

Eye on the World

Aug. 12, 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 August 12, 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 Patrick Goodenough titled "North Korea Strengthening Ties With Iran: 'Tehran and Pyongyang Have a Common Enemy' " was posted at cnsnews.com on Aug. 9, 2017. Following is the article.

North Korea's provocative actions and belligerent rhetoric directed at the United States come at a time when the Stalinist regime is strengthening ties with another government hostile towards the U.S., building on decades of missile and nuclear program collaboration.

Pyongyang's second most-senior leader, Kim Yong-nam, attended re-elected Iranian President Hasan Rouhani's inauguration ceremony at the weekend, and at meetings with senior Iranian officials the two regimes praised each other for standing up to the U.S.

North Korea also inaugurated a new embassy in Tehran. The Trump administration has been urging countries to downgrade or suspend their diplomatic ties with Pyongyang over its missile launches.

In its account of a meeting between Kim and parliamentary speaker Ali Larijani, the Mehr news agency quoted Larijani as saying North Korea had "shown praiseworthy resistance against U.S. bullying."

The North Korean official—who is chairman of the Supreme Assembly of North Korea—had in turn declared that “Tehran and Pyongyang have a common enemy.”

Kim also backed Iran’s right to launch ballistic missiles, in the face of Western criticism.

“The Islamic Republic of Iran has stated that no authorization is required for the building and firing of missiles, and we support this strong position,” Mehr quoted Kim as saying.

“He said North Korea will not abandon its national interests and urged the U.S. to stop its hostile policies to North Korea,” the news agency continued.

“He underlined that countries make their own destiny by relying on their power, and no state should surrender to excessive powers, because it has been proven that the United States has invaded countries that are weak in terms of military power.”

“Time and date will pass and change, but our common enemy will not change at all, and the United States continues to its bullying policies,” it quoted him as saying.

Kim called for a deepening of relations with Iran, to serve both countries’ interests.

When he met with Kim, Rouhani said Iran’s excellent ties with North Korea would continue, adding that all nations should be treated with respect and that “interference in other countries’ internal affairs” was wrong.

The inauguration of Pyongyang’s new embassy in Iran was attended by North Korean vice foreign minister Choe Hui-chol and Iranian vice foreign minister Ebrahim Rahimpour, according to a report by North Korea’s Rodong Sinmun.

Choe in a speech extolled strategic relations between the two governments’ leaders in their “common struggle for independence against imperialism.”

In his remarks, Rahimpour said the Iranian people remember North Korea’s “sincere help and solidarity” when Iran faced hard times, and would in turn “fully support the struggle of the Korean people at all times,” the report said.

Missile collaboration

Iran and North Korea have both drawn condemnation for their ballistic missile programs and tests.

The two have been collaborating in missile development since at least the early 1990s. Experts from each country have observed missile launches in the other, and weapons specialists have long reported on similarities between Iranian and North Korean ballistic missiles.

Among individuals targeted in U.S. sanctions for their role in ballistic missile procurement for Iran is an Iranian who the U.S. Treasury Department has

linked to shipments from North Korea of “equipment suitable for use in ground testing of liquid propellant ballistic missiles and space launch vehicles.”

A 2011 report by a U.N. panel on North Korea raised concern about Iran-North Korea missile cooperation that would violate multiple U.N. Security Council resolutions.

“Prohibited ballistic missile-related items are suspected to have been transferred between the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the Islamic Republic of Iran on regular scheduled flights of [North Korean flag carrier] Air Koryo and Iran Air, with trans-shipment through a neighboring third country,” the report said.

(The “third country” was said by diplomats at the time to be China, which sought to block release of the U.N. report.)

In 2015 the exiled opposition National Council of Resistance of Iran (NCRI) claimed that North Korean nuclear warhead experts were secretly visiting Iran, and that Iranian officials involved in nuclear and missile-related activities were also visiting North Korea regularly.

Another NCRI report, last June, claimed that Iran has established missile facilities based on North Korean models, with the help of visiting North Korean experts.

“These North Korean experts who were sent to Iran, trained the main IRGC [Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps] missile experts in IRGC garrisons, including the Alamehdi Garrison situated southwest of Tehran,” the report said.

NCRI claimed the North Korean experts have been involved in helping the IRGC to develop warhead and guidance systems for its missiles.

In its annual assessment of worldwide threats, the intelligence community told U.S. lawmakers last May that “North Korea’s export of ballistic missiles and associated materials to several countries, including Iran” was an illustration of “its willingness to proliferate dangerous technologies.”



An article by Gage Cohen titled “Trump Attacked for N. Korea Remarks, But Liberals and Media Okay With Similar Words by Truman and Clinton” was posted at cnsnews.com on Aug. 10, 2017. Following is the article.

Although Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), Democrat lawmakers, and many members of the media were quick to criticize President Donald Trump’s “fire and fury” remarks towards North Korea, they were wrong to suggest that no other U.S. president had used such tough rhetoric about another country.

For instance, comments made by Democratic President Harry Truman, after the first atomic bomb was dropped on Japan, were arguably much harsher than what Trump said.

On Tuesday, in response to Communist North Korea threatening to bomb the island of Guam where U.S. troops are stationed, President Trump said, "North Korea best not make anymore threats to the United States, they will be met with fire and fury, like the world has never seen."

"He [Kim Jong-un] has been very threatening, beyond a normal statement," said Trump. "And as I said, they will be met with fire, fury, and frankly power—the likes of which the world has never seen before."

CNN anchor Jake Tapper criticized the president's statement, saying "this is a time when words should be chosen and measured carefully. The White House sources tell us that the president spoke extemporaneously when he made that statement about 'fire and fury.' Perhaps now might not be the best time to improvise."

Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) also disapproved of Trump's remarks during an interview on KTAR radio.

"I take exception to the president's comments because you gotta' be able to do what you say you're going to do . . . In other words, the old walk softly but carry a big stick, Teddy Roosevelt's saying, which I think is something that should've applied because all it's going to do is bring us closer to a serious confrontation," said McCain, who is a strong opponent of President Trump.

"I think this is very, very, very serious," he said. "The great leaders I've seen don't threaten unless they're ready to act and I'm not sure President Trump is ready to act . . . It's the classic Trump in that he overstates things."

In addition, many Democrats attacked the president's comments. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) said that, "President Trump is not helping the situation with his bombastic comments," and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) called Trump's "fire and fury" quote "reckless rhetoric."

House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) concurred with her Democrat colleagues, going as far as to say that the president's remarks "demonstrates weakness" and are "recklessly belligerent."

However, former Democratic Presidents Harry Truman and Bill Clinton have made similar and even stronger comments during times when the security of the United States was being threatened.

In 1993, *The New York Times* reported: "On his weekend visit to South Korea, President Clinton warned that if North Korea developed and used an atomic weapon, 'we would quickly and overwhelmingly retaliate.' 'It would mean the end of their country as they know it,' " he said.

"It is an atomic bomb. It is a harnessing of the basic power of the universe. The force from which the sun draws its power has been loosed against those who brought war to the Far East," said Truman in a statement on August 6, 1945, after the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. (The second bomb was dropped on Aug. 9, 1945.)

"We are now prepared to obliterate more rapidly and completely every productive enterprise the Japanese have above ground in any city," said Truman, the only U.S. president to order a nuclear strike on largely civilian targets. "We shall destroy their docks, their factories, and their communications. Let there be no mistake; we shall completely destroy Japan's power to make war."

"If they do not accept our terms they may expect a rain of ruin from the air the like of which has never been seen on this earth," said Truman. "Behind this air attack will follow sea and land forces in such number and power as they have not yet seen and with the fighting skill of which they are already well aware."

Neither McCain, Feinstein, Pelosi, Tapper, or other members of the liberal media have said the comments by Clinton and Truman were too harsh or dangerous.



"Eye on the World" comment: Following are headlines of two Associated Press articles about Venezuela.

An article by Juan Carlos Hernandez titled "Maduro Vows 'Maximum Penalty' for Attack on Venezuela Base" was posted at ap.org on Aug. 7, 2017.

An article by Joshua Goodman and Fabiola Sanchez titled "Venezuela's New Assembly Declares Itself All-Powerful" was posted at ap.org on Aug. 9, 2017.



An article by Sarah Knapton titled "Acid Attacks Now So Widespread Public Needs Training in Helping Victims, Warn Doctors" was posted at telegraph.co.uk on Aug. 2, 2017. Following is the article.

Acid attacks are now so prevalent that the public needs to be trained in helping victims, the Royal College of Emergency Medicine (RCEM) has said.

The London alone, the number of attacks rocketed from 261 in 2015, to 454 last year, an increase of 73 per cent.

Doctors at the RCEM and Barts Health NHS Trust say that bystanders who come to the aid of victims should be taught to quickly remove contaminated clothing and wash off the acid with copious amounts of water, which can lessen scarring and the need for plastic surgery.

They also called for legislation to make the carrying of corrosive substances in the street illegal.

"The number of high profile "acid" attacks has been increasing in recent years, especially in London," said Johann Grundlingh consultant emergency physician at Barts Health Trust, writing in the British Medical Journal (BMJ).

"The attacks, involving a range of corrosive substances, have brought into sharp focus the need for clinicians, law enforcement officers, and our law-makers to find ways to deal with this latest menace on our streets.

"The assailants' intention is not to kill, but to maim and disfigure. Corrosive substances now seem to be a replacement for carrying knives.

"Bystanders who come to the aid of the victim of an attack can have an important role in minimising further injury."

Carrying corrosive substances is currently legal with no restrictions on volume or strength, although the government is considering changing the law.

In 2002, after similar attacks, Bangladesh banned the open sale of acid and imposed stringent punishment of offenders, which saw the number of attacks fall by 15-20 per cent a year.

India and Cambodia have also implemented legislation to combat acid attacks but have yet to introduce laws restricting the ease and availability of acid.

Last month two teenage boys were arrested following six acid attacks in the streets of London in a 72 minute spree. Just days before a man was arrested for flinging acid into the face of an aspiring model in the capital.

Although acid attacks are rarely deadly, victims are often left scarred, blinded and heavily traumatised.

The substance used is usually sulphuric or nitric acid and, unlike most other countries, in the UK men are more likely to be victims than women. Since police clamped down on knife crime, gang members frequently conceal acid in water bottles.



An article by Laretta Brown titled "Gorka Explains Use of Term 'Radical Islamic Terrorism' to MSNBC: You Don't Call Cancer the Flu" was posted at townhall.com on Aug. 8, 2017. Following is the article.

Dr. Sebastian Gorka, White House deputy advisor on national security, was questioned Tuesday on MSNBC about his insistence on the use of the term "radical Islamic terrorism."

"I don't understand how calling it by its name helps stop the attacks in Paris or in Belgium or in London," MSNBC's Ali Velshi said to Gorka.

"So If you, God forbid, caught cancer, and the hospital was forbidden from calling it cancer and said, 'you have the flu, go home and hydrate and some take aspirins,' would you actually have the right treatment?" Gorka asked.

"No, but there's still no cure for cancer," MSNBC's Stephanie Ruhle replied.

"Have you not heard of chemo?" Gorka asked.

"I have heard of chemo, and cancer can still kill you, so it doesn't matter what you call it," Ruhle rejoined.

"Doesn't matter what you call it, really?" Gorka replied. "So if I call it the flu, and say go home and take some aspirin, what's going to happen?"

"There must be a better response to that, right?" Velshi said. "I asked you a very straightforward question."

"I gave you a very simple answer," Gorka responded. "If you misdiagnose anything, whether it's a serious disease or international geopolitical threat, you will never solve it."

"For the last eight years we had an administration that said oh it's economic, oh these people are disenfranchised," he added. "Look it's not about economics, it's not about being disenfranchised, it's about people who have an ideology that is evil and has to be destroyed."

Velshi then asked about stopping "lone-wolf" attacks perpetrated by individuals rather than by groups like ISIS.

"There's no such thing as a lone wolf. You do know that?" Gorka responded.

"That was a phrase invented by the last administration to make Americans stupid. There has never been—never been—a serious attack . . . or a serious plot that was unconnected from ISIS or Al Qaeda, at least through the ideology and the TTPs—the tactics, the training, the techniques, and the procedures—that they supply through the internet. Never happened. It's bogus."



An article by Laretta Brown titled "NYT Columnist Says Abortion Should Be Democratic Party Litmus Test: 'Abortion is Liberty' " was posted at townhall.com on Aug. 2, 2017. Following is the article.

Feminist writer Lindy West wrote a column in *The New York Times* Wednesday [Aug. 2] responding to comments by the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC) that there is no litmus test for candidates on abortion. West argues that for women abortion is "liberty" and views it as a non-negotiable human rights issue.

West opens by acknowledging that she relates "to the flailing panic that is no doubt undergirding such a morally putrescent idea."

The "morally putrescent" idea presumably being that of the Democratic Party abandoning support of a practice that stops the beating hearts of hundreds of thousands of babies each year.

"There is no recognizable version of the Democratic Party that does not fight unequivocally against half its constituents' being stripped of ownership of

their own bodies and lives,” West argues. “This issue represents everything Democrats purport to stand for.”

Somebody should tell that to House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) who recently argued against using abortion as a litmus test for the party, acknowledging that most of her devout Catholic extended family was pro-life.

West argues that “to legislatively oppose abortion is to be, at best, indifferent to the disenfranchisement, suffering and possibly even the death of women,” but “at worst it is to revel in those things, to believe them fundamental to the natural order.”

She acknowledges that that the left “will have to choose (and soon) between absolute ideological purity and the huge numbers required to seize the rudder of the nation and avert global catastrophe.”

“But abortion is not valid fodder for such compromise,” she says, “nor is racism, nor is L.G.B.T.Q. equality, nor is any issue that puts people’s fundamental humanity up for debate. Abortion is not a fringe issue. Abortion is liberty.”

Interestingly enough, those on the other side of the abortion issue would agree with West’s assertion that abortion “puts people’s fundamental humanity up for debate.”

Namely, the fundamental humanity of unborn people, who have heartbeats at 3 weeks, can feel pain by 20 weeks, and, even learn language in the womb.

“There is no economic equality without the ability to terminate a pregnancy,” West argues.

Many pro-life women, who view the argument that women can’t succeed without the ability to end the life of their unborn child as demeaning, would disagree with West.

West goes on to cite a Pew Research Center poll showing that 70 percent of all Americans oppose overturning Roe v. Wade and concludes that abortion is “not particularly controversial.”

However, a recent Gallup poll found that only 43 percent of Americans consider abortion to be “morally acceptable” regardless of their views on its legality.

She goes on to emphasize that abortion is not controversial on the left and asks “what contortionist of logic came up with the proposal that alienating 75 percent of one’s constituents, and declaring half to not deserve control over their bodies, can strengthen a party’s numbers? This is not broadening our coalition; it’s flagrantly shrinking it.”

West is referring to the 21 million pro-life Democrats who apparently should not be allowed to identify and run as Democrats because their views are not in line with 75 percent of the party.

West is on to something when she identifies abortion as a central issue because it puts women’s lives at stake. But perhaps she should consider that

abortion's legality puts women's lives on the line from the moment their hearts start beating in the womb and that some Democrats should be permitted to hold and act on that view.



An article by Laretta Brown titled "Chris Cuomo: Abortion Is Not About Science" was posted at townhall.com on Aug. 8, 2017. Following is the article.

An exchange between Matt Schlapp, chairman of the American Conservative Union (ACU), and CNN's Chris Cuomo Tuesday about the White House's credibility turned into a revealing back and forth over whether abortion was about science or religion.

"You're wrong on the science many of you who believe that people on the pro-life side aren't looking at the science of it," Schlapp said. "Come on the science is on my side on the unique human nature of every child."

"It's not about science, it's about ethics, religion, morality is what abortion is about, it's not about science," Cuomo replied. "Nobody's making abortion about science I haven't even brought abortion up."

"Abortion is about science," Schlapp insisted.

"The idea of when life begins, guess what?" Cuomo continued. "Nobody knows. You can believe it begins at conception. You can believe it begins 40 days after the way the Jews do, you can believe in viability."

"I'll just believe in the science," Schlapp replied.

"There is an unknown component to it," Cuomo claimed.

"No, there's not."

"That's not what the science is behind climate change, Matt, they're not the same thing," Cuomo added.

"The science of when life begins is unquestionable and the question on climate change actually there's a great diversity on the science," Schlapp said.

There is certainly a strong body of scientific evidence that life begins at conception or fertilization. Even Merriam-Webster Dictionary's definition of fertilization is "the process of union of two gametes whereby the somatic chromosome number is restored and the development of a new individual is initiated." (emphasis mine)

Dr. Jerome Lejeune, the famed geneticist who discovered the chromosomal abnormality that causes Down Syndrome, once testified before Congress, "After fertilization has taken place a new human being has come into being . . . [This] is no longer a matter of taste or opinion, it is not a metaphysical contention, it is plain experimental evidence."

Schlapp and Cuomo were mainly discussing a new CNN Poll that found that just 24 percent of Americans say they trust the Trump Administration and 73 percent believe the White House is partially, if not, completely untruthful.

These percentages are comparable to an October poll by Pew Research Center which found that only 27 percent of Americans trust the supposed “scientific consensus” on climate change being caused by human behavior.



An article by Michael W. Chapman titled “Rev. Graham: Planned Parenthood Is Pushing ‘LGBTQ Agenda’ on Children” was posted at cnsnews.com on Aug. 9, 2017. Following is the article.

Commenting on Planned Parenthood’s “guidelines” for parents, which advises them to tell their kids, even preschoolers, that “your genitals don’t make you a boy or a girl,” evangelical leader Franklin Graham said that the abortion giant’s “true colors are showing,” it is pushing the “transgender identity” onto children and, overall, “pushing the LGBTQ agenda.”

On its website, Planned Parenthood posts a section for parents and preschool kids. In that section, Planned Parenthood ignores anatomy and basic biology and states that while “girls have vulvas and boys have penises/testicles, that answer isn’t true for every boy and girl . . . some people with the gender identities ‘boy’ or ‘man’ have vulvas, and some with the gender identity ‘girl’ or ‘woman’ have penises/testicles. Your genitals don’t make you a boy or a girl.”

On Facebook, Rev. Graham said, “Planned Parenthood’s true colors are showing. They’re in the news this time because their website gives ‘guidelines’ that instruct parents to teach their children, even preschoolers, that ‘your genitals don’t make you a boy or a girl.’ ”

“They want to introduce the concept of transgender identity to a younger and younger audience—pushing the LGBTQ agenda,” said Rev. Graham.

He continued, “Among other things, it says, ‘Putting daughters in pink princess rooms and boys in blue sports rooms before they’re old enough to choose for themselves can send the message that they have to like certain things because of their gender.’”

“Remember, Planned Parenthood is the largest abortion provider in the U.S., performing over 300,000 abortions annually,” said Rev. Graham. “The thought of that alone is staggering—what a tragedy.”

“Abortion is the murder of an unborn child,” he said. “What kind of parenting is that?”



An article by Joe Difazio titled “Trump’s Taken More Vacation Days to Date Than Obama Presidency” was posted at ibt.com (*International Business Times*) on Aug. 3, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

President Donald Trump was a frequent Twitter critic of former President Barack Obama for his vacation days and golf outings, but to date, Trump has outpaced the former president on both those fronts.

Before entering the White House, Trump was a frequent critic of Obama’s personal time outside the Oval Office. Trump even criticized taking vacations at all.

“Don’t take vacations. What’s the point? If you’re not enjoying your work, you’re in the wrong job,” tweeted Trump in 2012.

Trump has apparently changed his position on the matter, as the president is set to take a 17-day vacation starting Friday [Aug. 4].

Presidential vacations are easy fodder for criticism from the opposition party. During Obama’s time in office, Trump himself blasted the former president frequently on Twitter and called him the “habitual vacationer.” But exactly how much more vacation time Trump has taken compared to his predecessor depends on how you look at it.

This is Trump’s first official vacation, however the president has visited one of his private properties upwards of 40 of the days he’s been in office—so far he’s spent seven weekends at Mar-a-Lago. And sometimes Trump adds work to pleasure, such as when he hosted and golfed with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe during one of the Mar-a-Lago outings. But in addition to the 17 days he will take in Bedminster, one can additionally count all of his other golf outings as part-day vacations.

Trump and his staff are also notoriously sneaky about whether Trump is golfing or working during these trips to his properties. His press office has tried to obscure how much the president plays.

Obama, by comparison, would release to the press who he was playing with and when.

- By the Washington Post’s count on Thursday, by the end of this vacation, Trump will have taken 53 days at leisure.
- Compared to Obama’s 15 vacation days at the end of August during his own first term as president,
- Trump has to date almost doubled the former president’s trips to the links. Moreover, Obama played 17 rounds of golf by the end of August in 2009. Trump has played 33 times—that are known about—before heading to Bedminster.

As for his predecessors?

Here are what other presidents took in their first year (according to the Annenberg Public Policy Center's Fact Check).

- Jimmy Carter took only 19 vacation days.
- Ronald Reagan took 42 days of vacation.
- George H.W. Bush took 40 days.
- Bill Clinton took 21 days.
- George W. Bush took 69.
- Obama ended his first year with 26 vacation days, according to The Annenberg Public Policy Center's Fact Check.

If the cost for Trump's outings is figured in, it would appear the current president is on track to outpace Obama's spending.

The conservative leaning watchdog group Judicial Watch estimates that Obama spent close to \$100 million on travel in his eight years as president. Working off FOIA requests that Judicial Watch also used, an Obama trip to Palm Beach cost around \$3 million. Trump's seven trips to Mar-a-Lago have cost taxpayers some \$20 million so far—and that doesn't include Trump's trips to his other respective properties. Estimates of tax payer dollars spent on Trump's golfing can range as high as \$50 million, according to Trump Golf Count.



An article by Melanie Arter titled "AG: As Many Classified Leak Referrals in Past 6 Months As in Past 3 Years Combined" was posted at cnsnews.com on Aug. 4, 2017. Following is the article.

Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced efforts to crackdown on the leaking of classified materials, including plans to review "policies affecting media subpoenas."

"First, let me say I strongly agree with the president and condemn in the strongest terms the staggering number of leaks undermining the ability of our government to protect this country. Just yesterday, we saw reports in the media about conversations the president had with foreign leaders," Sessions said.

"No one is entitled to surreptitiously fight their battles in the media by revealing sensitive government information. No government can be effective when its leaders cannot discuss sensitive matters in confidence or to talk freely in confidence with foreign leaders," he added.

Sessions was referring to transcripts of the president's conversations with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto and Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull, which were leaked to the *Washington Post* on Thursday.

Sessions said the number of referrals for investigating classified leaks to the DOJ from the intelligence community has “exploded.”

In the first six months of the Trump administration alone, the DOJ received “nearly as many criminal referrals involving unauthorized disclosures of classified information as we received in the last three years combined,” the attorney general noted.

The DOJ has tripled the number of “active leak investigations compared to the number pending at the end of the last administration,” he said. It has also charged four people with “unlawfully disclosing classified material or with concealing contacts with foreign intelligence officers.”

Sessions and Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats both head the National Insider Threat Task Force, which was established in 2011.

“Soon after I arrived here in February, I initiated a review of our leak investigations and prosecutions. I reviewed how these cases were being referred and handled and was concerned with what we found—too few referrals, too few investigations with insufficient resources dedicated to them. I concluded the unprecedented rise in leaks required a surge of additional support for more investigations and to speed up our existing investigations,” Sessions said.

Sessions said he directed Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein and newly sworn FBI Director Christopher Wray to “oversee all classified leak investigations and actively monitor the progress of each and every case.” He also directed the National Security Division and U.S. attorneys to “prioritize cases involving unauthorized disclosures.”

The DOJ has “tripled the number of active leak investigations,” he said. “In response, the FBI has increased resources devoted to leak cases and created a new counterintelligence unit to manage these cases. Simultaneously, the department is reviewing policies that impact leak investigations.”

One of the policies the DOJ is reviewing is that involving media disclosures.

“I have listened to career investigators and prosecutors about how to most successfully investigate and prosecute these matters,” Sessions said. “At their suggestion, one of the things we are doing is reviewing policies affecting media subpoenas.

“We respect the important role that the press plays and will give them respect, but it is not unlimited. They cannot place lives at risk with impunity. We must balance their role with protecting our national security and the lives of those who serve in our intelligence community, the armed forces, and all law abiding Americans,” he said.



An article by Andy Schlafly titled “Chicago Leads the Resistance” was posted at townhall.com on Aug. 9, 2017. Following is the article.

With a rising level of violence and urban decay plaguing Chicago, you'd think Mayor Rahm Emanuel would be working overtime to police his city. More than 400 homicides have been recorded there so far this year, more than New York and Los Angeles combined.

Mayor Emanuel should be using all available resources to protect Chicago's law-abiding residents from the violent crime. Instead of doing his duty, Mayor Emanuel has decided to sue the Trump administration by filing a 46-page lawsuit against Attorney General Jeff Sessions.

Mayor Emanuel wants a federal judge to stop Sessions from withholding federal grants from sanctuary cities. But a federal law (8 U.S. Code Section 1373) provides that no State or local government may "prohibit, or in any way restrict" its officials, including the police, from providing the federal government with information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of persons they have in custody or even at a brief traffic stop.

Mayor Emanuel's lawsuit claims that the federal government has to abide by something called the Welcoming City Ordinance, which was announced by previous Chicago mayors in 1985 and 1989 and then passed by the city council in 2006 and 2012. Someone should remind the mayor that he took an oath to support the U.S. Constitution, which provides for the supremacy of federal law over local ordinances.

Justice Department lawyers will respond to Mayor Emanuel's lawsuit in due course, but the attorney general is not backing down. "No amount of federal taxpayer dollars will help a city that refuses to help its own residents," Jeff Sessions said in a statement.

"To a degree perhaps unsurpassed by any other jurisdiction, the political leadership of Chicago has chosen deliberately and intentionally to adopt a policy that obstructs this country's lawful immigration system," Sessions added.

Thomas Homan, the no-nonsense head of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), spoke out against Chicago, New York, San Francisco and Philadelphia as cities that harbor illegal immigrants. "Sanctuary cities, in my opinion, are un-American," he said in a recent interview.

"In the last year, I've read all these stories of how the crime rate has exploded in Chicago, and the president's trying to help them. We're stepping up our game in Chicago. Is Chicago doing everything that it can to decrease the criminal activity up there? I say no," Homan said.

"I say no because if you're an illegal alien, and you get arrested in the United States for a crime, and you get booked in Cook County, Chicago, my officers aren't allowed in the jail. They don't accept our detainees. They don't share information with us," he said.

"Why would Cook County not want my officers, federal law enforcement officers, to go talk to somebody that committed yet another crime against the citizens of this country? It's ludicrous," the acting head of ICE continued.

“These jurisdictions, these cities, are choosing to shield people who violated the laws of this country. So, what’s next? Sanctuary cities for people who don’t want to pay their taxes?”

San Francisco became America’s best-known sanctuary city when Kate Steinle was shot and killed there on July 1, 2015, by an illegal immigrant who was released from custody by the sheriff despite 7 felony convictions and 5 orders of deportation. In accordance with a city ordinance, the sheriff refused to honor a detainer from ICE so federal officials could intercept Juan Francisco López-Sánchez while he was in custody.

A few months after Kate Steinle’s preventable death, another illegal immigrant, Pedro Figueroa-Zarceno was in police custody for an outstanding warrant. Perhaps because outrage over Kate Steinle’s unnecessary death was bringing unwanted attention to San Francisco, this time the police turned the alien over to federal authorities for deportation to El Salvador.

Like many people who were ordered deported, Pedro didn’t actually go home when ordered to do so. He remained in San Francisco while continuing to resist deportation, and in 2016 his next hearing was scheduled for 2019.

Last week, the San Francisco city attorney announced an agreement to settle a lawsuit by paying Pedro \$190,000. So the illegal immigrant not only gets to stay, but if the city council approves the settlement, he’ll also get a lump sum from the taxpayers to enjoy life while waiting for his deportation hearing.

Seattle is another sanctuary city where local officials have joined the resistance against federal immigration laws, but that may change following a horrible crime committed in a Seattle suburb by a so-called Dreamer. Salvador Diaz-Garcia is accused of brutally attacking and raping a 19-year-old woman while she was on the treadmill of the gym in her apartment complex.

The crime occurred in the small suburb of Burien, which had its own sanctuary policy, but residents there are up in arms. Following a petition signed by 3,600 of Burien’s 33,000 residents, the city council has just voted 6-1 to allow the voters in November to decide whether to repeal the sanctuary ordinance.



An article by Blair Miller titled “Denver Mayor Drafts Executive Order to Push Back on Trump Immigration Policy” was posted at thedenverchannel.com on Aug. 1, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Mayor Michael Hancock is drafting an executive order that would create a legal defense fund for immigrants as part of a series of new policies aimed at pushing back against the Donald Trump administration’s crackdown on illegal immigration.

The legal defense fund would be in place through Jan. 20, 2021—the first day of the president’s current term—and would help pay for lawyers for people

threatened with deportation, according to a fact sheet of the draft executive order provided to Denver⁷ Tuesday. The *Denver Post* reports the fund would be created mostly from donations.

The proposed executive order would put into official city policy some of the things that Hancock and the city council have pushed for in recent months as pushback to a new crackdown by Trump and his head at the Department of Justice, Jeff Sessions.

Namely, it would make it official city/county policy that immigration enforcement is a federal responsibility and that city/county employees (especially the Denver Police Department and Denver Sheriff Department) won't aid federal agents in arresting people without a warrant.

The draft proposal also would engrain into city rule that neither law enforcement agency would hold an inmate beyond their release time without a warrant—even if there is an immigration detainer in place. It would also prohibit federal agents from entering any secure areas of a law enforcement facility without a warrant.

The proposal would also establish the legal defense fund and establish a team to track federal immigration law and enforcement in regards to the city and county.

And it would continue to uphold the U-Visa program that gives visas to undocumented people who are victims of crime and aid law enforcement in the investigation.

As a final facet, the proposed order would help families who are in the process of being broken up due to deportation get connected with foreign consulates and help them plan for their separation.

The proposal comes amid a push by councilors Paul Lopez and Robin Kniech to address some of these same concerns via the council and an ordinance—specifically the legal defense fund and language regarding detainees on undocumented immigrants.

Hancock said that though both his proposed executive order and the councilor's ordinance proposals are different means to address some of the concerns about Denver being a "sanctuary city," that he thinks both of their efforts are worthwhile.

"The community can rest assured that their mayor and their city council are all working towards the same goals as this conversation continues," the mayor said in a statement. "I am grateful to Councilmembers Robin Kniech and Paul Lopez for the tremendous amount of courage and vision they showed in bring forward these concepts we jointly care about. Our goals are shared."

He said that whether it's a city ordinance, as the councilors have proposed, or his executive order that ends up being finalized into memorial or ordinance, that Denver is standing with the immigrant community.

"This executive order is another step in this administration's work to send a clear message to our refugee and immigrant communities that Denver stands with you and that you can place your trust in your city and law enforcement agencies that are working to ensure you and your families can live a safe, happy and healthy life here in Denver," Mayor Hancock said. "We remain focused on enacting policies and actions that provide real protections to our immigrant and refugee communities, and does not give people a false sense of security."

But one of Denver's top immigration lawyers, Hans Meyer, said the mayor's executive order didn't go far enough and that he preferred the councilmembers' ordinance.

"If Mayor Hancock wants to stand up for the principles he espouses and protect Denver's immigrant community against the Trump administration's deportation machine, then he should adopt all the substantive protections of the proposed ordinance and not simply cherry pick the parts that make for easy sound bites," Meyer said. "Hancock's proposed executive order fails to extract Denver probation officers, city employees, and jail personnel from colluding with ICE to deport immigrant community members."



An article by Christine Rousselle titled "Al Gore's House Uses 34 Times the Electricity As An Average House" was posted at townhall.com on Aug. 2, 2017. Following is the article.

Hypocrisy, thy name is . . . Al Gore?

A new, more-than-slightly amusing report from *The Daily Caller* alleges that the former vice president just might not be practicing what he preaches when it comes to the environment. Namely: his house in Nashville uses 34 times as much electricity than an average house.

According to *The Daily Caller*, the amount of electricity that Gore uses to heat his swimming pool over the course of a year could power six average households.

- In just this past year, Gore burned through enough energy to power the typical American household for more than 21 years, according to a new report by the National Center for Public Policy Research. The former vice president consumed 230,889 kilowatt hours (kWh) at his Nashville residence, which includes his home, pool and driveway entry gate electricity meters. A typical family uses an average of 10,812 kWh of electricity per year, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration.

- It gets worse.

- Last September alone, Gore devoured 30,993 kWh of electricity. That's enough to power 34 average American homes for a month. Over the last 12

months, Gore used more electricity just heating his outdoor swimming pool than six typical homes use in a year. (*Daily Caller*)

Yikes. That's . . . certainly something.

Of course, Gore has argued in the past that this is okay, because he pays for solar panels and contributes to a green energy fund, but his house still receives the same non-renewable energy as his neighbors. Plus, Gore owns two other properties that presumably also use electricity.

Since leaving office, Gore has spent a considerable amount of time and has received dozens of awards for his work on protecting the environment. This is certainly a laudable goal, but it'd seem less shallow if he actually practiced what he preached.



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."