

Eye on the World

Oct. 2, 2021

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 Oct. 2, 2021.

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 Lahav Harkov titled "[Prime Minister Naftali] Bennett at the UN: Hating Israel Doesn't Make You 'Woke' " was posted at jpost.com on Sept. 28, 2021. (Reuters and Tovah Lazaroff contributed to this report.) Following is the article.

Israel is a beacon of light and freedom, and supporting it is a moral choice, Prime Minister Naftali Bennett said at his first-ever speech to the United Nations General Assembly on Monday.

Speaking in front of the iconic green marble wall, just over 100 days after he became prime minister, Bennett said that "Attacking Israel doesn't make you morally superior. Fighting the only democracy in the Middle East doesn't make you 'woke.' Adopting clichés about Israel without bothering to learn the basic facts, well, that's just plain lazy. Every member state in this building has a choice. It's not a political choice, but a moral one. It's a choice between darkness and light."

Israel, Bennett said repeatedly, "is a lighthouse in a stormy sea," a diverse democracy that contributes to the world with its innovations, he stated.

Pointing to the 38 countries that opted out of last week's Durban IV Conference—marking 20 years since the World Conference against Racism, which devolved into antisemitism and anti-Israel bias—Bennett said: "This conference was originally meant to be against racism, but over the years turned into a conference of racism, against Israel and the Jewish people—and the

world has had enough of this. I thank the 38 countries who chose truth over lies and skipped the conference.”

The prime minister specifically thanked the US for being a “longtime, trusted friend,” citing the vote last week to fund \$1bn. in Iron Dome batteries.

Bennett lamented that, “for way too long, Israel was defined by wars with our neighbors. But this is not what Israel is about.”

“Israelis don’t wake up in the morning thinking about the conflict. Israelis want to lead a good life, take care of our families, and build a better world for our children,” he stated, “which means that from time to time, we might need to leave our jobs, say goodbye to our families, and rush to the battlefield to defend our country—just like my friends and I have had to do ourselves. They should not be judged for it.”

Israelis, the prime minister said, are “determined to look ahead, to build a brighter future.”

While Israel is focused on doing good, it still faces a threat from a nuclear Iran, Bennett said.

“Iran’s nuclear weapons program is at a critical point,” he warned. “All red-lines have been crossed. Inspections—ignored. All wishful thinking—proven false. Iran is violating the [International Atomic Energy Agency’s] safeguard agreements—and it’s getting away with it.”

Iran is enriching uranium to 60%, one step away from weapons-grade material, and the world has been ignoring further evidence of its intention to develop a nuclear bomb.

“Iran’s nuclear program has hit a watershed moment—and so has our tolerance. Words do not stop centrifuges from spinning,” he stated.

Israel will not allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon, Bennett said.

The Iranian regime is weaker than it seems, and it can be stopped if its threat is taken seriously.

As for Iran’s regional malign actions, Bennett pointed to the Iran-backed terrorist groups on Israel’s borders, like Hezbollah, Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

“Iran’s great goal is crystal clear to anybody who cares to open their eyes: Iran seeks to dominate the region, and seeks to do so under a nuclear umbrella,” he said.

The prime minister pointed to places in which “Iran has spread its carnage and destruction”—Lebanon, Iraq, Syria, Yemen and Gaza—and said they are all in crisis.

“Like the Midas touch, Iran’s regime has the ‘Mullah-touch.’ Every place Iran touches, fails,” he quipped.

Bennett said that Iran’s military drone unit threatens the entire world, mentioning the attack on the *Mercer Street* vessel—in which Iranian suicide drones

killed a British and a Romanian citizen—as well as its proxy armies throughout the Middle East, which it plans to arm with thousands of deadly UAVs.

The prime minister also referred to Iranian President Ebrahim Raisi's history of heading a "death commission" that ordered the murder of 5,000 political activists—and then celebrating the deaths by pocketing the victims' money and eating cream puffs.

"He celebrated the murder of his own people, by devouring cream cakes," Bennett emphasized. "And now Raisi is Iran's new president. This is who we're dealing with."

On a more positive note, Bennett referred to the Abraham Accords—which he called by their name—as "rays of light," along with peace with Jordan and Egypt. He said that more is to come.

On Sunday night, Bennett met with Bahraini Foreign Minister Abdullatif bin Rashid Al Zayani and United Arab Emirates Minister of State in The Foreign Ministry Khalifa Sharren Almarar, in what was his first meeting with senior officials from Abraham Accords countries. Bennett expressed the importance of marking a year since the accords were signed.

"We are stable, we believe in this relationship and we want to expand it as much as possible," he said.

In his speech on Monday, Bennett also compared covid-19 and political polarization, calling them both plagues that could have devastating results, and saying his government has solutions for both.

"In a polarized world, where algorithms fuel our anger, people on the Right and on the Left operate in two separate realities, each in their own social media bubble: They hear only the voices that confirm what they already believe in. People end up hating each other, societies get torn apart. Countries broken from within go nowhere," Bennett said.

The new government has been an "antidote" and a source of "calm and stability: an honest attempt for political normalcy," he stated.

Bennett called his government the most diverse in Israel's history and said that it is working toward a shared purpose of unity.

"We carry a message: Things can be different. It's okay to disagree . . . For healthy debate is a basic tenet of the Jewish tradition and one of the secrets to the success of the Start-Up Nation. What we have proven is that even in the age of social media, we can debate, without hate," Bennett said.

The prime minister met with UN Secretary-General Antonioni Guterres and US Ambassador to the UN Linda Thomas-Greenfield after the speech, and spoke at a Jewish Federations of North America event, at which leaders of other Jewish organizations were present.

"Iran-phobia runs rampant at UN," Iran's Ambassador Majid Takht Ravanchi posted on Twitter after Bennett spoke. Israel "is in no position to discuss our

peaceful program when it has hundreds of nuclear warheads," he said, referring to Israel's widely believed status as a country that possesses nuclear weapons.

When quizzed about Bennett's comments on Iran, Jalina Porter, Principal Deputy Spokesperson, said that the Biden administration believes that a "mutual return to compliance is in America's national interest."

She added that "we believe the best available option is to restrict Iran's nuclear program and provide a platform to address Iran's destabilizing conduct."



A Reuters article by Pushkala Aripaka and Ludwig Burger titled "EU Finds J&J Covid Shot Possibly Linked to Another Rare Clotting Condition" was posted at reuters.com on Oct. 1, 2021. Following is the article.

The European Union's drug regulator on Friday identified a possible link between rare cases of blood clotting in deep veins with Johnson & Johnson's (JNJ.N) covid-19 vaccine and recommended the condition be listed as a side-effect of the shot.

The European Medicines Agency also recommended that immune thrombocytopenia (ITP), a bleeding disorder caused by the body mistakenly attacking platelets, be added as an adverse reaction with an unknown frequency to the J&J vaccine product information and to AstraZeneca's (AZN.L) vaccine.

J&J said while the chances of experiencing these conditions were very low, the product information would be updated accordingly as it continues to work closely with authorities including EMA.

"We strongly support raising awareness of the signs and symptoms of rare events to ensure they can be quickly identified and effectively treated," the company said.

Both the J&J and AstraZeneca vaccines have previously been associated with a very rare combination of blood clotting and low platelet counts known as thrombosis with thrombocytopenia syndrome (TTS).

The two products are based on harmless vector viruses that instruct human cells to make a protein that primes the immune system against future coronavirus infections.

EMA said the new, possibly life-threatening clotting condition known as venous thromboembolism (VTE) to be included on the J&J product label was separate from TTS.

VTE typically begins by a clot forming in a vein of a leg, arm or groin, which then travels to the lungs and blocks the blood supply there.

Regardless of any vaccine use, VTE is most commonly caused by injury or lack of movement in bedridden patients. Birth control pills and a number of chronic conditions are also seen as risk factors.



An article by Michael Brown titled "Did You Hear About the Latest Moral Outrage From California?" was posted at townhall.com on Oct. 1, 2021. Following is the article.

With so much happening in the news every day, from the congressional hearings on our withdrawal from Afghanistan to the budget crisis and more, it's easy to overlook some of the truly horrendous things taking place in our nation. But what California's Governor Newsom recently signed into law cannot be overlooked. It is nothing less than a frontal assault on parental rights, also hurting the very children it claims to protect.

Although there were two controversial bills Gov. Newsom signed last week, we'll focus here on AB 1184.

As reported by California Family Council, this bill "prohibits insurance companies from revealing to the policyholder the 'sensitive' services of anyone on their policy, including minor children, even though the policy owner is financially responsible for the services. These 'sensitive' services include abortions, sexual assault treatment, drug abuse and mental health treatment, cross-sex hormones, puberty blockers, and sex-change operations. In California, minors can consent to all of these sensitive treatments, except for sex-change surgeries, after the age of 12 under certain conditions, and consent to abortions at any age."

Perhaps you want to read that again? Not a word is exaggerated or misreported. This is exactly what this bill entails. Yet for Newsom and other California leftists, this is a cause for celebration.

Talk about turning the world upside down. Talk about calling good evil and evil good. Talk about undermining families.

But let's not think in abstract terms. Let's be concrete and specific.

Not only can your 13-year-old child make radical, life-altering decisions, such as having an abortion, without your knowledge or consent. That would be bad enough. But your child can use your family insurance policy to pay for that abortion, and when your insurance statement comes, there will be no explanation of services.

In fact, your insurance provider will be prohibited from disclosing to you what your own child has done and what your policy has covered. And this is now the law in California.

Should we feel anything less than outrage? And who gave the government such intrusive, potentially destructive powers?

Your minor child can actually choose to get treated with cross-sex hormones or puberty blockers, drugs which can have disastrous lifelong consequences, without possibly being able to understand the implications of what they're doing, and by law, you cannot find out about it.

Your child doesn't have to tell you. The doctors don't have to tell you. And your insurers don't have to tell you.

To say it again, this is an absolutely indefensible outrage.

Listen to the words of Grace Lidinsky-Smith, writing in Newsweek June 25. "In my early 20s," she says, "I became depressed and gender dysphoric after years of obsessing over identity issues. Finally, I thought I saw my route forward: the total transformation of medical transition, to live as a man."

And note carefully: she was in her early 20s when she made these fateful decisions, not a teenager, let alone a 12-year-old.

She continues, "I had the most supportive possible environment for transitioning: easy access to hormones, an affirming community and insurance coverage. What I didn't have was a therapist who could help me scrutinize the underlying issues I had before I undertook serious medical decisions. Instead, I was diagnosed with gender dysphoria and given the green light to start transition by my doctor on the first visit."

Stories like this are all too common these days, leading to a growing number of "detransitioners" and a growing pushback against the rush to "transition" young people.

Lidinsky-Smith then describes the process: "I started my transformation with cross-sex hormones injections. Four months later, I had my breasts removed in the masculinizing surgical procedure known as 'top surgery.' The day I got my first testosterone shot, I wept with joy. I thought I had discovered my path to self-actualization as a transgender man.

"One year later, I would be curled in my bed, clutching my double-mastectomy scars and sobbing with regret."

And, she says candidly, "I wondered desperately how I could have been so wrong about something so important. I knew people who were very happy with their changes. But it all went wrong for me.

"My gender dysphoria, which I had taken as proof that I was truly meant to live as male, turned out to stem from other mental health issues. My change had been a brutal mistake, and I would have to live with the consequences—numb scars, no breasts, a deepened voice—for the rest of my life."

Tragically, she is now one of many young women with similar stories. (Many young men have their horror stories too.)

Yet now, in California, she could have embarked on this self-destructive journey as a young minor, starting with puberty blockers and/or cross-sex hormones, completely cutting her parents out of the process, with the law on her side. And when her parents began to wonder what was happening to their daughter, there was no way they could find out—by law.

And if she decided to have her breasts removed—irreversibly—at the age of 19, California, with the help of your own insurance company, would have her covered. Parents, you could be in for a very big surprise one day!

And let's not forget about other "sensitive" services, such as "sexual assault treatment, drug abuse and mental health treatment."

Here, too, it is utterly outrageous for parents to be locked out of such critical situations, yet it is now the law, and Gov. Newsom and his colleagues are celebrating.

I urge every parent in California to get as involved in your children's lives as you possibly can—I mean that in the most positive, helpful, and healthy ways, not in oppressive and overbearing ways.

I encourage you to cultivate honesty and transparency. To make your kids feel safer with you than with any of their peers or other elders. And to work tirelessly until this legislation is overthrown.

The light can still drive out the darkness.



An article by Dennis Prager titled "Who Would Hide a Jew if Nazis Took Over America?" was posted at townhall.com on Sept. 28, 2021. Following is the article.

There is something about most Jews that few non-Jews know: We Jews often ask ourselves if a non-Jew in our lives would hide us in the event of a Nazi-like outbreak.

I don't know if young Jews think about this, but nearly all Jews who grew up in the decades following the Holocaust often wondered: Would this non-Jew hide me?

I have thought about this all my life because the question, "Who hid Jews?" is one of the most important questions anyone—Jew or non-Jew—needs to think about. That question is far more important than "Who didn't hide Jews?" because great goodness is rarer than great evil and even rarer than simple moral cowardice. Yet, a vast number of books have been written attempting to understand evil, while relatively few have been written attempting to explain good.

The reason for this is simple: Since the Enlightenment, i.e., since the decline of Judeo-Christian thought, most secular people have believed, and nearly all secular thought has been predicated on, the reality-denying idea that human nature is essentially good. As a result, scholars regard good as the norm and evil as the aberration. So, they study evil far more than good.

That is why the question, "Who rescued Jews?" should be of overwhelming importance to humanity as a whole. If people are interested in increasing good and in decreasing evil, what question could be more important?

A lifetime of study of this question has led me to the following answers.

■ No. 1: Sam and Pearl Oliner, two professors of sociology at California State University at Humboldt, were the authors of one of the most highly regarded works on altruism, "The Altruistic Personality." The book was the product of the Oliners' lifetime of study of non-Jewish rescuers of Jews during the

Holocaust. They themselves had been hidden by non-Jews in Poland, and I had the privilege of interviewing them.

I asked Sam Oliner, "Knowing all you now know about who rescued Jews during the Holocaust, if you had to return as a Jew to Poland and you could knock on the door of only one person in the hope that they would rescue you, would you knock on the door of a Polish lawyer, a Polish doctor, a Polish artist or a Polish priest?"

Without hesitation, he responded, "Polish priest." And his wife immediately added, "I would prefer a Polish nun."

I should note that neither had a religious agenda, as both were secular Jews.

Of course, most Christians in Europe failed the moral test of the Holocaust, but so did nearly all secular intellectuals. And few Christians today deny this. But any honest person would still bet on a priest before a doctor, artist, lawyer or professor. It is one reason I believe that the decline of Judeo-Christian religions is a calamity: We will produce fewer people who will do great good.

■ No. 2: Another study of rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust offered four characteristics of rescuers. I read this book about 40 years ago and I do not remember the name of the book or three of the four characteristics. But I remember one of them because it struck me as an original insight and because it made so much sense. According to this study, individuals who were considered "eccentric" prior to the war were disproportionately represented among those who hid Jews.

Now, why would that be? Why would people regarded as eccentric be more likely to risk torture and death to hide a member of a persecuted group they weren't part of?

The answer is obvious: Eccentrics are, by definition, people who march to the beat of their own drummer, who are nonconformists, and who don't seek social approval.

That should give us some major insights into who would save Jews—or any other group targeted for death (such as landowners in communist countries)—if our society were taken over by Nazis or communists.

If this theory about eccentrics is correct, it should give us pause.

When I observe Americans, Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders, and, for that matter, the citizens of most countries at this time, this observation about who would risk their lives to hide a Jew leaves me pessimistic with regard to how any of these groups would act under a Nazi or communist regime.

We have seen herdlike behavior and an unquestioning obedience to authority that few expected to witness in previously free countries such as the English-speaking ones. Worse, we have seen *unquestioning obedience to irrational authority*.

Wearing masks outdoors is irrational. Yet a vast number of Americans have, sheeplike, obeyed irrational government demands to wear them. Telling people who have had covid-19 to take a vaccine against covid-19, when natural anti-

bodies are longer lasting and more effective, not to mention safer, than a vaccine is irrational. Telling people who have been vaccinated or had covid-19 to wear masks is irrational. Prolonged lockdowns of healthy people are irrational.

Yet tens of millions of Americans are unquestioningly obeying irrational orders and castigating those resisting or even questioning them.

It was "eccentric" Christian pastors who kept their churches open and an "eccentric" Catholic priest who sued the state of California for denying him his constitutional right to minister to his flock—and who prevailed against the state. Except for these clergymen and a handful of eccentric restaurant owners, almost all other Americans obeyed the state's irrational orders.

That is frightening because people who obey irrational orders and despise those who do not are precisely the type of people who didn't hide Jews.

So, then, here are two questions for American Jews to ponder:

- If a Nazi-like doctrine took over America, and you could knock on the door of someone who obeyed all government orders regarding masks, regardless of their rationality, or someone who questioned government authority and obeyed few or none of its mask orders—on whose door would you knock?
- If you were given the choice between knocking on the door of an atheist professor and the door of an Evangelical pastor or a Catholic priest—on whose door would you knock?



An article by Michelle Malkin titled "All It Takes Is One" was posted at creators.com on Sept. 14, 2021. Following is the article.

"One is the loneliest number," Three Dog Night famously sang over five decades ago. But all it takes is one brave soul fighting against the tide to inspire 10. Ten become hundreds. Hundreds become thousands. Thousands become millions. Millions become a new majority.

- Riverside County, Calif., Sheriff Chad Bianco is one.

On Monday, Sheriff Bianco announced he "will not enforce the (covid-19) vaccine mandate on Sheriff's Department employees." In response to a cascade of draconian state directives and the Biden administration's overt war on the unvaccinated, Bianco asserted his constitutional duty to protect the public "from the criminal element, as well as being the last line of defense from tyrannical government overreach." Local media and establishment public health "experts" have condemned Bianco, but he refuses to back down:

"In November 2018 the residents of Riverside County elected me as their Sheriff. I stood before God and swore an oath to the Constitution of the

United States, and the Constitution of the State of California . . . As your sheriff I have an obligation to guard your liberty and freedom.”

■ Chicago police officer and Fraternal Order of Police president John Catanzara is one.

Catanzara is leading the charge against heavy-handed Mayor Lori Lightfoot’s vaccine mandate. Speaking on behalf of the rank and file, he declared two weeks ago that his union is “100% against mandated vaccines for our members” and blasted the dearth of studies for long-term side effects or consequences. “To mandate anybody to get that vaccine, without that data as a baseline, amongst other issues, is a ‘hell, no’ for us.”

The multiplier effect is real: “It ain’t just our guys. It’s the sergeants, lieutenants and captains,” Catanzara points out. “This is a united front.”

■ New York public school teacher and founder of Teachers for Choice Michael Kane is one.

He has been a tireless advocate for parents and educators in the Big Apple. His group is “100% against forced medical mandates for any American to keep their job, especially educators.” On Monday, Kane was joined by several hundred public school employees, families and city workers who overtook Foley Square in opposition to Mayor Bill “The Bully” de Blasio’s authoritarian vaccine mandate with no testing opt-out alternative. Those who claim religious or medical exemptions will be barred from teaching in the classroom; school employees have until Sept. 27 to get the jab or lose their job.

Kane is not alone. He helped inspire thousands of protesters to join a march on Monday night across the Brooklyn Bridge as they waved signs taunting “Come and Make Me,” “Let Me Call My Own Shots,” “My Body, My Choice” and “No Medical Apartheid.” The fight has just begun. As Kane warns, “There are many other medical mandates that are coming soon, and we stand in opposition TO ALL OF THEM!”

■ Broadway star Laura Osnes is one.

Last month, she quit a one-night benefit concert after the venue required all actors to get the covid-19 shot and no option to provide a negative covid-19 test was extended to her. She walked away from the performance opportunity because “there is so much that is still unknown” about the experimental jabs. “I stand by the decision my husband and I, with input from our physician, have made for ourselves, our family planning and our future,” she wrote on Instagram. “I believe individuals have the right to do the research, consult a doctor, and come to their own conclusions before deciding whether or not to get any injection.”

■ Emily Dahl is one. Hannah Redoute is one. Bailey Korhorn is one. Morgan Otteson is one.

Together, they are the four members of the Western Michigan University soccer team who banded together to sue the school over its mandatory vaccine policy citing their First Amendment-protected religious liberty. Last week, a federal judge granted their motion for a preliminary injunction against WMU,

blocking the university from kicking them off the team after their requests for religious exemptions were denied by school officials.

Twelve other WMU athletes have since joined the quartet's lawsuit: Taylor Williams, Jake Moertl, Maxwell Huntley, Kaelyn Parker, Annalise James, Reilly Jacobson, Kia Brooks, Aubree Ensign, Sydney Schafer, Danielle Natte, Nicole Morehouse and Katelyn Spooner.

■ In June, 153 health care workers in the Houston Methodist Hospital system quit or were fired for refusing to submit to mandatory jabs as a condition of employment.

■ Two weeks ago, 30 maternity ward nurses and staffers resigned in protest of the upstate New York Lewis County General Hospital's vaccine mandate with no religious exemptions—forcing the facility to close the maternity department.

■ On Saturday, six Los Angeles police officers filed a federal lawsuit in U.S. District Court seeking to overturn the department's vaccine mandate. They are not alone. More than 2,300 LAPD employees have filed notices seeking religious exemptions, and another 300 officers and staff have filed for medical exemptions—together constituting 20% of the workforce.

■ Remember: All it takes is one. Ten become hundreds. Hundreds become thousands. Thousands become millions. Millions become a new majority. This is how tyranny ends.



An article by Michelle Malkin titled "The Manufactured Border Crisis" was posted at creators.com on Sept. 21, 2021. Following is the article.

In nearly 30 years of covering America's corrupted immigration and entrance policies, I can tell you definitively that every "border crisis" is a manufactured crisis. Caravans of Latin American illegal immigrants don't just form out of nowhere. Throngs of Middle Eastern refugees don't just amass spontaneously. Boatloads of Haitians don't just wash up on our shores by random circumstance.

All the world's a stage, and as I exposed in my most recent book, "Open Borders, Inc.," the world's migrants are nothing more than expedient tools to globalist elites, profit-maximizing corporations, self-aggrandizing religious and nonprofit groups, and criminal smuggling syndicates.

That's how the so-called border crises under former Presidents Bill Clinton, George Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump all played out. The players are always the same: United Nations operatives, U.S. Chamber of Commerce lobbyists, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and its sovereignty-undermining shelter operators around the world, Jewish and evangelical Christian refugee resettlement contractors, international drug cartels, human traffickers, and their militant multicultural abettors. It's the same old, same old under President Joe Biden. The latest wave of Haitians traversing rough seas

and barren deserts to trespass onto U.S. soil at our southern border in Del Rio, Texas, is no accidental phenomenon.

Todd Bensman, senior national security fellow at the Center for Immigration Studies, has been interviewing Haitians at Ciudad Acuna, Mexico, the town through which an estimated 15,000 of these illegals have passed to form the massive encampment in Del Rio, Texas. Several dozen told Bensman that “on Sunday, Sept. 12, the Mexican government effectively sent a mass of migrants it had bottled up for months in its southern states up to the American border. This move, which appears to have been done under the cover of Mexico’s independence week of celebration known as El Grito, essentially foisted a humanitarian problem onto the Americans in a single week.”

Several Haitians told Bensman that government officials in Tapachula informed them they no longer needed passports or other paperwork they had been waiting months for—and then were suddenly given a three-day grace period to make their rush for the border.

Because Ciudad Acuna and Del Rio are not as infested with Mexican cartel enforcers, thousands of Haitians took advantage of the relatively safe passage into America’s promised land without having to pay the usual coyote fees.

Most have been lying in wait in Chile and Brazil for several years looking for better economic opportunities, so don’t believe sob-story propaganda that the prime factor has to do with any recent natural disaster or sudden political turmoil. Open-borders academic Andrew Selee of the Migration Policy Institute himself tweeted that “for those wondering about where Haitian migrants are coming from, most left Haiti in 2010-12 after the earthquake and settled in Brazil. Later most moved to Chile & Ecuador . . . This means that most of those arriving in Texas have been out of their country for about a decade. The covid recession, discrimination, and the perception that they could get into the US now all played a role in the movement north over the past few months . . . Both Colombia and Panama registered huge increases in transit through the Darien Gap in July/August suggesting significant movement north.”

Countless Catholic parishes, like the Franciscan parish in Necocli run by Father Henry Lopera, have facilitated Haitians’ migration through the Darien Gap and onto Mexico and the U.S. by supplying food packages. Doctors Without Borders has three health posts to assist the trespassers. Along the way, these Haitian invaders have also been assisted by the United Nations’ International Organization of Migration, which has dispatched minibuses filled with toiletries and hair ties, according to The Guardian.

As I reported in “Open Borders, Inc.,” the International Organization of Migration, or IOM, is the same agency that signed “cooperation agreements” in Mexico with three migrant shelters along its southern border to assist border-busting “irregulars” traveling through the Mexican states of Chiapas and Oaxaca on their way to the U.S.

The IOM pact guaranteed supplies of medicine, hygiene products, construction materials, therapy services and legal training at the Hermanos en el Camino shelter, along with the Catholic-run Hogar de la Misericordia shelter

and Jesus el Buen Pastor del Pobre y el Migrante shelter. IOM extended similar aid to nine other migrant shelters in the northern and central parts of Mexico, from Chihuahua, Sonora and Tamaulipas along the northern border to San Luis Potosi, Veracruz and Tlaxcala in the center of the country.

Who's paying? Funding for IOM's operations comes from the U.S. State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, which is subsidized by y-o-u.

The bozos in the Biden administration are now play-acting with their performative gestures of "mass deportation" of Haitians. But I've seen this show and all its reruns over the past three decades before. It ends with sneaky "temporary protected status" orders, mini-amnesties and maxi-amnesties to feed the global Open Borders, Inc. beast.

All the world's a stage, and America is the overrun doormat being trampled upon while our own citizens suffer increasing deprivation and anarcho-tyranny. Ain't "diversity" grand?



An article by Michelle Malkin titled "What Every Parent Must Know About Pfizer" was posted at creators.com on Sept. 28, 2021. Following is the article.

The CEO of Pfizer (market cap: \$240.5 billion) is Albert Bourla (2020 compensation package: \$21 million). Bourla and his colleagues want your kids to start getting jabbed with his company's covid-19 vaccine by Thanksgiving. Triumphant after the Biden administration last week approved Pfizer's covid-19 booster shots (estimated global sales: \$26 billion), the company is touting study results (preliminary and non-peer-reviewed), which purportedly show "robust" antibody response and "favorable" safety outcomes for children ages 5-11 who received a two-dose combo in clinical trials.

Now, here are some facts all moms and dads must know about Pfizer before they allow their young daughters and sons to be guinea pigs of a profit-maximizing multinational corporation.

Twenty-five years ago, Pfizer sent a team to Kano, Nigeria, during a meningococcal meningitis outbreak. They conducted an "open label" (unblinded) clinical trial involving 200 children, half of whom were given Pfizer's new antibiotic Trovan and half of whom received the gold standard treatment, ceftriaxone. Watchdogs noted that Pfizer used substantially lower doses of ceftriaxone to rig the trials in favor of Trovan.

At the time of the Kano trial, Pfizer was pushing for approval from the Food and Drug Administration of their latest potential billion-dollar cash cow for pediatric use. Eleven Nigerian children died, five after receiving Pfizer's product and six after receiving lower-than-normal doses of the older drug.

Pay close attention, parents. A Washington Post investigation reported that one 10-year-old girl suffering from meningitis was not taken off experimental Trovan

and given standard, proven treatments by Pfizer's clinical trial operators—when it was clear that her condition was deteriorating. One of her eyes froze. She lost strength and then died. A Nigerian doctor who supervised the studies for Pfizer admitted that his office had “backdated an approval letter” for the human trials, which “may have been written a year after the study had taken place.” Informed consent was undermined by language and education barriers.

One outraged African newspaper demanded that the government “tell us whether our children were used as guinea pigs and, if so, who committed such criminality and who is liable.” After years of protracted litigation with the pharmaceutical behemoth, Nigerian families reached a \$75 million out-of-court settlement sealed with a confidentiality clause.

A separate whistleblower lawsuit filed by Pfizer's former associate medical director for central research and Yale pediatric infectious disease specialist, Juan Walterspiel, alleged that the company fired him in retaliation for warning before and after the deadly Kano fiasco that the study methods were “improper and unsafe.” Walterspiel further claimed that Pfizer had bribed Nigerian officials to continue the study and cut safety corners because “stock options and bonuses (were) at stake.”

Pfizer tried to suppress Walterspiel's allegations but was forced into a settlement after WikiLeaks published diplomatic cables showing that Pfizer had attempted to dig up dirt on a Nigerian prosecutor to bully him into dropping lawsuits by state and federal authorities in Africa.

A secret internal Nigerian government report, leaked years after it had been written, concluded that Pfizer violated international law by conducting an “illegal trial of an unregistered drug” and failing to inform children's parents that the meningitis treatment was experimental. The government panel called the Trovan tragedy a “clear case of exploitation of the ignorant.”

If you think this corruption was all an anomaly or misunderstood altruism or “misinformation,” I encourage you to start doing your own homework before your child's health and life become just another cost of doing Big Pharma business.

Search the internet and PubMed (while you still can) for “Pfizer,” “Celebrex,” “Bextra,” “Geodon,” “Zyvox,” “Lyrica” and “Neurontin.”

Find out more about why Pfizer paid the largest fine for health care fraud in American history (\$2.3 billion) in 2009 to resolve allegations that it illegally caused false claims to be submitted to the government and paid kickbacks to health care providers to induce them to prescribe their products.

Learn more about the nearly 3,000 people who developed suicidal thoughts and severe psychological disorders after taking Pfizer's smoking cessation drug, Chantix. Pfizer paid out nearly \$300 million to settle those cases. Or the nearly 10,000 women who won claims of \$1 billion after developing breast cancer linked to Pfizer's Prempro hormone replacement therapy.

And just remember, parents, that the pandemic profiteers who stand to gain unprecedented, multibillion-dollar windfalls from endless vaccine boosters

administered cradle to grave around the world have the most terrifying man-made immunity ever created: immunity from liability for their corner-cutting, life-endangering business model.



An article by Michael Brown titled "Why YouTube's Banning of Anti-Vaxxers Is So Ominous" was posted at townhall.com on Sept. 30, 2021. Following is the article.

The September 29 lead headline on Drudge Report was even more apocalyptic and alarming than normal, featuring a giant YouTube logo, front and center, covered by a red "cancel" circle. The headline declared, "YOUTUBE BANS ALL 'ANTI-VAX' CONTENT. "

Secondary headlines also sounded ominous tones: "Sydney warns unvaccinated face total social isolation IDEFINITELY when lockdown ends . . ."; "UNITED AIRLINES firing employees who refuse shot"; "Biden Order Mandate Enforcement With Up To \$700,000 Fine . . ."—and more.

Are things really as bad as they seem? In a word, yes.

But let me say at the outset that I am not an anti-vaxxer myself. My official, oft-stated, public position on the covid vaccines is this: Do the research, pray for wisdom, and make an informed decision. As for my personal choices, I'm keeping those personal, since I do not have the health expertise to influence others in either direction.

As for my experience with the covid videos our ministry has posted online, YouTube has been totally fair with us. They have not demonetized, let alone banned, a single video we have made discussing the virus or the vaccines from different points of view.

I appreciate this, but, at the same time, I recognize that this is exactly the way things should be. That's what freedom of speech is all about. And that's what these public platforms are all about.

Unfortunately, as reported on the MSN website, "As part of a new set of policies aimed at cutting down on anti-vaccine content on the Google-owned site, YouTube will ban any videos that claim that commonly used vaccines approved by health authorities are ineffective or dangerous. The company previously blocked videos that made those claims about coronavirus vaccines, but not ones for other vaccines like those for measles or chickenpox."

So, while a million viewpoints on a million subjects can be freely discussed, including what foods are or are not healthy and what diets are or are not healthy and what exercise regimes are or are not healthy or what drugs for different illnesses are or are not healthy—etc., etc.—there can be no open discussion about what vaccines are or are not healthy.

This is utterly outrageous. Talk about a frontal assault on our freedoms.

And what a dangerous new precedent this sets when it comes to future censorship of banned ideas.

The rationale behind the decision is this: "Misinformation researchers have for years said the popularity of anti-vaccine content on YouTube was contributing to growing skepticism of lifesaving vaccines in the United States and around the world. Vaccination rates have slowed and about 56 percent of the U.S. population has had two shots, compared with 71 percent in Canada and 67 percent in the United Kingdom."

But what if it is not just misinformation? What if there are genuine scientific concerns? What if there is a growing body of anecdotal evidence supporting those concerns? And, in any case, who decides what is and is not "misinformation"? More importantly, who decides which "misinformation" is permitted and which is forbidden?

Should a video with blatant misinformation about the Bible be permitted on YouTube, even if it will lead many people astray spiritually? (The answer is yes, it should be permitted.)

What about a video with misleading information about UFO's? Should that be permitted? (Again, the answer is yes.)

But if you have genuine, well-researched, carefully-considered issues with vaccines in general, not to mention covid vaccines in particular, your content will be banned on YouTube.

This really is ominous.

In a text thread today in response to this news, a Christian attorney wrote, "It's going to get worse, probably much worse. The full court press is on with social media, large corporate interests, and Hollywood doing the progressive Left's bidding. I'm more worried about what it portends beyond vaccinations. A governmental-business conglomeration able to do this—literally mandate what people put in their body—can dictate nearly anything about how we live and even how we think."

He added, "I'm not optimistic that good info can stop the juggernaut. That's because it's not about rational discourse—it's about power and ultimately an antichrist spirit." In other words, this is a bigger battle, one that is both ideological and spiritual. We dare not minimize the threat.

Looking back to March 2018, I wrote an article titled, "Why YouTube's Conflict With Infowars Should Concern Us All."

The article began with these words: "I have never been a fan of Alex Jones and Infowars. I strongly reject some of the conspiracy theories Jones has put forth. But if it is true that his channel could be removed from YouTube, we should not ignore this. It doesn't matter if we are on the left or right or in between. Especially since The Daily Caller reported that 'YouTube is getting help from the left-wing Southern Poverty Law Center in its effort to identify extremist content.'"

Fast forward back to today, and you can see that our concerns were quite valid.

In the past, a major newspaper like USA Today may have had 2-3 million subscribers, while, to this day, major network news shows may draw 5-7 million viewers per network. In contrast, YouTube currently has 2.29 billion users, meaning that when YouTube bans you, it really hurts.

Add to this the fact that we began this year with Twitter banning the most powerful man on the planet from its platform—the sitting president of the United States—and you realize that things are quickly spiraling out of control.

Let us, then, push back with wisdom, with truth, with courage, with strategic action and—for people of faith—with prayer.



A government policy titled “HIPAA, covid-19 Vaccination, and the Workplace” was posted at [hhs.gov](https://www.hhs.gov) on Sept. 30, 2021. Following is the policy (without accompanying footnotes).

1. Does the HIPAA Privacy Rule prohibit businesses or individuals from asking whether their customers or clients have received a covid-19 vaccine?

No. The Privacy Rule does not prohibit **any person** (*e.g.*, an individual or an entity such as a business), including HIPAA covered entities and business associates, from asking whether an individual has received a particular vaccine, including covid-19 vaccines.

First, the Privacy Rule applies **only** to **covered entities** (health plans, health care clearinghouses, and health care providers that conduct standard electronic transactions) and, to some extent, their **business associates**.

Second, the Privacy Rule **does not regulate** the ability of covered entities and business associates to request information from patients or visitors. Rather, the Privacy Rule regulates how and when covered entities and business associates are permitted to use and disclose **protected health information (PHI)** (*e.g.*, PHI about whether an individual has received a covid-19 vaccine) that covered entities and business associates create, receive, maintain, or transmit. Thus, the Privacy Rule **does not prohibit** a covered entity (*e.g.*, a covered doctor, hospital, or health plan) or business associate from asking whether an individual (*e.g.*, a patient or visitor) has received a particular vaccine, including covid-19 vaccines, although it does regulate how and when a covered entity or its business associate may use or disclose information about an individual’s vaccination status.

Additional examples. The Privacy Rule **does not apply** when an individual:

- Is asked about their vaccination status by a school, employer, store, restaurant, entertainment venue, or another individual.
- Asks another individual, their doctor, or a service provider whether they are vaccinated.

■ Asks a company, such as a home health agency, whether its workforce members are vaccinated.

Other state or federal laws address whether individuals are required to disclose whether they have received a vaccine under certain circumstances.

2. Does the HIPAA Privacy Rule prevent customers or clients of a business from disclosing whether they have received a covid-19 vaccine?

No. The Privacy Rule does not prevent any individual from disclosing whether that individual has been vaccinated against covid-19 or any other disease. The Privacy Rule does not apply to individuals' disclosures about their own health information. It applies **only to covered entities** and, to some extent their **business associates**. Therefore, the Privacy Rule does not apply when an individual tells another person, such as a colleague or business owner, about their own vaccination status.

3. Does the HIPAA Privacy Rule prohibit an employer from requiring a workforce member to disclose whether they have received a covid-19 vaccine to the employer, clients, or other parties?

No. The Privacy Rule does not apply to employment records, including employment records held by covered entities or business associates in their capacity as employers. Generally, the Privacy Rule does not regulate what information can be requested from employees as part of the terms and conditions of employment that an employer may impose on its workforce. However, other federal or state laws do address terms and conditions of employment. For example, federal anti-discrimination laws do not prevent an employer from choosing to require that all employees physically entering the workplace be vaccinated against covid-19 and provide documentation or other confirmation that they have met this requirement, subject to reasonable accommodation provisions and other equal employment opportunity considerations. Documentation or other confirmation of vaccination, however, must be kept confidential and stored separately from the employee's personnel files under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

4. Does the HIPAA Privacy Rule prohibit a covered entity or business associate from requiring its workforce members to disclose to their employers or other parties whether the workforce members have received a covid-19 vaccine?

No. The Privacy Rule does not apply to employment records, including employment records held by covered entities and business associates acting in their capacity as employers. Thus, the Privacy Rule generally **does not** regulate what information can be requested from employees as part of the terms and conditions of employment that a covered entity or business associate may impose on its workforce, such as the ability of a covered entity or business associate to require its workforce members to provide documentation of their vaccination against covid-19 or to disclose whether they have been vaccinated to their employer, other workforce members, patients, or members of the public.

For example, the Privacy Rule **does not prohibit** a covered entity or business associate from requiring or requesting each workforce member to:

- Provide documentation of their covid-19 or flu vaccination to their current or prospective employer.
- Sign a HIPAA authorization for a covered health care provider to disclose the workforce member's covid-19 or varicella vaccination record to their employer.
- Wear a mask—while in the employer's facility, on the employer's property, or in the normal course of performing their duties at another location.
- Disclose whether they have received a covid-19 vaccine in response to queries from current or prospective patients.

Other federal or state laws address whether an employer may require a workforce member to obtain any vaccinations as a condition of employment and provide documentation or other confirmation of vaccination. These laws also address how employers must treat medical information that they obtain from employees. For example, documentation or other confirmation of vaccination must be kept confidential and stored separately from the employee's personnel files under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

5. Does the HIPAA Privacy Rule prohibit a doctor's office from disclosing an individual's protected health information (PHI), including whether they have received a covid-19 vaccine, to the individual's employer or other parties?

Generally, yes. The Privacy Rule prohibits covered entities and their business associates from using or disclosing an individual's PHI (*e.g.*, information about whether the individual has received a vaccine, such as a covid-19 vaccine; the individual's medical history or demographic information) except with the individual's authorization or as otherwise expressly permitted or required by the Privacy Rule.

Generally, where a covered entity or business associate is permitted to disclose PHI, it is limited to disclosing the PHI that is reasonably necessary to accomplish the stated purpose for the disclosure.

For example, if consistent with other law and applicable ethical standards, under the Privacy Rule:

- A covered physician **is permitted** to disclose PHI relating to an individual's vaccination to the individual's health plan as necessary to obtain payment for the administration of a covid-19 vaccine.
- A covered pharmacy **is permitted** to disclose PHI relating to an individual's vaccination status (*e.g.*, that an individual has received a covid-19 vaccination, the date of vaccination, the vaccine manufacturer) to a public health authority, such as a state or local public health agency. In such situations, the covered pharmacy may rely, if such reliance is reasonable under the circumstances, on a representation by the public health authority that the information requested constitutes the minimum necessary for the stated purpose(s) of the disclosure (*e.g.*, to track and compare the effectiveness of different covid-19 vaccines).

- A health plan **is permitted** to disclose an individual's vaccination status where required to do so by law.
- A covered nurse practitioner **is permitted** to provide PHI relating to an individual's covid-19 vaccination status to the individual.
- A covered clinician who is an investigator in a covid-19 vaccine clinical trial **is permitted** to use or disclose PHI to the vaccine manufacturer and FDA about clinical trial participants for the purpose of activities related to the quality, safety, or effectiveness of the covid-19 vaccine. Such purposes include:
 - To collect or report adverse events, product defects or problems (including problems with the use or labeling of a product), or biological product deviations.
 - To track FDA-regulation products, including covid-19 vaccines.

To enable product recalls, repairs, replacement, or lookback (including locating and notifying individuals who have received products that have been recalled, withdrawn, or are the subject of lookback).

To conduct post-marketing surveillance.

- A covered hospital **is permitted** to disclose PHI relating to an individual's vaccination status to the individual's employer so that the employer may conduct an evaluation relating to medical surveillance of the workplace (*e.g.*, surveillance of the spread of covid-19 within the workforce) or to evaluate whether the individual has a work-related illness, **and** all of the following conditions are met:

"The covered hospital is providing the health care service to the individual at the request of the individual's employer or as a member of the employer's workforce.

"The PHI that is disclosed consists of findings concerning work-related illness or workplace-related medical surveillance.

"The employer needs the findings in order to comply with its obligations under the legal authorities of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), or state laws having a similar purpose (*e.g.*, under OSHA's recordkeeping requirements, worker side effects from vaccination constitute a 'recordable illness,' and thus, employers are responsible for recording such side effects in certain circumstances.

"The covered health care provider provides written notice to the individual that the PHI related to the medical surveillance of the workplace and work-related illnesses will be disclosed to the employer. (This can be accomplished by providing the individual with a copy of the notice at the time the health care is provided, or by posting the notice in a prominent place at the location where the health care is provided if the health care is being provided on the work site of the employer.)"

In other circumstances, the Privacy Rule generally requires a covered entity to obtain an individual's written authorization before disclosing the individual's PHI, such as disclosure of whether the individual has received a vaccine, to, for example:

- A sports arena or entertainment purveyor.
- A hotel, resort, or cruise ship.
- An airline or car rental agency.

NOTE: The Privacy Rule **does not** prohibit an individual from choosing to provide any of these individuals or entities with information regarding their vaccination status.

For additional information on the Privacy Rule and its application, visit <https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-individuals/index.html>.

Resources

The CDC issued "Updated Healthcare Infection Prevention and Control Recommendations in Response to covid-19 Vaccination," available at <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/infection-control-after-vaccination.html>.

OSHA, at the U.S. Department of Labor, published "Protecting Workers: Guidance on Mitigating and Preventing the Spread of Covid-19 in the Workplace," available at <https://www.osha.gov/coronavirus/safework>. Additional guidance and resources on covid-19 and the workplace, are available at <https://www.osha.gov/coronavirus>.

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issued guidance entitled, "What You Should Know About covid-19 and the ADA, the Rehabilitation Act, and Other EEO Laws," available at <https://www.eeoc.gov/wysk/what-you-should-know-about-covid-19-and-ada-rehabilitation-act-and-other-eeo-laws>.



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."