

Eye on the World

Feb. 24, 2018

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. 24, 2018.

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).



A video and an article by Christal Hayes titled “Mexico Struck by Massive 7.2-Magnitude Earthquake” were posted at usatoday.com on Feb. 17, 2018. Following is the article.

A massive earthquake hit Mexico Friday [Feb. 16] evening, leaving buildings shaking throughout the southern portion of the country.

The earthquake was first measured as a 7.5-magnitude and later lowered to having a 7.2-magnitude by the U.S. Geological Survey. The epicenter was found along the Pacific coast near Santiago Ixtayutla, a town in the state of Oaxaca in the southwestern area of the country.

There is no tsunami threat from the quake, according to the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center.

Videos on social media show people in the streets grabbing onto a car as the ground started shaking. Footage inside a building show lights swaying back and forth with people lined up along a hallway.

It’s unclear if any damage or injuries were reported.

Mexico is no stranger to earthquakes. The country dealt with two back-to-back quakes in September that left hundreds dead after buildings crumbled, including schools.

More than 90 people died after the first earthquake on Sept. 7, then days later on Sept. 19, another disaster struck in Central Mexico. Several hundred were left dead.

The second tragedy landed on the 32nd anniversary of the 1985 earthquake in Mexico City, which left an estimated 9,500 people dead.



A video and an article by Kim Hjelmgaard titled "Mexico Struck by 5.9-Magnitude Earthquake" were posted at usatoday.com on Feb. 19, 2018. Following is the article.

A 5.9-magnitude earthquake struck southern Mexico early Monday, but it was shorter and less intense than one that struck in the same area, damaging about 1,000 houses, on Friday.

Monday's quake struck 27 miles east of Oaxaca at a depth of six miles, the U.S. Geological Survey said. Oaxaca is about 300 miles south of Mexico City. There are no immediate reports of casualties or damage.

The quake triggered emergency alarms and jarred awake residents as far away as Mexico City who scrambled into the streets.

Friday's tremors caused tall buildings in Mexico's capital to sway for over two minutes and revived memories of two earthquakes in September last year that killed several hundred people in Mexico City and other parts of the country.

More: [Mexico struck by massive 7.2-magnitude earthquake](#)

No one was killed during last week's quake, but a military helicopter carrying officials assessing its damage crashed, killing 13 people and injuring a further 15.



A Reuters article titled "Saudi Foreign Minister Rejects Qatari Proposal of EU-Style Security Pact" was posted at reuters.com on Feb. 19, 2018. Following is the article.

Saudi Arabia has no interest in participating in a European Union-style regional security alliance as proposed by Qatar, its Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir said on Monday.

Qatar's Emir Sheikh Tamim bin Hamad al-Thani said on Friday that Middle Eastern states should put their differences behind them and forge a security pact modeled on the European Union in order to pull the region back from the brink.

He asked the international community to keep up diplomatic pressure on the countries concerned to achieve that, but offered few other details.

"We already have a structure in place," said al-Jubeir in Vienna on the sidelines of a meeting with his Austrian counterpart, referring to the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), the Gulf states' 36-year-old political and trading bloc.

Qatar, a tiny but rich Gulf Arab state, has been isolated over the past seven months by trade and travel sanctions imposed by Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain and Egypt over accusations - denied by Doha - that it supports terrorism and regional rival Iran.

Efforts by the United States and Kuwait to end the rift have failed to produce any results.

"It is our hope that the Qataris will do the right thing and stop their support for terrorism . . . Should they do so, they will become a welcome member of the GCC and we can move forward to improve the security for all of us," al-Jubeir said.



An article by Michael Brown titled "Why Don't We Care About the Slaughter of Nigerian Christians?" was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 20, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

Thousands of Christians are being butchered in Nigeria and whole villages being destroyed.

Why are we so unconcerned? Why don't we care?

I believe the biggest reason is that we simply don't know about what's happening there. Well, now you know. Here are the facts.

For the last several months, one of my good friends, a Christian missionary serving the poorest of the poor in Nigeria, has been sending me emails with terrifying news. Fulani tribesmen raping and killing villagers. Children being used as Islamic suicide bombers, resulting in scores of casualties. One horrible report after another.

Yet with each email I received, as I scoured the major news agencies in the West, I found nothing reported. Not a word.

At the same time, Nigerian news sources were ablaze with reports of the latest atrocities.

Today, I saw this shocking headline on Jihad Watch: "Nigeria: Muslims wipe out 15 villages in mass slaughter of Christians, government does nothing."

The article began with this quote, "Despite several calls to the governor and his deputy, and other security apparatus, the government remained silent as the atrocities continued. The Fulani were able to carry out their deadly attack. They stayed for hours in the vicinity, moving at will, unchallenged."

How could this be?

According to Robert Spencer at Jihad Watch, it's because "Nigerian President Muhammadu Buhari clearly has no sympathy for the victims. He shares the world view of the jihadi attackers."

When I emailed my friend in Nigeria to ask if this was true, she wrote back immediately:

"This article doesn't state which villages, so I am not sure. It is happening every day. The worst this year was the New Year's Day massacre, followed by a mass burial of 73 victims. There have been many attacks since then. Villages razed, girls and women raped, men butchered. Cutlasses have been replaced by AK-47's. The military has, at times, seemed complicit.

"The president only gets upset when there are reprisal killings of Fulani. He himself is a Fulani man and a cattle-rearer. The stated reason is grazing rights. If you object to cows eating your crops, you, your village and maybe surrounding ones will be attacked. It is in every paper, every day. The nation is smoldering. Only Jesus."

(Her closing sentence meant, "Jesus is our nation's only hope.")

She also sent me this YouTube link, viewed over 180,000 times at present, in which a Nigerian social commentator who lives in the States blasts the president's alleged inaction (and, worse still, alleged wrong actions).

The video begins with a clip from a pastor, boldly denouncing wickedness in the government and stating plainly that, "The killing, the killing that is going on in Nigeria shows the irresponsibility of the president called Buhari."

And the pastor urged every Nigerian to fight back, not with weapons but by getting their voter's cards, urging the people not to let wicked men in government to decide their fate. Yes, he bellowed, "Enough is enough!"

As a result of his sermon, we are informed that a warrant was issued for his arrest.

Outrageous? Absolutely. But Nigeria is a nation divided, with a Muslim majority in the north and a Christian majority in the south, with terrorist groups like Boko Haram still on the prowl, and with systemic governmental corruption.

And as Christianity continues to spread across the nation at an exponential pace, so also persecution is spreading.

As reported by Christian Today in 2016, "Muslims are converting to Christianity in northern Nigeria amid rapidly rising levels of Christian persecution, which has seen more than ten thousand Christians killed in five years, according to a new report released today.

"While much media attention has been focused on Islamic State and the plight of persecuted minorities in the Middle East, 11,500 Christians in northern Nigeria were killed in five years between 2006-2014, and 13,000 churches were destroyed, forcing 1.3 million Christians to flee to safer areas of the country."

As devastating as these statistics are, they are more likely under-reported than over-reported, which again begs the question: Why don't we care? Why aren't we raising our voices? Why aren't we standing with our fellow-believers in prayer?

Again, I believe it is largely because of our ignorance.

But if you've read this article, you can't claim ignorance any more.



"Eye on the World" comment: The following list of articles consists of headlines of extra articles, which are considered international. The articles were not posted, but the headlines give the essence of the story.

-
- An article by Michael W. Chapman titled "Chinese Catholics Call on Bishops Worldwide: Stop the Vatican Deal With Chinese Government" was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 15, 2018.
 - An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Kerry: It was 'Strategic Thinking,' Not a 'Concession,' to Leave Missiles Out of Iran Nuclear Deal" was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 19, 2018.
 - A Reuters article by Jeffrey Heller and Tora Cohen titled "Netanyahu Confidants Named As Suspects in New Corruption Probe" was posted at reuters.com on Feb. 20, 2018.
 - An article by Dan Boylan titled "Russia Tests New Stealth Fighter Over War-Weary Syrian Skies" was posted at washingtontimes.com on Feb. 22, 2018.



An editorial by John Stossel titled "Pay Your Dues!" was posted at jewish-worldreview.com on Feb. 21, 2018. Following is the article.

If your workplace is a union shop, are you forced to pay union dues? This week, the Supreme Court heard arguments about that.

When I worked at CBS and ABC, I was ordered to join the American Federation of Radio and TV Artists. That union had won a vote that gave them the right to speak for all reporters. I said, "I'm no 'artist.' I'm a reporter! I won't join!" But my bosses said they couldn't pay me unless I did.

In right-to-work states, unions can't force people to join. But only 28 states are right to work. Aging socialist bureaucracies like New York state are not among them.

But now the Supreme Court may say that no government worker, in any state, can be forced to pay a union.

"If we lose this case, the entire public sector will be right to work," warns Lee Saunders, president of AFSCME, the big government employees union.

That outcome would thrill Rebecca Friedrichs. She's the teacher who filed the right-to-work lawsuit that went to the Supreme Court two years ago.

Friedrichs got mad at the California Teachers Association during the last recession. Good teachers at her school were about to be laid off. She'd tried to protect them by getting all teachers to agree to a slight pay cut.

"All America was taking a pay cut then," she told me. "Why should we be any different?"

But her union wouldn't even allow her to survey other teachers. "They told me, Rebecca, don't worry about those teachers who were about to lose jobs . . . We're going to give them a seminar on how to get unemployment benefits."

That was one thing that made Friedrichs angry enough to sue the Teachers Association. Three years later, the Supreme Court agreed to hear her case.

Supreme Court watchers predicted that she would win. Union cheerleaders were pessimistic. Chris Hayes of MSNBC said that Friedrich's case might "decimate the way that public sector unions function."

But shortly before the justices voted, Antonin Scalia died.

"That was the most devastating day," says Friedrichs. Without Scalia's vote, the Court deadlocked 4 to 4.

Now a new suit has been filed by government worker Mark Janus. With Neil Gorsuch now the ninth justice, unions are worried.

In fact, they are so worried that AFSCME representative Steven Kreisberg agreed to do one of my YouTube interviews.

"Our members . . . want their union to have power," he said. "It's (Janus') right to dissent and not be a member of our union. He only has to pay the fees that are used to represent him."

But what's the point of dissenting from the union if you still have to pay? Janus doesn't want to be forced to pay for something he doesn't agree with.

Kreisberg replied, "I'm not sure if he doesn't agree with it, or just simply doesn't want to pay because he'd like to get those services for free."

That's an argument a free-market advocate can understand: It's not fair if people freeload off others' work—getting benefits others fund. But who judges what is a "benefit"?

"If I saw their representation as a benefit, I could agree with that, but I don't," Friedrichs said. "The benefits aren't worth the moral costs."

Kreisberg responded, "That sounds like the words of a right-wing activist, not the words of a teacher."

Janus's lawsuit points out that Thomas Jefferson wrote, "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical."

Kreisberg had a quick answer to that: "Thomas Jefferson had no sense of 21st-century labor relations."

That's probably true. But some principles are eternal, like deciding what to do with your own money and not being forced to fund speech with which you disagree.

The justices will announce their ruling sometime this summer. I hope that they'll side with Jefferson. Forcing people to pay for what we don't want is tyranny.



An editorial by Walter Williams titled "Will Automation Kill Our Jobs?" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Feb. 21, 2018. Following is the article.

A recent article in The Guardian dons the foreboding title "Robots will destroy our jobs—and we're not ready for it."

The article claims, "For every job created by robotic automation, several more will be eliminated entirely . . . This disruption will have a devastating impact on our workforce."

According to an article in MIT Technology Review, business researchers Erik Brynjolfsson and Andrew McAfee believe that rapid technological change has been destroying jobs faster than it is creating them, contributing to the stagnation of median income and the growth of inequality in the United States.

If technology is destroying jobs faster than it's creating them, it is the first time in human history that it's done so.

Actually, the number of jobs is unlimited, for the simple reason that human wants are unlimited—or they don't frequently reveal their bounds.

People always want more of something that will create a job for someone. To suggest that there are a finite number of jobs commits an error known as the "lump of labor fallacy."

That fallacy suggests that when automation or technology eliminates a job, there's nothing that people want that would create employment for the person displaced by the automation. In other words, all human wants have been satisfied.

Let's look at a few examples.

- In 1790, farmers were 90 percent of the U.S. labor force.
- By 1900, only about 41 percent of our workers were employed in agriculture.
- Today less than 3 percent of Americans are employed in agriculture.

And it's a good thing.

If 90 percent or 41 percent of our labor force were still employed in agriculture, where in the world would we find the workforce to produce all those goods and services that weren't around in 1790 or 1900, such as cars, aircraft, TVs, computers, aircraft carriers, etc.?

Indeed, if technology had not destroyed all of those agricultural jobs, we would be a much, much poorer nation.

What about the claim that our manufacturing jobs are going to China—a claim that’s fueling the Trump administration to impose trade barriers?

It is true that between 2001 and 2013, 3.2 million jobs were outsourced to China. However, in the same time frame, China lost about 4.5 million manufacturing jobs, compared with the loss of 3.1 million in the U.S.

Job loss is the trend among the top 10 manufacturing countries, which produce 75 percent of the world’s manufacturing output (the U.S., Japan, Germany, China, Britain, France, Italy, South Korea, Canada and Mexico). Only Italy has managed not to lose factory jobs since 2000. Nonetheless, the U.S. remains a major force in global manufacturing.

Because of automation, the U.S. worker is now three times as productive as in 1980 and twice as productive as in 2000. It’s productivity gains, rather than outsourcing and imports, that explain most of our manufacturing job loss.

If our manufacturing sector were its own economy and had its own gross domestic product, it would be the seventh-largest in the world. Total manufacturing value could be as high as \$5.5 trillion.

In other words, about 17 percent of global manufacturing activity happens in the United States, and America dominates advanced manufacturing.

According to the Alliance for American Manufacturing, U.S. manufacturing employs a large percentage of the workers who are trained in fields related to science, technology, engineering and math. It employs 37 percent of architectural and engineering workers and 16 percent of life, physical and social scientists.

Economist Joseph Schumpeter described this process of technological change. He called it “creative destruction.”

Technology and innovation destroy some jobs while creating many others. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. labor force in 1950 was 62 million. By 2000, it was 79 million, and it’s projected to reach 192 million by 2050.

Though the “creative destruction” process works hardships on some people who lose their jobs and are forced to take lower-paying jobs, any attempt to impede the process would make all of us worse off.



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled “Do Not Let the Children Lead” was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 21, 2018. Following is the article.

Where are all the grown-ups in times of crisis and grief? Don’t bother searching America’s prestigious law schools.

Two adult men, occupying lofty perches as law professors, argued this week that the voting age in the U.S. should be lowered to 16 because some high

school survivors of the Parkland, Florida, shooting who want gun control “are proving how important it is to include young people’s voices in political debate.”

That was the assertion of University of Kentucky law professor Joshua Douglas on CNN.com. He praised some student leaders at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School who’ve been making the rounds on TV, shouting at President Trump, Republicans in Congress and the NRA “to demand change”—which Douglas defines obtusely as “meaningful gun control,” whatever that means.

Because these children are apparently doing a better job at broadcasting his own ineffectual political views, Douglas asserts, “we should include them more directly in our democratic process” by enfranchising them now.

Harvard law professor Laurence Tribe similarly tweeted, “Teens between 14 and 18 have far better BS detectors, on average, than ‘adults’ 18 and older.” On what basis does distinguished Professor Tribe make such a claim? On a foundation of pure, steaming BS.

Undaunted, gun control advocate Tribe urged: “Wouldn’t it be great if the voting age were lowered to 16? Just a pipe dream, I know, but . . . #Children’sCrusade?”

This is unadulterated silliness. It’s hashtag hokum from a pair of pandering left-wing profs exploiting a new round of Democratic youth props. I have called this rhetorical fallacy “argumentum ad filium:” If politicians appeal to the children, it’s unassailably good and true.

This is not compassion, but abdication. America is not a juvenilocracy. It is a constitutional republic. There is a reason we don’t elect high school sophomores and juniors to public office or allow them to cast ballots. There are many, many reasons, actually.

Pubescents are fueled by hormones and dopamine and pizza and Sonic shakes. They’re fickle and fragile and fierce and forgetful. They hate you. They love you. They need you. They ignore you. They know everything. They know nothing. All in the span of 10 seconds. I know. I have two of them.

If you’re lucky, they’ve only Googled “Should I eat Tide pods?” or “What happens if I snort Ramen powder?” and not actually attempted the latest social media stunt challenges.

But that’s what kids do. Because they’re kids.

Many may be exceptionally smart, passionate and articulate beyond their years, but they do not possess any semblance of wisdom because they have not lived those years. Their knowledge of history, law and public policy is severely limited (Common Core certainly hasn’t helped). And their moral agency and cognitive abilities are far from fully developed.

Most are in no position to change the world when they can’t even remember to change their own bedsheets.

Yet, Tribe relishes the opportunity to hide behind the young Parkland activists headed to CNN’s propaganda town halls and Washington, D.C.: “NRA will

meet more than its match in these amazing kids," he gleefully cheered. "(I)t'll meet its master and will be brought to heel. At long last."

President Obama employed this very same kiddie human shield strategy to ram his federal health care takeover through Capitol Hill and down our throats. Immigration and education lobbyists use it, too. Their cynicism is unbounded. Human prop-a-palooza infantilizes public discourse and renders measured, mature dissent impossible.

Those who question the logic, efficacy and wisdom of the latest left-wing "children's crusade" face accusations of "hating" the children. Refusing to acquiesce to their tears and protests is tantamount to letting them die.

Showing resilience and resolve in the face of horrific adversity deserves the highest praise and attention. Juvenile victim status, however, does not warrant absolute moral authority or the unfettered powers in the political arena that ideologically stunted law professors are so eager to bestow upon them.

It's fine to listen, but do not let the children lead.



An article by Joe Herring titled "School Shootings and Clairvoyant Government" was posted at americanthinker.com on Feb. 16, 2018. Following is the article.

The harsh reality of the Florida school shooting is that prevention is possible only if our authorities are clairvoyant, or given unthinkable powers to pretend so.

Gun control arguments, whether relating to restricting access to guns or banning them for certain people, or for everyone, are dangerously misleading in these cases. Because the only authority capable of implementing and enforcing such restrictions is the same authority that makes the determination of who ought to be restricted.

This is a textbook example of conflict of interest, one specifically prohibited by the Constitution.

Does this mean that even the craziest folks ought to have unfettered access to guns?

Of course not. Sadly, that straw-man argument will be echoed endlessly over the coming weeks.

Whether we describe incidents like this in terms of clinical psychosis or in terms of good and evil, the fact remains: there is no government solution to problems of social deficiency that does not abridge the rights of some, many, or all.

It makes sense to review our systems to identify cracks through which the truly deluded or dangerously unhinged might fall, but in the end, what will we do with the information?

- Who will be empowered to act on the knowledge gained?
- Will counselors, school psychologists, social workers, et al. be granted authority to suspend or revoke a constitutional right?
- Should someone alert the authorities about a person like the Florida shooter?
- Will due process be abridged in the name of urgency?
- Or will the ACLU or some other group leap to their defense, forcing drawn out court battles over supposition, leaving the accused to prove a negative or the government to prove intent without action?

While this troubled kid in Florida offered many opportunities for intervention, any intervention that might've prevented yesterday's act would have required a government official to predict the future and to abrogate someone's rights (with potentially life-changing repercussions).

- Like being accused of child molestation, being branded as "too unstable for gun access" or even being investigated for it will stay with that individual for the rest of his life, for employers, neighbors, and friends to see.

A handy tool against a political rival? You bet. There are some crimes where the accusation is enough, and until Christ returns, there will always be those among us willing to exploit the darker angels of our nature.

- Is this a door through which government can safely pass in a free republic?
- Will the potential for abuse and inevitable confusion result in yet another unreliable government function, for which we will have paid handsomely in lost liberty and privacy?

Until actual threats are made, reliably and with documentation, or evidence of planning and preparation to commit the act comes to light, government must be constrained, and certainly prohibited from acts of prior restraint.

The solution to our school shooting horror lies in our own hearts, where we must address our own deficiencies of character, eliminating perversity and license in our own behavior so as to present an example worthy of our children.

Over the last 50 years, we have let our society become a sewer. Now we wonder why people are getting sick.

The last thing we need is a "solution" cooked up by the very politicians who backed up the toilet in the first place.



An article by Susan Jones titled "Nunes Wants Answers From Ex-Obama Officials: When Did You Learn Dossier was Paid for By Democrats?" was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 21, 2018. Following are excerpts of the article.

House intelligence committee chairman Devin Nunes (R-Calif.) told Fox News on Tuesday that he has “ten simple questions” to ask Obama administration official relating to the Steele dossier, a salacious and unsubstantiated opposition research document paid for by the Democrat Party and the Clinton campaign.

“We sent out a questionnaire today,” Nunes told Fox News’s Tucker Carlson Tuesday night.

“And we’re asking several former and current officials to answer ten simple questions . . .

“These are all questions that we should be able to get answers to, and we will. So part of what we sent out today with the questionnaire, with ten questions on it, also was a cover letter that says if you do not answer this—we’re giving them a couple of weeks to answer it—you will be subpoenaed and you will come before Congress to tell us when you knew about this.”

Nunes did not name the current and former officials who are getting the questionnaire.

The ten questions, obtained by Fox News, include the following:

- When and how did you first become aware of any of the information contained in the Steele dossier?
- In what form(s) was the information in the Steele dossier presented to you? By whom? (Please describe each instance)
- Who did you share this information with? When? In what form? (Please describe each instance)
- What official actions did you take as a result of receiving the information contained in the Steele dossier?
- Did you convene any meetings with the intelligence community and/or law enforcement communities as a result of the information contained in the Steele dossier?
- When did you first learn or come to believe that the Steele dossier was funded by a Democrat-aligned entity?
- When did you first learn or come to believe that the Steele dossier was funded by the Democrat National Committee (DNC) and/or Hillary for America (Clinton campaign)?
- When did you first become aware that the Steele dossier was used to obtain a FISA order on Carter Page?
- Was President Obama briefed on any information contained in the dossier prior to January 5, 2017?
- Did you discuss the information contained in the Steele dossier with any reporters or other representatives of the media? If so, who and when?

In his cover letter, Nunes told the unnamed officials they have until March 2 to provide answers, or else the committee will “initiate compulsory process.”

Nunes told Tucker Carlson on Tuesday that the House committee has found “collusion” all right:

“We have found collusion—we’ve found collusion between the Democrats, specifically the Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee and the Russians. However, it doesn’t seem to be that—nobody’s interested in that collusion. We’ve also found to felony leaks—nobody seems to be interested in getting to the bottom of the felony leaks.

“So it’s part of what the House intelligence committee, led by the Republicans, are trying to get to the bottom of despite what we’re up against . . . We’re not getting help from the Democrats in the House and we’re also not getting any help from the mainstream media,” Nunes said.

Meanwhile, President Donald Trump tweeted on Wednesday about his attorney general’s failure to investigate the Obama administration response to Russian meddling.

- If all of the Russian meddling took place during the Obama Administration, right up to January 20th, why aren’t they the subject of the investigation?
- Why didn’t Obama do something about the meddling?
- Why aren’t Dem crimes under investigation?
- Ask Jeff Sessions!



“Eye on the World” comment: The following list of articles consists of headlines of extra articles, which involve the United States. The articles were not posted, but the headlines give the essence of the story.

Government spending

- An article by Daniel Mitchell titled “The Numbers Don’t Lie: Republicans are Bigger Spenders Than Democrats” was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 15, 2018.

Illegal immigration

- An article by Abby Hamblin titled “Trump Considers Pulling ICE Out of California to Let the State Learn” was posted at sandiegouniontribune.com (San Diego) on Feb. 22, 2018.

News about the media

- An article by Craig Bannister titled “Bozell Calls on ABC News President to Apologize for Insults to Pence’s Christian Faith on ‘The View’ ” was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 15, 2018.

- An article by Todd Starnes titled "Franklin Graham: Christians Should Be Alarmed by ABC's Anti-Christian Rhetoric" was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 20, 2018.
- An article by Craig Bannister titled "CNN, MSNBC Aired Hourly Celebrations of Russian-Organized Anti-Trump Rally" was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 19.
- An article by Matt Vespa titled "Reporter Suggests More Abortions Would Have Prevented Florida Shooting" was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 17, 2018.
- An article by Matt Vespa titled "No, CNN Commentator, the NRA Didn't Train the Florida Shooter; That's a Total Garbage Lie" was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 20, 2018.
- An article by Beth Baumann titled "Gun Control Movement Has Multiple Nationwide Student Walkouts Planned" was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 17, 2018.
- A video and an article by Ian Schwartz titled "Florida School Shooting Survivor: CNN Told Me 'I Needed to Stick to the Script'; They Scripted Entire Town Meeting" were posted at realclearpolitics.com on Feb. 22, 2018.

Comments about weapons

- An article by Susan Jones titled "Rep. Scalise, Shot in June, Points to Prayer and Self-Defense" was posted at cnsnews.com on Feb. 16, 2018.
- An article by Timothy Meads titled "Hurricane-Proof Windows Prevented Even Deadlier Massacre" was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 18, 2018.
- An article by Matt Vespa titled "Friendly Reminder: The Usual Anti-Gun Proposals Wouldn't Have Stopped Florida Shooting" was posted at townhall.com on Feb. 19, 2018.
- An article by Amie Parner and Mike Lillis titled "Dems Want Gun Control, But Worry It Could Cost Them Midterms" was posted at thehill.com on Feb. 22, 2018.



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."