underrepresented. Similar underrepresentation is practiced in college football. Where you find whites

overrepresented in both sports is on the cheerleading squads, which are mostly composed of white women.

If you were to explore this lack of racial diversity in sports with a college president, he might answer, "We look for the best players, and it so happens that blacks dominate."

I would totally agree but ask him whether the same policy of choosing the best applies to the college's admissions policy. Of course, the honest answer would be a flat-out no.

The most important issue related to college diversity obsession is what happens to black students. Black parents should not allow their sons and daughters to fall victim to the diversity hustle, even if the diversity hustler is a black official of the college.

Black parents should not allow their sons and daughters to attend a college where they would not be admitted if they were white.

A good rule of thumb is not to allow your children to attend a college where their SAT score is 200 or more points below the average of that college. Keep in mind that students are not qualified or unqualified in any absolute sense. There are more than 4,800 colleges—a college for most anybody.

The bottom-line question for black parents and black people in general is: Which is better, a black student's being admitted to an elite college and winding up in the bottom of his class or flunking out or being admitted to a less prestigious college and performing just as well as his white peers and graduating?

I would opt for the latter. You might ask, "Williams, but how will the nation's elite colleges fulfill their racial diversity needs?"

My answer is that's their problem.



"Eye on the World" comment: There is a school-of-thought that says that Bill Clinton's sexual sins happened so long ago that they should not be included with the current discussions about the sexual sins of politicians and Hollywood executives. However, another school-of-thought says that comments by Hillary Clinton draw her and her husband back into the media spotlight.

■ An article by Katie Pavlich titled "Hillary Says Bill Clinton's Victims Are 'Misremembering' History" was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 22, 2017.

■ A statement by Hillary Clinton titled "Every survivor of sexual assault deserves to be heard, believed and supported" was posted at twitter.com on Nov. 22, 2015.

■ An article by Amanda Prestigiancomo titled "7 Times Hillary Clinton Threatened, Smeared and Targeted Women" was posted at dailywire.com on Sept. 29, 2016.

■ An article by Matt Vespa titled “Radio Host Grills Hillary on Bill’s Sexual Assault Allegations: Do You Regret Attacking His Accusers?” was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 21, 2017.



An editorial by Ann Coulter titled “The History of Sex in America, Part 1” was posted at townhall.com on Nov. 24, 2017. Following is the article.

-
- “Spotlight on sexual harassment moves victims to break silence”
 - “Women Drawing the Line”
 - “The Evolving Concept of Sexual Harassment”

Thousands and thousands of headlines like these appeared in newspapers across the country—back in 1991. Spare us the self-righteousness, millennials.

Just as every new generation thinks it discovered sex, refusing to wonder how they came kicking and screaming into the world, apparently the new thing is for every generation to think it discovered sexual harassment.

There have been tectonic shifts in Americans’ attitudes about sex, but the idea of thanking someone by sending him a prostitute with a note in her vagina is of relatively recent vintage.

These are the major epochs in American sexual history:

- 1607-1968: Women in America were treated better than any place else on Earth, at any time in history.
- 1968-1991: Manson Family values swept the nation, with the rise of the Worst Generation. Left-wing men, from senators to hippies, treated women as subjugated beings and sexual playthings.

The Weathermen forced girls into group sex. The Supreme Court granted constitutional protection to the most vile forms of pornography. Hollywood dumped the Hays Code, and promptly went pedal-to-the-metal on movies showing the bright side of the sexual exploitation of women.

Sen. Teddy Kennedy let a girl drown at Chappaquiddick, after driving with his lights off to avoid detection on the way to a late-night extramarital liaison, and then didn’t report the accident for hours, passing houses with their lights on, while he tried to construct an alibi, ending with him asking his cousin to say he was driving.

The *New York Times*’ James Reston’s first sentence on Kennedy’s killing and cover-up was: “Tragedy has again struck the Kennedy family.” Within 11 years Kennedy was running for president to gushing press notices.

- 1991-the near-present: Sexual degradation of women is still taken utterly unseriously by the left, as sexual harassment is used exclusively as a political weapon against enemies of the state: conservatives, white men, athletes and Haven Monahan, the rakish UVA frat boy who didn’t exist, but was still made infamous by *Rolling Stone* magazine.

The proof comes from two major events from the 1990s: The false sexual harassment charges against Judge Clarence Thomas in 1991 and the true sexual assault charges against President Bill Clinton in 1998.

The whole country knew Anita Hill was not telling the truth when she claimed Thomas had sexually harassed her at the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Perry Mason-style, her charges were produced decades after the alleged dirty talk, but right before the U.S. Senate voted on Thomas' nomination to the Supreme Court.

Hill didn't want to go public with her story (for good reason). But she was assured by feminists that she just had to whisper vague allegations to the Senate Judiciary Committee and Thomas would quietly withdraw.

Even the accusations are hard to take seriously in the Age of Weinstein. Hill said Thomas talked about pornography and bragged about his sexual prowess. No touching, no propositioning, no quid pro quo, no grabbing a woman's breasts and taking a photo.

The media did all they could to support Hill, featuring her defenders on all the Sunday shows, but—and this was the key—Americans saw the hearings.

Poll after poll showed that the public believed Thomas by staggering margins. Not one person who knew both Hill and Thomas believed Hill. Even wacko feminists and eunuch "feminist" males didn't really believe Hill. As mentioned, they just wanted to block Thomas' nomination in order to save "choice."

In the end, 11 Democrats voted to confirm his nomination.

Feminists lost the battle, but won the war by bothering all of us with their sexual harassment training sessions for the next few decades. Men just don't get it! Women don't lie! Believe the women! (Some women were NOT to be believed: The ones telling pollsters they believed Thomas over Hill, 2 to 1.)

After years of this sex panic, with men being sued for telling their secretaries "you look great in that," feminists finally got themselves a genuine sexual predator with President Bill Clinton.

Feminists defended the predator.



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."