

Eye on the World

Feb. 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 Feb. 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 Wael Mahdi titled "Saudi Arabia Breaks Records on Oil Exports and Output for Year" was posted at bloomberg.com on Feb. 20, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Saudi Arabia boosted oil exports and production last year to the highest monthly averages on record as the global crude market endured oversupply.

Exports climbed to 7.65 million barrels a day on average last year, from 7.39 million barrels a day a year earlier, according to Joint Organisations Data Initiative monthly data compiled by Bloomberg. Production rose to 10.46 million barrels a day from 10.19 million, on average, over the same period.

Saudi Arabia led the push by global producers to end a crude glut by cutting output as of Jan. 1. JODI data indicate that the kingdom's exports surged to more than 8 million barrels a day in November and December right before the cuts were due to start. Shipments in November were the highest since May 2003, JODI data show.

"Whenever there was no agreement with others, Saudi Arabia was running after expanding its market share," said Mohamed Ramady, an independent analyst in London.

Saudi Arabia pumped 10.2 million barrels to 10.67 million barrels a day in the first 10 months as producers discussed output cuts without making an agreement. It reined in production in January following the deal between the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and non-OPEC nations to reduce output by 1.8 million barrels a day, according to data compiled by Bloomberg.



An article titled “Study: Venezuelans Lost 19 lbs. on Average Over Past Year Due to Lack of Food” was posted at foxnews.com on Feb. 20, 2017. Following is the article.

In a new sign that Venezuela’s financial crisis is morphing dangerously into a humanitarian one, a new nationwide survey shows that in the past year nearly 75 percent of the population lost an average of 19 pounds for lack of food.

The extreme poor said they dropped even more weight than that.

The 2016 Living Conditions Survey (Encovi, for its name in Spanish), conducted among 6,500 families, also found that as many as 32.5 percent eat only once or twice a day—the figure was 11.3 just a year ago.

In all, 82 percent of the nation’s households live in poverty, the study found.

Venezuelans suffer shortages of the most basic goods, from food to medicine, amid triple-digit inflation and a nearly 80 percent currency collapse in the last year.

A whopping 93.3 percent told Encovi researchers that their income was not enough to cover their food needs, which would explain why Venezuelans are replacing red and white meat with vegetables and tubers, mainly potato, and other cheaper options.

“There is a change in eating habits patterns from 2014 [when Encovi surveys began]. Previously Venezuelans consumed primarily rice, breads and pastas; now it’s tubers,” said Maritza Landaeta, a researcher with the Venezuelan Health Observatory, as quoted by runrun.es.

“In our qualitative studies we observed mothers who say that they fed their children only with bananas or auyamas [a kind of pumpkin] to satisfy their feeding needs,” she said.

Additionally, 65 percent of those surveyed admitted having children at home who had skipped school for food-related reasons—including filling in for their parents in the long food lines.

Venezuela’s food crisis has gotten so bad that remains of everything from dogs and cats to donkeys and even giant anteaters have been found in garbage bags at city dumps around the country.

“Sometimes we only find the animal’s heads, guts and legs. We used to see this very little in the past, but this practice is now out of control and on the

rise,” Robert Linares, a Maracaibo waste disposal worker, told the Miami Herald. Linares added he recently found on the street the remains of a dog that had been skinned and dismembered.

The once-wealthy oil producing nation has fallen on hard times since Nicolás Maduro took power following the death of socialist leader Hugo Chávez in 2013. A drop in global oil prices has crippled the country’s economy and Venezuela has been plagued with the worst inflation rate in the world, close to 700 percent last year, according to International Monetary Fund.

The lack of food has even earned a nickname: “The Maduro Diet.”



An article by Carola Sole titled “Brazil’s Poorest Region Suffers Worst Drought in a Century” was posted at yahoo.com on Feb. 22, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

A cow’s skull lies baking in the sun and nearby another dead cow rots, symbols of the desolation gripping northeastern Brazil during its worst drought in a century.

Farmer Kerginaldo Pereira, 30, walks through the dust and cactuses in dismay. There are in all about 30 skeletons of cattle, donkeys and other farm animals in a sort of open-air cemetery set aside in his settlement of Nova Canaa, in Ceara state, to avoid spread of disease.

“Most are animals that died of thirst or hunger. Sadly, that’s the reality. So many animals have died in these five years of drought,” Pereira said.

The semiarid northeast of Brazil, known as the Sertao, is used to rain shortages but no one can remember a drought like this. There has been almost no rain since 2012 and the leafless, desiccated landscape has the appearance of having been in a vast fire.

Rivers and reservoirs that used to serve rural populations are not coping. The authorities estimate that reserves are at six percent capacity, with some completely emptied.

Pereira said he had to sell his other three cows and 10 sheep, fetching poor prices because they were “skeletal.”

Like others in Nova Canaa, home to 70 families near the town of Quixeramobim, he could no longer afford to feed the animals as well his two small daughters.

Everyday activities, even washing clothes or drinking, have become a luxury in the Sertao, which extends across eight states. The region has 25 million inhabitants and of them three million have insufficient water, according to state government figures—a ratio that shoots up for those living in the countryside.

Rural communities depend on government water trucks, which fill cisterns. Even so there is only enough for about 20 liters (5.3 gallons) a day per person, far off the World Health Organization's recommended 50 to 100 liters a day, for drinking, cooking and sanitation.

To boost this supply, villages get together to pay for hard-to-afford private deliveries, or they go with donkeys to public wells where they stand in line for hours. Some dig their own wells but the water is so salty that even animals refuse to drink.

Most families get little more than about \$130 a month in social security and emergency drought aide—barely enough, especially when extra deliveries by truck cost about \$50.

"We were able to get through one year of drought easily, because the reservoirs still had plenty of water saved, but now we are having to conserve more every day," said Clara Carneiro, a 67-year-old farmer. She saves shower water and reuses washing-up water to give to her dozen cows, which each need 100 liters a day.

Tourism has also dried up, literally.

The Paradise Bar, with views of the Cedro Reservoir in Quixada, is still open but there are few customers now that the lake, which has a capacity of more than the equivalent of 50,000 Olympic swimming pools, is completely dry.

Hundreds of carcasses of turtles and the bones of fish litter the bed of the reservoir.

Local people who depended on fishing in the reservoir say the drought has devastated them.

"Everybody here lived by fishing. There were a lot of fish, shrimps," said Francisco Elso Pinheiro, 75. He said that by selling fish he had been able to double his approximately \$300 a month pension.

His boat now? It's anchored in the middle of dry land.

Weather forecasts for 2017 give little hope of the Sertao getting a break, let alone refilling the reservoirs. The small communities around Quixeramobim say only God can help them.

"We have to pray because the only one who can help is above. The politicians forget about us once elections are over," said farmer Sebastiao Batista, 66, looking upward.



An Associated Press article by Mark Stevenson titled "Mexicans Weigh the Daunting Prospect of Deportee Camps" was posted at washingtonpost.com on Feb. 22, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Mexicans fear deportee and refugee camps could be popping up along their northern border under the Trump administration's plan to start deporting to Mexico all Latin Americans and others who entered the U.S. illegally through this country.

Previous U.S. policy called for only Mexican citizens to be sent to Mexico. Migrants known as "OTMs"—Other Than Mexicans—got flown back to their homelands.

Now, under a sweeping rewrite of enforcement policies announced Tuesday by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, migrants might be dumped over the border into a violence-plagued land where they have no ties while their asylum claims or deportation proceedings are heard in the United States. U.S. officials didn't say what Mexico would be expected to do with them.

The only consensus so far in Mexico about the new policies of President Donald Trump is that the country isn't remotely prepared.

"Not in any way, shape or form," said the Rev. Patrick Murphy, a priest who runs the Casa del Migrante shelter in the border city of Tijuana, which currently houses about 55 Haitian immigrants. They were part of wave of thousands who swarmed to the border in the closing months of the Obama administration in hopes of getting asylum in the U.S.

Tijuana was overwhelmed, and while the government did little, a string of private Christian groups pitched in to open shelters with improvised bedding, tents and sanitary facilities. Donated food kept the Haitians going.

Mexicans quake at the thought of handling not thousands, but hundreds of thousands of foreigners in a border region already struggling with drug gangs and violence.



An article by Scott Erickson titled "The Truth About Sanctuary Cities And Crime Rates" was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 17, 2017. Following is the article.

If restricting local law enforcement from cooperating with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainer requests is supposed to make communities safer, as some immigration advocates and law enforcement officials suggest, I'd like to hear them reconcile their beliefs with the actions of Texas' Travis County Sheriff Sally Hernandez.

Hernandez, sworn in as the newly elected head of the Travis County Sheriff's Department last month, almost immediately adopted an anti-cooperation policy prohibiting her department from honoring nearly all ICE detainer requests.

"The public must be confident that local law enforcement is focused on local public safety, not on federal immigration enforcement," Hernandez said.

Detainer requests are notices sent by ICE to local jurisdictions informing them of its desire to take physical custody of an individual in local custody.

The sheriff's new policy stipulated that only four exempted crimes—murder, capital murder, aggravated sexual assault, and human trafficking—would be grounds for her department to honor an ICE detainer.

Unfortunately for the alleged victim of Hugo Javier Gallardo-Gonzalez and the community at large, accusations of repeatedly sexually abusing a child did not meet the criminal standard for ICE cooperation set by the sheriff.

Gallardo-Gonzalez was arrested this past Sunday, accused of sexually assaulting his girlfriend's young daughter beginning in 2014. The abuse is alleged to have continued for over a year.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement submitted a detainer request to the Travis County Sheriff's Office in order to take custody of Gallardo-Gonzalez, but their request was denied.

Gallardo-Gonzalez subsequently made bail the next day and is now waiting to be released once outfitted with a GPS monitor.

The decision by Hernandez to deny the ICE detainer request was reckless and borders on malfeasance.

Whose well-being is served by the decision to dismiss this ICE detainer request and release into the public an individual accused of a particularly heinous crime? Is the public safer as a result? Is the community of illegal individuals safer?

The answers to those questions seem clear enough. No one, save perhaps the accused man, is better off for the decision by the sheriff to deny assistance to ICE.

But this reality doesn't conform to the narrative repeated by many that suggest law enforcement cooperation with federal immigration authorities hurts public safety and erodes police and community relations.

Mayor Javier Gonzales of Santa Fe, New Mexico, argued only months ago that sanctuary cities have no impact on crime, stating, "Study after study [has] shown that sanctuary cities do not lead to an increase in crime because of the presence of people that are undocumented."

But a 2014 draft study conducted by ICE doesn't support the mayor's notion that sanctuary cities have no impact on crime.

The study found that during the observation time frame (January 2014 to August 2014), 8,145 individuals were released from jail after arrest due to their respective jurisdictions declining an immigration detainer request from ICE.

Of the 8,145 individuals released, 1,867 were subsequently re-arrested a total of 4,298 times and accumulated a staggering 7,491 charges.

So much for the argument that sanctuary cities have no impact on crime.

The notion that local law enforcement cooperation with ICE will somehow also destroy police and community relations—specifically relations between the police and communities of illegal immigrants—is tenuous.

No community of decent people—citizens, illegal immigrants, or otherwise—wants to live in a society beset by violence and social dysfunction. Stripping local law enforcement of the ability to merely cooperate with their federal counterparts on issues as plain as the removal of a dangerous criminal jeopardizes the safety of all law-abiding individuals.

Hernandez and her refusal to cooperate with ICE on the removal of an individual accused of sexual assault against a child demonstrates the absurdity of those devoted to a dogmatic faith in sanctuary cities. Clarity and perspective should rule the day, especially when public safety is at stake.



An article titled “Arizona Sheriff Releasing 400 ‘Criminal Illegal Immigrants’ Every 10 Days” was posted at judicialwatch.org on Feb. 22, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

An average of 400 “criminal illegal immigrants” are being released every 10 days by the newly elected sheriff in Arizona’s most populous county, federal law enforcement sources tell Judicial Watch, many of them violent offenders.

It’s part of Maricopa County Sheriff Paul Penzone’s new policy to protect illegal aliens, even those who have committed serious state crimes, from deportation. Under a longtime partnership between the county and the feds, the Phoenix field office of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) was notified when “aliens unlawfully present with additional Arizona charges” were released from the Maricopa County Jail, which is one of the nation’s largest with a population of about 8,000.

That ended when Penzone, who refers to illegal immigrants as “guests,” took office this year and, though he formally announced the change last week, it was put into practice much earlier.

During a recent 10-day period, more than 400 criminal illegal immigrants were released from the Maricopa County Jail, according to federal law enforcement officials directly involved in the process in Phoenix.

Weekdays are the busiest, with an average of about 40 criminal illegal aliens getting released from Maricopa County Jail facilities, the sources said. On weekends the number drops to about ten each day.

The illegal aliens have state criminal charges ranging from misdemeanors to felonies, driving under the influence and drug offenses. “There’s no telling how many criminals he’s (Sheriff Penzone) putting on the streets,” said a

high-ranking federal law enforcement official stationed in Arizona. Judicial Watch's calls to the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office were not returned.

Before the new sheriff changed the system, ICE would send a wagon every 12 hours to pick up criminal illegal aliens scheduled to be released from the main jail in Maricopa County. Under the new policy, Maricopa County officials are not giving ICE "any notification at all of the release of criminal illegals," according to an agency official in Phoenix who's not authorized to talk and can't be identified.

Without cooperation from county authorities, federal agents would have to stand at the door to the jail 24 hours a day and guess which prisoner should be deported, sources said.

"We can't stand out there and question everyone that walks out of that jail," said a federal agent directly involved in the matter. "Even if we did, we would have to make arrests on the street, in the middle of protestors, families and picketers and that will only heighten the danger to agents."



An article by KC Baker titled "Hero Grandmother Thwarts Baton Attack on Baton Rouge Cop: 'We Have Just Lost Too Many Men' " was posted at yahoo.com on Feb. 22, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

On Sunday, driver after driver saw a man attacking a Baton Rouge, Louisiana, police officer who'd tried to arrest him but just kept going.

Only one stopped to help him—a petite grandmother [who is black] who jumped out of her car and onto the man's back, possibly saving the officer's [who is white] life in the process.

Vickie Williams-Tillman, 56, was heading to a Sam's Club in Baton Rouge early Sunday morning to buy fixings for a nice Sunday meal for her husband when she saw an officer on the side of the road in a heated exchange with a suspect.

Concerned, she slowed her car to a stop—and saw the suspect lunge at the officer.

"They began tussling on the other side of the car," she tells *People*. "It didn't look good."

Thinking fast, the mother of three and grandmother of four dialed 911.

"But that wasn't enough," says Williams-Tillman, who works at a Catholic school during the day and cleans offices at night.

According to Baton Rouge police, Cpl. Billy Aime, 44, a 21-year police veteran, found drugs in the suspect's vehicle during a traffic stop just before 8 a.m. on Sunday on Harry Drive.

When Aime tried to handcuff the suspect, identified as 28-year-old Thomas Bennett, he allegedly became aggressive, Baton Rouge Police Department spokesman Sgt. L’Jean McKneely tells *People*.

Bennett allegedly grabbed Aime’s baton, using it to repeatedly hit him in the head, says McKneely.

That’s when Williams-Tillman took action.

She asked, “You got it?” she says.

Still struggling with the suspect, the officer mouthed the word no.

At that moment, she says, “The officer and I just locked eyes. I will never forget the look in his eyes. His eyes said, ‘Help me.’ ”

Risking her own safety, the 5-foot-2-inch Williams-Tillman “jumped out of her vehicle and onto back of the assailant,” according to police. “It was just instinct,” she says, adding, “God led the way.”

Just then, backup arrived and subdued Bennett with a stun gun. He was taken into custody and booked into East Baton Rouge Parish Prison on counts of aggravated battery, disarming a police officer, battery on a police officer, resisting an officer with violence, possession of cocaine and possession of drug paraphernalia, according to police.

After the attack, Williams-Tillman said she and Aime hugged each other. “All these emotions came out,” she says. “It was like we already knew each other.”

Williams-Tillman, who hurt her hand and wrist, was taken to the hospital afterward, along with Aime and the suspect, where she was treated and released.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled “There’s Nothing Free” was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Feb. 22, 2017. Following is the article.

It was Nobel laureate economist Milton Friedman who made famous the adage, “There’s no such thing as a free lunch.” Professor Friedman could have added that there is a difference between something’s being free and something’s having a zero price.

For example, people say that there’s free public education and there are free libraries, but public education and libraries cost money.

Proof that they have costs is the fact that somebody has to have less of something by giving up tax money so that schools and libraries can be produced and operated. A much more accurate statement is that we have zero-price public education and libraries.

Costs can be concealed but not eliminated. If people ignore costs and look only to benefits, they will do darn near anything, because everything has a benefit. Politicians love the fact that costs can easily be concealed. The call for import restrictions, in the name of saving jobs, is politically popular in some quarters. But few talk about the costs.

We know there are costs because nothing is free.

Let's start with a hypothetical example of tariff costs. Suppose a U.S. clothing manufacturer wants to sell a suit for \$200. He is prevented from doing so because customers can purchase a nearly identical suit produced by a foreign manufacturer for \$150.

But suppose the clothing manufacturer can get Congress to impose a \$60 tariff on foreign suits in the name of leveling the playing field and fair trade. What happens to his chances of being able to sell his suit for \$200? If you answered that his chances increase, go to the head of the class.

Next question is: Who bears the burden of the tariff? If you answered that it's customers who must pay \$50 more for a suit, you're right again.

In his 2012 State of the Union address, President Barack Obama boasted that "over 1,000 Americans are working today because we stopped a surge in Chinese tires."

According to a study done by the Peterson Institute for International Economics (<http://tinyurl.com/jdtbktu>), those trade restrictions forced Americans to pay \$1.1 billion in higher prices for tires. So though 1,200 jobs were saved in the U.S. tire industry, the cost per job saved was at least \$900,000 in that year. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average annual salary of tire builders in 2011 was \$40,070.

Here's a question for those of us who support trade restrictions in the name of saving jobs: In whose pockets did most of the \$1.1 billion that Americans paid in higher prices go? It surely did not reach tire workers in the form of higher wages.

According to the Peterson Institute study, "most of the money extracted by protection from household budgets goes to corporate coffers, at home or abroad, not paychecks of American workers.

In the case of tire protection, our estimates indicate that fewer than 5 percent of the consumer costs per job saved reached the pockets of American workers." There is another side to this. When households have to pay higher prices for tires, they have less money to spend on other items—such as food, clothing and entertainment—thereby reducing employment in those industries.

Some people point out that other countries, such as Japan, impose heavy tariffs on American products. Indeed, Tokyo levies a 490 percent tariff on rice imports to allow Japanese rice growers to gain higher income by charging Japanese consumers four times the world price for rice.

Therefore, some suggest that Congress should even the playing field by imposing stiff tariffs on Japanese imports to the U.S. Such an argument dif-

fers little from one that says that because the Japanese government screws its citizens, the U.S. government should retaliate by screwing its own citizens.

Putting the issue in another context: If you and I are at sea in a rowboat and I commit the foolish act of shooting a hole in my end of the boat, would it be intelligent for you to retaliate by shooting a hole in your end of the boat?



An article by Katrina Trinko titled "Abortion and the One Question the Left Won't Answer" was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 3, 2017. Following is the article.

If there weren't, well, lives at stake, Democrat Rep. Eric Swalwell's dodging of Fox News' Tucker Carlson's questions about whether abortion was the taking of a human life would be comical.

Just check out how often Swalwell (who is, of course, from California) dodged it in an appearance Tuesday night (transcript omits some cross chatter):

Carlson: "Do you think it is the taking of a human life, abortion?"

Swalwell: "I think that, right now . . . before viability, a woman should be able to make her own decision. After viability, in the case of her own psychological health, in the case of rape or incest, she should also be able to make that decision."

Carlson: "OK, but is it the taking of a human life?"

Swalwell: "That is a woman's personal decision."

Carlson: "OK, but what do you think? I'm not asking about the decision, I mean is it human life or not?"

Swalwell: "She's terminating something that she does not want, and that's her own choice."

Carlson: "OK, but do you think it's human life?"

Swalwell: "Do I think—I think, at viability, a baby . . . should be decided by the woman. She's the one who has to have it."

Carlson: "You brought it up, that's why I'm pressing you, but do you think, before viability, it's a human life or something else?"

Swalwell: "I think it's not viable yet, Tucker, and courts have decided this and it's a woman's decision."

Carlson: "You're not going to answer my question, now or ever I suspect, but you should because it's a basic question I think."

This is . . . a muddled mess of illogical thinking.

And it really gets to the gist of the abortion debate, which is this: Is the unborn baby human or not, and if not human, at what point does she become human?

Because after all, if the baby isn't human, it's irrelevant if women want to have abortions, just as it's irrelevant if they want to remove tumors or a few cells or have any other number of medical procedures.

But if the baby is human . . . it's horrifying that our society wouldn't protect her life, just because she's in a vulnerable, dependent position.

Yet this is the question over and over again that the left won't deal with.

Maybe they won't deal with it because it threatens their current abortion policies. After all, it's risible to argue that a full-term baby isn't human in the womb, and yet acquires humanity passing through the birth canal.

Yet our current laws act like that is the case. Right now, the United States is one of only seven countries in the entire world that allows abortion on demand after 20 weeks.

As President Donald Trump—who pledged during his campaign to make the late-term abortion ban the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act law—bluntly put it in one of his debates with former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, “If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby.”

Incidentally, that's not a position that aligns with most Americans' viewpoints: A mere 27 percent of Americans think that abortion should be allowed beyond the first three months, outside of rape/incest/life-of-the-mother situations, according to a January Marist poll sponsored by the Catholic organization Knights of Columbus.

It's not surprising that Americans aren't comfortable with abortion during all nine months. The increasingly prevalence of ultrasounds has made seeing unborn babies much more vivid than it was in decades past.

And the age at which unborn babies are viable is steadily lowering: In 2011, a baby born at 21 weeks survived in Germany, according to *Time*.

There's no doubt that women who face unexpected pregnancies, particularly women in difficult circumstances, have a tough situation. There's much as a culture that we can—and should—do to help support these women, whether it's helping them financially or emotionally or in other ways. Thankfully, there are private organizations across the country that do just that—and deserve our support.

It's irrelevant what the courts think about when life becomes human. It's irrelevant what abortion activists think about when life becomes human.

What is relevant is science—which tells us that an unborn child has her own unique DNA at the moment of conception.

If Swalwell doesn't think unborn babies are human, he should say that (and be ready to explain why having your own unique DNA and being able to grow into an adult human aren't signs of being human).

But if he does think that unborn babies are human or are human at the time they are viable, he should realize it's time to demand justice for those babies and their right to life, no matter how tragic the circumstances in which their lives began.

Nor is it just Swalwell who refuses to take this question seriously. When House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., was asked a similar line of questions in 2015, she refused to answer:

CNS News: "In reference to funding for Planned Parenthood: Is an unborn baby with a human heart and a human liver a human being?"

Pelosi: "Why don't you take your ideological questions—I don't, I don't have—"

CNS News: "If it's not a human being, what species is it?"

Pelosi: "No, listen, I want to say something to you. I don't know who you are and you're welcome to be here, freedom of this press. I am a devout practicing Catholic, a mother of five children. When my baby was born, my fifth child, my oldest child was six years old. I think I know more about this subject than you, with all due respect."

CNS News: "So it's not a human being, then?"

Pelosi: "And I do not intend to respond to your questions, which have no basis in what public policy is that we do here."

If you're going to make public policy about who lives and dies, it's relevant who is human and who's not. Sadly, that doesn't seem to be something many on the left agree with.



An article by Christine Rousselle titled "Norma McCorvey, the 'Jane Doe' in Roe v. Wade Who Eventually Became a Pro-Life Activist, Dies at 69" was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 18, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Norma McCorvey, who was the "Jane Roe" plaintiff in the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court case that legalized abortion in the United States, passed away on Saturday in Katy, Texas, due to a heart condition. She was 69.

McCorvey was 22 when she found herself pregnant out of wedlock, poor, and struggling with addiction, and sued the state of Texas looking to change the state's abortion laws. By the time the Supreme Court decided Roe v. Wade in 1973, she had already given birth and had placed the child up for adoption.

After decades of work advocating for abortion rights, she became a born-again Christian in 1995 and abandoned that movement entirely and quit her job at an

abortion clinic. She was later received into the Roman Catholic Church in August of 1998. She was confirmed by Fr. Frank Pavone, the director of Priests for Life. She called her work to legalize abortion the “biggest mistake” of her life.

After her stunning conversion to the pro-life side, McCorvey remained active in the movement and attempted to overturn Roe v. Wade. She spoke at the March for Life, and was arrested protesting Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor’s Senate confirmation hearing.

Various pro-lifers reacted with sadness to McCorvey’s passing.

On a personal note, I had the chance to meet McCorvey when I was an intern with National Right to Life the summer after I graduated from college. She was an absolutely fascinating and inspiring woman, and she will be dearly missed. May she rest in peace.



“Eye on the World” comment: While many independents like the ideas of Donald Trump, they often get disgusted by his approach in fulfilling his promises to the electorate. Many of those same independents, who are ready to criticize his mistakes, are often more disgusted with the approach used by the media and the Hollywood elites. Therefore, instead of criticizing Mr. Trump’s mistakes, many criticize the media and the Hollywood elites for their unreasonable approach.



An article titled “Brezezinski: ‘Our Job’ Is to Control ‘Exactly What People Think’ ” was posted at grabien.com on Feb. 22, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Controlling “exactly what people think” is the job of the media, MSNBC’s Mika Brzezinski boldly declared Wednesday morning.

While discussing President Trump’s entreaties to the American people to remain skeptical of the press, Bzezinski worried that if the economy turns south, Americans may end up trusting him over the media.

“And it could be that while unemployment and the economy worsens, he could have undermined the messaging so much that he can actually control exactly what people think,” Brzezinski said. “And that, that is our job.”

SCARBOROUGH: “Exactly. That is exactly what I hear. What Yamiche said is what I hear from all the Trump supporters that I talk to who were Trump voters and are still Trump supporters. They go, ‘Yeah, you guys are going crazy. He’s doing—what are you so surprised about? He is doing exactly what he said he is going to do.’”

BRZEZINSKI: "Well, I think that the dangerous, you know, edges here are that he is trying to undermine the media and trying to make up his own facts. And it could be that while unemployment and the economy worsens, he could have undermined the messaging so much that he can actually control exactly what people think. And that, that is our job."

The comment failed to raise any eyebrows from her co-panelists.



An editorial by John Stossel titled "Fake News" was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 22, 2017. Following is the article.

"Fake News!" shouts our president, calling out CNN, *The New York Times* and others.

I love it.

Although it's not really true—not the way President Donald Trump means it. The media rarely "fake" anything. Over time, they generally get the facts correct.

But the president makes a good point: The smug lamestream media spin left but won't admit it.

At ABC News, my colleagues acted as if I was the only guy in the building with an opinion. Everyone else was "in the middle." This was nonsense. Almost all were leftists. They constantly pushed big government. Their bias was revealed in questions they asked, the "experts" they chose to interview and their endless calls for political correctness and new regulation.

Unfortunately, Trump is now just as ridiculous, claiming that "crime is reaching record levels" when it's half what it was 25 years ago. He claimed, "We had a very smooth rollout of the travel ban," and that he had "the biggest electoral college win since Reagan," and so on.

This is absurd. Facts are facts. Trump shouldn't make things up.

But I still love his "Fake!" tweets because much of what media spew is misleading.

I did it myself. On "20/20," my consumer reports covered exploding coffee pots and risks posed by pesticides used on lawns. ("Danger in the Grass!")

These weren't lies. A few personal injury lawyers did have clients injured by coffee pots. One man's skin peeled off after he played golf on a freshly sprayed course. The injuries were horrible.

But in terms of consumer protection, this "news" was irrelevant and misleading. It's a big country. Rare and horrible things happen. I wised up eventually, realizing that those threats distract people from real threats, like driving in the rain, drinking too much, smoking, etc.

But my peers continue to terrify people about trivial or nonexistent threats from power lines, hair dye, saccharin, NutraSweet, Teflon pans, electric blankets, computer terminals, cellphones, “killer” bees and more. They win awards for it.

In 1999, the media said planes would crash because computers couldn’t handle the switch to the year 2000. Now they claim global warming will drown us if we don’t honor meaningless climate treaties. They imply that polar bears are vanishing, although scientists studying 13 polar bear populations found “12 stable/increasing and one declining.”

Friday, Trump varied his attack, calling *The New York Times*, NBC, ABC, CBS and CNN “the enemy of the American people.”

Enemy?

Maybe Trump said that because he’s a narcissist who thinks he is “the American people” and the media run antagonistic headlines like:

- “Doomsday Clock Ticks 30 Seconds Closer to Global Annihilation Thanks to Trump, Scientists Say”—NBCNews.com
- “. . . Trump will Destroy the Environment . . .”—*The Intercept*
- “Trump Will Destroy Public Education If We Let Him”—*Huffington Post* op-ed
- “Is Donald Trump a Threat to Democracy?”—*New York Times*
- “How Trump’s Speech to the CIA Endangered America”—*The Atlantic*

These claims are a mix of opinion and click-bait. All are possible. Trump could be the infantile, petulant authoritarian some of us fear. Terrible things may happen. But they haven’t yet, and much of what’s written deserves the label “fake news.”

The press is depressingly shallow. They blow up little things, speculate about conspiracies and constantly obsess about “who’s winning.” Offensive remarks are taken out of context and amplified. Days later, it’s forgotten and the media move on to the next sensational accusation. They rarely explain the policies at stake, what those policies cost, past success or failure or the laws of economics.

As a result, we miss the real news: the big, important changes that happen slowly. Remember the coverage of the beginning of the women’s movement, the invention of the computer chip, Google, Facebook, etc.? No? That’s because there wasn’t any. But the growth of Facebook alone changed lives more than the election of any politician.

Wages rise—inflation-adjusted household income rose \$7,000 over the last 30 years. But the media claim that the middle class and the poor get poorer.

We live longer than ever. Crime is down. But Americans are fearful and pessimistic because what they read and see on TV makes them believe life’s getting worse. When the media do that, they are indeed enemies of the people.



An article by Susan Jones titled "Limbaugh: 'Nobody' Helping Trump, But 'Obama Had All Kinds of Support' " was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 20, 2017. Following is the article.

"Donald Trump has nobody helping him other than the people who voted for him," Rush Limbaugh said on Sunday in a rare appearance on the morning newsmaker shows.

"Obama had the media, Obama had the judiciary, Obama had all kinds of support. In an Obama press conference, the difficult question—'What enchants you?' I mean, Obama was never challenged seriously by the media," Limbaugh told *Fox News Sunday*.

"Trump doesn't have any of that. He's got to keep his supporters on board. He's got to keep them revved up. So, the rally (on Saturday in Melbourne, Fla.) was great."

Limbaugh said he really hoped Trump would do a rally, to focus on his domestic agenda. And he had more advice for the president:

- But the thing that will really make all of this Russia stuff and all this deep-state stuff not to take hold is getting to work, implementing the repeal of Obamacare. Getting to work and really doing tax reform, and getting to work and really shore up our borders, because that is the primary area where people who voted for Trump felt that we were on the way to losing the country.
- We've even lost the definition of immigration. Immigration today, if you listen to the left, equals anybody who wants to come into the country should be allowed. That's not what immigration is. That's illegal immigration. And we ought to all oppose it.
- We are all in favor of immigration that determines who gets in, the quantity of people who get in, whether they assimilate or not—nobody's opposed to that.
- But immigration has been defined now as people flooding the country who are noncitizens. And that's called immigration, according to the culture of the left. And we're—we're just ruining our opportunity to stay together as a people with common culture.

Host Chris Wallace told Limbaugh that by this time in Barack Obama's presidency, Democrats had already passed the stimulus bill: "President Trump is pretty slow . . . on repealing Obamacare; pretty slow on tax reform. And there's a lot of disarray inside the Republican Party on Capitol Hill," Wallace said.

"Well, now, here I have to tiptoe," Limbaugh replied. "We are not talking Republicans and Democrats opposing Trump. We're talking about establishment versus Trump. Trump considered to be an outsider.

"The establishment doesn't want any part of Trump. They don't want him to succeed. And I would throw some Republicans in that as well. It's just the

way Washington works. And this is why I think moving forward on this agenda is crucial.”

Later in the interview, Limbaugh noted, “The media did not make Donald Trump, and they can’t destroy him. But the media thinks, and I—when I say media, let me define—ABC, CBS, NBC, *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *USA Today*, *L.A. Times*, the cadre.

“They have a formula. They have a blueprint for destroying Republican political officials they don’t like. It’s not going to work on Trump. He doesn’t fit that mold. They are trying to every day. It’s kind of comical to watch.”

Limbaugh said Trump’s comment on Saturday [Feb. 18] about the media being the “enemy of the American people”—a remark that had the liberal media outlets in an uproar—does not go too far among Trump’s voters.

“I think that there’s something to it,” Limbaugh said. “Enemy of the people, enemy of the state, they are enemies of Trump. And Trump won the election.

“Trump won—on substance, Trump did more interviews. He explained his agenda more than any political presidential candidate ever has in my memory. And he has tried to stick to it as people perceive it.

“And this effort to stop him . . . it clearly is anti-Trump. And Trump has a connection with his voters that most politicians don’t have. I understand perhaps better than anybody in media. And that connection that he has is not anything that anybody else can break. Only he can break it.”



An editorial by David Limbaugh titled “The Left’s All-Out War on Trump” was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 17, 2017. Following is the article.

Please don’t tell us conservatives that we need to find common ground with the left during this era of Trump. That would only advance liberals’ cause, because they have no intention of working with President Trump. They are conducting an all-out war against him and his administration, and appeasement efforts wouldn’t change that.

What the naive among us need to understand is that the left plays hardball. Liberals subscribe to an end-justifies-the-means philosophy. They are not fair. They don’t intend to be fair. They believe they are entitled to advance their America-transforming agenda whether in or out of power, and no amount of wishful thinking can alter that reality.

They will say and do practically anything to further their vision for America, and it doesn’t matter if they did the opposite yesterday. A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little conservative minds.

The leftist machine purports to be opposed to Trump for his allegedly dastardly actions, but he has barely had time to get started (though he deserves great credit for what he has done so far). Truth be told, liberals' opposition springs not from what he's done—other than the travel ban—but from who he is and the threat he represents to their agenda.

They told us he would be a tyrannical autocrat, and just four weeks into his term, they claim to have him dead to rights on the charge. Yet Trump has not engaged in any illegal conduct or committed any lawless overreaches. President Obama, on the other hand, was habitually lawless, and the left, far from being concerned, reveled in it. Ends and means.

Understand this: The left has no evidence that Trump colluded with Russia to affect our election. It is absurd that we are even forced to talk about this. Smear with innuendo and slander—that's liberals' MO.

In case you haven't noticed, these professional malcontents have organized throughout the nation, with more than a little help from the community organizer in ex-chief, Barack Obama. They have placed themselves throughout the nation to make mischief—not the kind you smile at but the kind designed to bring down a duly elected president.

With remarkable foresight and patience, progressives have conspired for decades to plant themselves in America's important institutions, from the universities to the halls of government in secure civil service jobs.

Many of these people are working overtime inside and outside government to undermine, scandalize, sabotage and ultimately bring down the Trump administration in its incipiency. That tactic is a lot easier than trying to block his desperately needed reform agenda on the merits.

I strongly suspect that leftists within our intelligence agencies criminally leaked classified information to corroborate their claim that Trump colluded with Russia to interfere with the presidential election.

They thought they'd hit pay dirt with reports that before Trump took office, his national security adviser, Michael Flynn, had conversations with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak allegedly about reviewing the recent sanctions Obama had imposed on Russia.

Can you imagine the salivating? Here's the smoking gun. Flynn talked to Russia. Trump likes Russian President Vladimir Putin. Russia hacked the United States. Trump won the election. Therefore, Trump colluded with Putin to engineer his election victory over Hillary Clinton. That is one convoluted syllogism, isn't it?

The left doesn't care about the truth of the matter. Once liberals obtained what they considered a colorable morsel of damning evidence, they insisted their fears about Trump were already vindicated. He was guilty as charged. Except that he wasn't.

Flynn has stated that his conversation didn't touch on sanctions. *The New York Times*, in its story reporting that Trump campaign aides had repeated contacts with Russian intelligence agents, admitted it had seen no evidence

of cooperation or collusion between the Trump team and the Russians regarding the election. That little tidbit has not found its way into any headline in the mainstream media.

Liberals hate Trump, and they hate that they lost the election, and they are not going to tolerate it. I hope the rest of America understands that.

They are not only disgracefully pretending they have hard evidence of misconduct leading directly to Trump but also ignoring the egregious misconduct of the leakers and the real threat that poses to national security.

Trump got off to an incredibly impressive start, but liberals have now delivered a blow to his momentum, and they are poised to finish the job. They are strategically placed in our cultural institutions and throughout our vast bureaucracy and are coordinating in every state to stage planned protests that look spontaneous.

Richly funded by George Soros and other like-minded America haters, they are inspired by the shadow leadership of former President Obama and his activist organization formed for this very purpose.

I will not defend misconduct on the part of elected officials and their appointees—if it actually occurs—just because they are Republicans. But I am not going to sit by silently as the left continues to smear and sabotage this newly inaugurated president based on shards of facts that don't prove their allegations.

I realize that nothing we do will stop the left or dampen its single-minded determination to destroy Trump and preserve Obama's radical agenda, but we can prevent the left from succeeding if we fight back with equal energy and commitment.

But that will be impossible unless we fully recognize what's going on—the tactics of the left and liberals' ruthlessness. We are, in effect, in a war that we didn't start.

So please keep your eyes open and prepare to fight back.

In the meantime, let's pray that President Trump will not be unduly distracted by these efforts and can focus on advancing an agenda that will restore economic growth and shore up America's national security. His news conference on Thursday gives me great confidence that President Trump fully understands what the left is doing. He is undeterred and undistracted—and pressing forward with his agenda.

The left, in turn, probably now understands that it has unleashed a tiger.



An article by Alex Seitz-Wald titled "Obama-Aligned Organizing for Action Relaunches for Trump Era" was posted at nbcnews.com on Feb. 10, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

After a long period of withdrawal from the public eye, Organizing for Action [OFA], the political group that grew out of Barack Obama's first presidential campaign, is ramping back up for the Trump era with a focus on defending the Affordable Care Act and training grassroots organizers, officials tell NBC News.

Had Hillary Clinton won the presidency, OFA was likely headed for a wind-down. But with Trump in the White House, the relaunched OFA will claim a spot in the increasingly crowded marketplace of groups looking to fight the new president's agenda.

OFA has hired 14 field organizers in states home to key senators as part of its campaign to defend Obama's signature healthcare law. To run that campaign, the group hired Saumya Narechania—the former national field director at Enroll America, which worked to sign people up for Obamacare—and a deputy campaign manager.

Jennifer Warner is returning to the group as national organizing director after running Democrats' coordinated campaign in Ohio last year. And former Clinton campaign spokesperson Jesse Lehigh has joined OFA as its communication director.

The rest of the group's leadership is largely remaining intact, with former Obama 2012 campaign manager Jim Messina and former White House aide Jon Carson as co-chairmen, Katie Hogan as executive director, Jack Shapiro as director of policy and campaigns and Aaron Buchner promoted to chief of staff.

What role Obama himself will play remains unclear.

OFA is looking to expand into other issue areas as well, like climate change and gun control, and is exploring the possibility of launching a program to recruit and train people to run for office. But it is unlikely to get directly involved in electoral campaigns, according to OFA.

For now, it's focused on planning events ahead of the congressional recess later this month, when members of Congress will hold events in their district. Organizers are hoping to produce more moments like the one at Utah Rep. Jason Chaffetz' town hall Thursday night when he was confronted by angry constituents.

OFA has gone through several iterations since it first launched in 2009, all of which faced criticism from Democrats who felt it detracted from other party efforts while accomplishing little.

Those concerns have become more public after an election loss in which many Democrats feel their forces were too fractured and poorly coordinated, and that Obama neglected his duties to maintain and build party infrastructure.

"OFA should fold into the [Democratic National Committee]. Having two organizations is redundant, and dilutes and confuses the mission. Given the urgency of the moment, we need laser-like focus, with clear lanes and cohe-

sion, not duplication,” former Michigan Gov. Jennifer Granholm told Politico this week before the new contours of the group were announced.

Defenders say OFA has learned from its experiences and that its activities will not directly compete with other organizations, even though it will continue to raise money from both large and small donors that fund other progressive and Democratic organizations as well.

Instead, OFA says it can fill a niche that will benefit the progressive movement as a whole by nurturing a broad base of grassroots organizers and working with other groups to mobilize voters on specific issues.

“There are important progressive organizations that mobilize supporters around key issues of the day and OFA has great partnerships with many of them,” Lehrich said in an email. “OFA fills a unique role by investing in organizing to build a lasting and successful progressive movement. We’re bringing in thousands of new people who have never been engaged before, connecting them to a nationwide grassroots network, providing them with cost-free training, and empowering them to apply those skills to make change in their communities.”

It’s a humbler vision for a group that once, paradoxically, tried to raise a grassroots army it could command at will to push Obama’s agenda through Congress.

The narrower focus has, for instance, led OFA to stay out of confirmation battles over Trump’s cabinet nominees and the dozen other fights liberal groups are engaged in at any given moment.

- OFA says more than 1,800 people have applied to its Spring Community Engagement Fellowship, a six-week training program, two-thirds of whom have not previously been involved with OFA.

- And the group has teamed up with Indivisible, a buzzy newcomer to the progressive movement, to offer organizing training that began Thursday night with a video conference. A combined 25,000 people have registered to participate in those trainings, OFA said.

- To defend Obamacare, the group says it has planned 400 health care-focused events in 42 states this year with partners that include mainline liberal groups, like the Center for American Progress and Planned Parenthood, as well those from the progressive wing, like MoveOn.org.

- OFA says 20,000 people have used their tool to call senators’ offices to urge them not to repeal Obamacare and says one million supporters have already taken action with OFA.

The goal is to further hinder the already stalling momentum around repeal the Affordable Care Act.

- For instance, OFA helped get Obamacare supporters to flood townhalls for Florida Republican Rep. Gus Bilirakis, Illinois GOP Rep. Peter Roskam, and California Rep. Tom McClintock, which lead to national news coverage about anti-repeal backlash.



An article by Asawin Suebsaeng titled "Leaked Emails: Dem State Leaders Think Obama's New Organizing Army is 'Grade A Bull****'" was posted at thedailybeast.com on Feb. 17, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

It is difficult to overstate just how enraged state Democratic activists and leaders are with Organizing for Action (OFA), the political and community-organizing army that grew out of Barack Obama's presidential campaigns.

The nonprofit, which functions as a sort of parallel-Democratic National Committee, was founded to mobilize Democratic voters and supporters in defense of President Obama's, and the Democratic Party's, agenda.

Instead, the organization has drawn the intense ire, both public and private, of grassroots organizers and state parties that are convinced that OFA inadvertently helped decimate Democrats at the state and local level, while Republicans cemented historic levels of power and Donald J. Trump actually became leader of the free world.

These intra-party tensions aren't going away, especially now that OFA "relaunched" itself last week to protect the Affordable Care Act, boost turnout at congressional townhalls, and train grassroots organizers gearing up for the Trump era.



Looking back to 2012, here is an article by Charlie Spiering titled "Exclusive Video: Obama Meeting ACORN in 2007: 'You've Got a Friend in Me'" that was posted at washingtonexaminer.com on Sept. 26, 2012.

The Washington Examiner recently obtained a lengthy video of presidential candidates Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton and John Edwards in interviews seeking ACORN's endorsement in 2007. The one portion of this full video to be released previously treats of Obama's extensive ties to the now-defunct organization.

During the interview, Obama reminded the group that he believed in ACORN's mission and been a loyal partner with the organization his entire career.

"I came out of an organizing grassroots background, that's what I did three and a half years before I went to law school. That's the reason I moved to Chicago, is to organize." Obama stated. "This is something that I know personally."

Obama continued to talk about the values of ACORN, reminding them that he was "trained" in the values of grassroots organizing while he was a community organizer.

Stay abreast of the latest developments from nation's capital and beyond with curated News Alerts from the Washington Examiner news desk and delivered to your inbox.

"[T]hat's been my bias throughout my career, that's what I've always stood for and that's what I've always believed in," he said.

The president also reminded the group that ACORN was "smack dab in the middle" of "Project Vote," a 1993 voter registration drive he ran in Illinois before he went to law school.

"I've been fighting alongside ACORN on the issues you care about my entire career even before I was an elected official," he said.

Obama continued, "Once I was elected there wasn't a campaign that ACORN worked on down in Springfield that I wasn't right there with you and since I've been in the United States Senate, I've always been a partner with ACORN as well."

Obama explained that he met many of the ACORN leaders during a meeting in Washington D.C. after Hurricane Katrina.

"You know that you've got a friend in me, and I definitely welcome ACORN's input, you don't have to ask me about that," Obama concluded. "I'm going to call you even if you didn't ask me, because that's how I've operated throughout my career."

As Sean Higgins notes in his column today, Obama also expressed his willingness to create a program funded by the federal government to seek out and enroll all eligible Americans in the services they are entitled to.



Looking back to 2009, here are excerpts from an article by Matthew Vadum titled "ACORN's Man in the White House" that was posted at spectator.org on Sept. 28, 2009.

Newly discovered evidence shows the radical advocacy group ACORN has a man in the Obama White House.

This power behind the throne is longtime ACORN operative Patrick Gaspard. He holds the title of White House political affairs director, the same title Karl Rove held in President Bush's White House.

Evidence shows that years before he joined the Obama administration, Gaspard was ACORN boss Bertha Lewis's political director in New York.

Lewis, the current "chief organizer" or CEO of ACORN, was head of New York ACORN from at least 1994 through 2008, when she took over as national leader of ACORN. With Gaspard at work in the White House, Lewis might as well be speaking to President Obama through an earpiece as he goes about his daily business ruining the country.

Erick Erickson of the website RedState recently did an excellent job explaining the relationship of Gaspard to Lewis and President Obama so I won't take up space here recalling all his valuable insights. Suffice it to say Erickson

reported that Gaspard figures prominently in Lewis's rolodex, which Erickson has in his possession.

Incidentally, the lines between ACORN and radical left-wing SEIU, whose acronym stands for Service Employees International Union, become fuzzy in places.

SEIU Locals 100 and 880 are part of the ACORN network of organizations. Local 100 in New Orleans is headed by Rathke. SEIU Local 880 in Chicago is headed by longtime ACORN insider Keith Kelleher.

You'd never know about the SEIU connection from visiting ACORN's website, www.acorn.org. That's because the website has been receiving a thorough scrubbing in recent months. On ACORN's affiliated organizations page, references to the two SEIU locals mysteriously disappeared.

Meanwhile, the American public is beginning to realize that ACORN is a vast criminal conspiracy whose reach extends to the highest levels of the U.S. government.

Obama's statement that he's barely aware of ACORN's problems is nothing short of ridiculous, especially so because Patrick Gaspard was a political director for ACORN New York.

Last year he worked as national political director for the Obama campaign followed by a stint as associate personnel director for the Obama-Biden transition team.

As the old Washington saying goes, politics is personnel. Who knows how many administration officials were put in place by Gaspard with direct input from ACORN's Bertha Lewis. It boggles the mind.

We also now know the Obama administration was lying about ACORN's high level involvement in the 2010 Census. The coordination between ACORN and the Census was revealed as a result of a Freedom of Information Act request filed by the relentless investigator Tegan Millspaw of Judicial Watch. The Census and other government agencies have cut ties with ACORN as the ACORN scandal widens.

We have to wonder: when it comes to ACORN, what else is the Obama administration lying about?



An article by Darius Tahir titled "Boehner: Republicans Won't Repeal and Replace Obamacare" was posted at politico.com on Feb. 23, 2017. Following are excerpts of the article.

Former House Speaker John Boehner predicted on Thursday that a full repeal and replace of Obamacare is "not what's going to happen" and that Republicans will instead just make some fixes to the health care law.

Boehner, who retired in 2015 amid unrest among conservatives, said at an Orlando healthcare conference that GOP lawmakers were too optimistic in their talk of quickly repealing and then replacing Obamacare.

“They’ll fix Obamacare, and I shouldn’t have called it repeal and replace because that’s not what’s going to happen. They’re basically going to fix the flaws and put a more conservative box around it,” Boehner said.

The former speaker’s frank comments capture the conundrum that many Republicans find themselves in as they try to deliver on pledges to axe Obamacare but struggle to coalesce around an alternative.



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.”