

The Blessed Hope!

“Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;” –(Titus 2:13)

Diamond & Nugget #321

Current Events through a Biblical World View!

Biden is using the church to import more Democrat voters to the U.S.

Hundreds of millions of dollars is being funneled to religious NGOs to entice and support illegal immigrants across the southern border

At a time when millions of Americans are homeless and in need of medical treatment, Washington is more concerned with playing host to millions of illegal immigrants south of the border.

How many Americans would like to receive cash debit cards, food, clothing, medical treatment, shelter, and even “humanitarian transportation” for doing absolutely nothing, aside from breaking the law? Well, sorry, because American citizens don’t qualify for the massive handout that surpasses \$1.6 billion dollars, according to the Center for Immigration Studies. The freebies are going to millions of US-bound migrants in 17 Latin American nations and Mexico instead.

In what was once a matter of quiet speculation is now an open secret: the Biden administration is using hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayer money to fund a variety of NGO initiatives aimed at helping illegal immigrants enter the US from Latin America and Mexico.

Under the auspices of a United Nations-led “*Regional Refugee and Migrant Response Plan (RMRP)*,” the U.S. State Department’s Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) have been sending taxpayer funds to various religious nonprofit organizations, which then dangle the juicy enticements before thousands of migrants, opening the floodgates to a wave of illegal US southern border crossings.

Exhibit number one. With an estimated 25% of the U.S. population declaring membership in the Catholic Church, it might be expected that this denomination and its various offshoot organizations would spend the bulk of its funds tending to its American flock. Shockingly, that is not the case.

The prominent Catholic Charities USA and its various related agencies, for example, while not among those operating south of the border alongside the United Nations, receive “*tens of millions of dollars in federal subsidies to oversee illegal immigrant transportation*” north of the Rio Grande and resettlement operations to various sanctuary cities inside of the US.

At the same time, some 13 franchises of the nonprofit Caritas, whose website proudly pronounces that it is “*inspired by the Catholic faith*” and is “*the helping hand of the Church,*” will allocate \$12.3 million to immigrants south of the border, much of it as hard cash, according to the UN database.

According to USA spending ([here](#) and [here](#)), and cited by Todd Bensman of CIS, USAID and the State Department’s PRM have doled out in excess of \$11 million to the NGO Caritas Brazil, since the mass migration program started in 2021, including \$3 million pledged through December 2024 to “*overseas refugee assistance programs for the Western Hemisphere*” that include “*food, non-food items, shelter, health, [and] psychosocial support.*”

It can’t go unnoticed that the same sanctuary cities that are [putting illegal immigrants up in hotels](#) while giving them [free meal tickets](#), are the same places where thousands of tent cities overflowing with homeless people – many of them with serious medical problems and deadly addictions – have popped up over the last five years. Are the churches and various religious organizations opening their doors to these needy citizens? Judging by the deplorable state of the streets in America, it certainly doesn’t look like it, nor does the Biden administration seem to care.

Another example of a religious nonprofit serving as “*co-smuggler*” in the illegal trafficking of human flesh is the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, which has pledged \$17.1 million in assistance to immigrants in at least seven Latin American nations during 2024, according to the UN’s RMRP planning documents. In fiscal year 2022, 47% of revenue reported by HIAS was the result of grants from government organizations, primarily from the State Department, but also from the Department of Homeland Security, according to the group’s tax filings and other sources, with the rest deriving from powerful corporate sponsors and other sources.

Meanwhile, in just the last year, the State Department’s PRM and USAID have forked over to the International Organization of Migration \$1.4 billion, by far the highest amount on record, according to USAspending.gov .

So what’s going on here? Why is the Biden administration so obsessed with using taxpayer dollars to fund a massive influx of illegal immigrants into the country at a time when America already has enough poor people to take care of? Is it really the case that the Democrats are working on behalf of strictly humanitarian interests, or is something else at play? When dealing with the world of politics, it’s not a bad idea to think more in terms of power, not compassion.

In a nutshell, the Biden administration hopes to attract as many illegal immigrants into the country and turn them into loyal voters so Democrats can create a permanent one-party state. And judging by the outstanding numbers, the cynical strategy just might work.

The Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) report for [fiscal 2023](#) shows that the number of non-detained illegal immigrants has surged from 3.7 million in FY 2021 to nearly 4.8 million in FY 2022 and almost 6.2 million in FY 2023, making Joe Biden – in cahoots with faith-based NGOs – the greatest smuggler of human beings in the history of the United States.

Dreadfully Anticipated Vatican Document Coming April 8

Another interesting observation is that April 8 is the day Pope Francis will issue a new document [Dignitas Infinita](#) on gender and human dignity, which will likely reiterate his declaration in *Fiducias Supplicans* that the Church should bless homosexual couples. For obvious reasons Rome's endorsement of LGBT living has offended all of Heaven.

This is not to imply that the forthcoming document is the sole reason for the coming Warning but is to suggest it is the 'last straw' before God intervenes with the heavy hand of Justice.

Nor is it to suggest that the Warning will occur on the day of the eclipse, but to simply point out that the April 8 eclipse is an ominous sign that tribulation is near.

Still another point of interest is that the April 8 eclipse will occur one day after the Feast of Divine Mercy. Christ told St. Faustina that the time of His Mercy would soon give place to a time of Divine Justice. Could the April 8 eclipse be our sign that the time of Mercy has ended? Will Christ have mercy if Rome continues to encourage homosexuals to come to Church as they are?

True Human Dignity Needed

It indeed is time to think of our true human dignity, which consists in our being made to the image of God. We live up to this by keeping ourselves "unspotted from this world" (James 1:27) and not by allowing polluted affections to "take hold on you." (1 Corinthians. 10:13) St. Paul reminds us **"that no fornicator, or unclean, or covetous person (which is a serving of idols), has inheritance in the kingdom of Christ."** (Ephesians 5:5)

If Francis had any concern for human dignity he would publicly decry homosexuality and expel all homosexuals from the Vatican, the likes of which we haven't seen, and he would exhort LGBT people to sorrowfully regret their lifestyle and go to confession with the understanding that this is the only thing that can erase from their being the criminal affections that war against their true dignity.

He would also remind everyone of the fierce punishment and destruction that befell Sodom and Gomorrah for the sin of homosexuality. The world today has become a # merry-go-round with this corruption having penetrated every facet of society like a cancer. Even the elementary and pre-schools have been polluted with this shame, so simple common sense should tell us that the Warning is ***“nigh, even at the doors.”*** (Matthew. 24:33)

Cattle Tracking Provision That May Limit Beef Supply Passed in Omnibus Bill

By Derek Knauss

April 7, 2024

‘The left wants to ban cattle and before you can ban anything you need a registry, you need to know where it’s at and who owns it.’

A controversial measure to include \$15 million for the electronic tracking of livestock has made it through Congress via the recently passed omnibus bill, raising fears among critics that the new system could be weaponized by the government to limit beef consumption.

American cattle rancher Shad Sullivan told The Epoch Times that he fears that the electronic tags will be the end of the small rancher.

“They are going to use it as a taxing mechanism to eventually control the livestock,” Mr. Sullivan said. “In the European Union, they used these measures under the guise of climate change lies to limit the cattle supply, and if they do that here, it will destroy our industry.”

“If the tag mandate is implemented it will be the key to open the door to the gas chamber for independent ranching.”

Rep. Thomas Massie (R-Ky.), who owns livestock, also sounded the alarm that the move could lead to the erosion of the industry.

“The left wants to ban cattle and before you can ban anything you need a registry, you need to know where it’s at and who owns it and that’s why they want to tag cattle,” he said in a March 23 post on social media platform X, formerly known as Twitter. *“We’ve seen it happen in Europe.”*

In a previous post, Mr. Massie wrote that, if passed, the electronic tracking *“will be used by the GREEN agenda to limit beef production, and by the corporate meat oligopoly to DOMINATE small ranchers.”*

The omnibus bill, which was passed on March 22, combines six essential spending bills

into one and includes text that allocates \$15 million to “*related infrastructure*” needed for the program.

The full text of the provision reads: “*The agreement directs the Department to continue to provide the tag and related infrastructure needed to comply with the Federal Animal Disease Traceability rule, including no less than \$15,000,000 for electronic identification (EID) tags and related infrastructure needed for stakeholders to comply with the proposed rule, ‘Use of Electronic Identification Eartags as Official Identification in Cattle and Bison,’ should that rule be finalized.*”

Since its initial proposal last year, the mandate for electronic ear tags for cattle and bison crossing state lines has stirred controversy, particularly among small ranchers. They fear that the added costs, which large corporate ranchers can absorb, will drive many smaller operations out of business.

Currently, most livestock are tracked using tags that display 11-digit numbers, which are both visible and trackable. On Jan. 19, 2023, the Federal Register published proposed regulations to mandate the inclusion of radio-frequency identification in ear tags. These enhanced tags must be “*both visually and electronically readable*” to be recognized as official for the interstate movement of cattle and bison.

“*Livestock,*” under the regulation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; includes all sexually intact cattle and bison 18 months of age and older; all female dairy cattle of any age; all male dairy cattle born after March 11, 2013; cattle and bison of any age used for rodeo or recreational events; and cattle and bison of any age used for shows or exhibitions, according to the proposal. Since 2003, following the discovery of the first case of bovine spongiform encephalopathy, also known as mad cow disease, in the United States, ranchers have been pushed to adopt electronic identification tags for livestock movement. The cattle industry has been gradually advancing toward enhanced traceability rules and technology ever since.

However, the federal mandating of electronic ear tags would place unnecessary and punitive costs on American ranchers while also further raising the price of beef, according to Justin Tupper, president of the U.S. Cattlemen’s Association.

“*It is another example of ridiculous spending,*” Mr. Tupper told the Epoch Times. “*If they are going to use these funds to hand out free tags to those who would want them then there would be no real harm, but that is not what it looks like they are doing here.*”

“*Instead they are going to give them to the big tag companies to shove down our throat to mandate it, which is an entirely different thing.*”

A new mandate on livestock would only add another obstacle to an industry already decimated by regulations and drought.

The beef cattle supply has already dropped to its lowest point in decades, raising the price of beef to another all-time high and renewing concerns over the long-term health of the nation's farming community. A series of severe droughts, coupled with government policies that continue to favor large, industrial food processors, has reduced the nation's supply of beef cattle to a level not seen since the early 1950s, according to Mr. Tupper.

Lawmakers slipped the funding for the electronic ear tag infrastructure into a single paragraph in the omnibus bill, which allowed lawmakers to pass legislation without the scrutiny that would normally occur and is another example of the increasingly intrusive role the federal government has in the lives of the independent ranchers, he said.

"Anything that is mandated we are going to push back very hard against," Mr. Tupper said. *"We always have to be aware of who controls the data."*

"We are well aware of the fact that data can exert a tremendous amount of control over the nation's livestock."

The provision could also be the beginning of the end for the independent American rancher, according to Mr. Sullivan.

"The beef industry is the last bastion of freedom," he said. *"Ranchers across the nation have to stand up. If not, these tags will be the end of the small rancher."*

EPA Threatens Locally Produced Beef - Mission Creep: Proposed EPA Rule Shuts Down Small Meat Producers

ROBERT W MALONE MD, MS
APR 08, 2024

**In Another Blow to Decentralized Natural Meat Production, EPA Rule Indirectly Shuts Down Small Meat Producers via Clean Water Act Overreach
*American's Will Lose the Choice to Buy Local Meats***

On January 23, 2024, under Biden Administration guidance, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed a new rule that will bring 3,879 meat and poultry products (MPP) processing facilities under their jurisdiction.

This was swiftly followed by an abbreviated comment period which closed on March 25, 2024, and then immediate implementation of the rule change. All justified by wastewater levels of Nitrogen and Phosphorus coming from animal meat processing, mirroring the WEF agenda to minimize Nitrogen runoff from European farms which has sparked the widespread farmer protests throughout the European Union.

The new rule involves a major shift in the technology-based effluent limitations guidelines and standards (ELGs) for the meat and poultry industry, threatening their livelihoods by forcing them to add water filtration systems to their facilities.

What does this mean to small meat processing facilities? It's been reported that the initial cost to *install a water filtration system* bringing them into compliance be \$300,000-400,000 with a minimum of \$100,000 annual maintenance. This would force many small meat processing facilities to shutter their doors.

It is also a direct attack on the buy local foods movement. If local meat producers no longer have a nearby facility to process the meat, they will no longer be able to provide their product direct to the customer at food markets or online.

The EPA initially promulgated the MPP ELGs in 1974 and amended them in 2004. Currently, they only apply to approximately 150 of the 5,055 MPP facilities in the industry. But, in the EPA's Benefit Cost Analysis, they state that "EPA estimates the regulatory options potentially affect 3,879 MPP facilities."

Accordingly, the history of EPA's regulation of MPP effluent guidelines and standards has never extended beyond direct discharge facilities and this rule significantly expands their regulatory overreach.

The Kansas Natural Resource Coalition (KNRC) filed comments opposing the proposed rule and was joined by other county coalitions and American Stewards of Liberty. KNRC, an organization of 30 Kansas counties, states these proposed rules will "*regulate indirect discharge facilities*" that "*departs from constitutional and statutory authority*" significantly altering the balance between state and federal powers.

They also state that the proposal "gives priority to environmental justice goals and emphasizes ecological benefits, but the EPA jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act is not based on ecological importance or environmental justice."

- [EPA Federal Register Notice of Proposed Rule](#)
- [KNRC Filed Comments](#)

Demonstrating that the "comment period" was mere window dressing to meet formal federal comment requirements, immediately on March 25, 2024 the EPA jammed through a finalized version of its devastating new interpretation of the Clean Water Act, which it has titled "[Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Meat and Poultry Products Point Source Category](#)." Clearly this is another case of aggressive, arbitrary and capricious EPA regulatory overreach, directly analogous to the recent Supreme Court case [West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency](#), 597 U.S. 697 (2022), a [landmark](#) decision of the U.S. Supreme Court relating to the [Clean Air Act](#), and the extent to which the

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) can regulate carbon dioxide emissions related to climate change.

According to the EPA, after months of study and testing to look for bacteria, viruses, etc, what they actually found in the wastewater of processing facilities was Nitrogen and Phosphorus. Two of the fundamental elements which all living things are composed of (Carbon, Hydrogen, Nitrogen, Oxygen, Phosphorus).

As a result, The EPA has decided that the entire meat industry - from slaughtering beef to poultry, marinas to packaging - must now retrofit current facilities with lagoons and biomass dissipates to turn "nutrients" into CO₂ and methane in order to prevent these "pollutants" from entering local water supplies.

The EPA anticipates these new rules will, at least, result in the closure of 16 processing facilities across the country at a time when our country's meat producers are already struggling to survive due to bottlenecks in USDA certified facilities. However, on the high side EPA estimates include an impact range of up to 845 processing facilities.

The EPA acknowledges (via the Federal Register) that this rule change will have far-reaching impacts up and down the supply chain from consumer prices to producer losses.

A press release was just put out by a consortium of protein producers who have said this will cost "millions more than the EPA's highest estimates and result in the loss of tens of thousands of jobs."

It gets worse;

Facilities can bypass these new regulations by drastically reducing their weekly/annual pounds processed. However, the U.S. population continues to grow (largely due to immigration) at a rate that we're currently incapable of feeding with record low volumes of meat production. Reducing pounds processed will have sizable impacts upon food security, as will further closures, and supply chain disruptions. These issues have now risen to the point of being a national security threat.

Problems in the rule change;

- The rule change fails to provide clarity or funding to local water treatment facilities for testing or range of acceptable levels of runoff, and in my opinion over-steps federal authority (WOTUS jurisdiction) by dictating local water rights. Especially as the EPA acknowledges most water used in processing is from a well source, or privately owned water source.

- The rules fail to account for foreign inputs, and actually incentivize domestic closures, prioritizing imported meat products in a manner conducive to the monopolistic multinational conglomerate beef producers who are not US based.

This, at a time when the U.S. has gradually become a net importer yet facing critical infrastructure collapses, such as Key Bridge.

- The rules specify 17 species of endangered animals that may become affected by the salt residues (a byproduct of the process they want used to turn biomass into gas), as these salts flow "downstream" from processing facilities. This is bogus language to attempt to establish jurisdictional standing, as the rules do not differentiate between facilities that are near navigable waters vs facilities that have private water rights.

However, for those who do comply, as opposed to reducing production, they'll be left open and vulnerable to future lawsuits from environmental activists over endangered species. These lawsuits have historically become costly, with states eventually caving to the demands made, as evidenced by the Oregon Dept. of Forestry v Cascadia in filing after filing - Spotted Owl to CoHo Salmon - resulting in the drastic reduction of privately owned timber lands and logging contracts.

- The rules currently allow for the off-gassing of the biomass as it becomes CO₂ and methane, but say nothing about future carbon taxes, or financial burdens that may be incurred due to the additional carbon outputs via the new carbon credit/taxes the Biden Administration created via the Commodities Credit Corporation. Oregon, California and Washington have already instituted state versions of Cap and Trade legislation e.g. requiring companies to purchase these carbon credits in order to remain in business.

Aside from the massive overreach in relation to non-navigable waters of the US, typically locally regulated, or an authority reserved to the states to regulate, these new rule changes have the potential to negatively impact our food supply for years to come.

Congressmen Estes and Burlison have proposed H.R. 7079, the "BEEF ACT" (formally known as H.R.7079 - Banning EPA's Encroachment on Facilities Act), as a means of prohibiting the EPA from using its deferential authority (Chevron doctrine) to interpret the Clean Water Act. However, this legislation currently has a 1% chance of being enacted, and only a 4% chance of passing out of the House Committee on Transportation.

In parallel to direct legislative action, there is clearly a need to mount a legal challenge to this action, one which can build upon the precedent established by West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency, which should benefit from the anticipated Supreme Court action to overturn the Chevron Deference legal precedent which currently enables this type of regulatory overreach. Further information concerning the Chevron Deference can be found in this substack essay, and SCOTUS Blog has covered the current status of the Supreme Court case in an article titled "Supreme Court likely to discard Chevron".

Dutch Food Brands Announces Plans To Make Half Of The Recipes On Packaging Meatless

by Jacob Thompson



In response to campaigning by Dutch animal rights group Wakker Dier, seven brands have agreed to make at least 50% of the recipes on food packaging vegan or vegetarian.

The following report is by [Green Queen](#):

Seven CPG brands have agreed to increase plant-based and vegetarian visibility on-pack in the Netherlands, accepting animal advocacy group Wakker Dier's request to make at least half of the recipes on product packaging meatless.

Conimex, Fairtrade Original, Jumbo, Knorr, Koh Tai, Patak's and Plus will all make the adjustment, while Grand'Italia (with 48% of on-pack recipes free from meat and fish) and Lassie (53%) already do so.

"These brands inspire consumers and show that you don't have to cook meat the old-fashioned way every day," Collin Molenaar, campaigner at Wakker Dier, said. "Packages are ideally intended to inspire consumers with simple dishes. And so they can also help people to choose plant-based more often."

Meanwhile, Albert Heijn and Maggi have plans to add plant-based tips to recipes, but haven't said they'll remove meat from half of them. And according to Wakker Dier, Honig (80% of whose packaging recipes are not suitable for vegetarians) is the only brand that hasn't promised a shift.

Aandeel vlees- en vega(n) recepten



Given that many consumers follow back-of-the-box recipes, this encourages the overconsumption of meat. In fact, 29% of the recipes with red meat contain a larger amount than what's recommended by the national dietary guidelines. Wakker Dier notes how the Health Council of the Netherlands [recommends](#) eating a diet where 60% of a person's protein consumption comes from plant-based sources.

Read the whole report [here](#).

AUTHOR COMMENTARY

"[1] Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; [2] Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; [3] Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." -(1st Timothy 4:1-3)

Though this move is minor, it still felt it worth mentioning as it demonstrates the very subtle tricks companies are now doing to entice people into more meatless and vegan meals without realizing it, thus subtly helping to further guide people into reducing their meat intakes.

"[7] Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? [8] Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? [9] For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? [10] Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he

that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope.” -(1st Corinthians 9:7-10).

Homes Purchased by BlackRock Being Set Up to House Illegal Migrants

by [Wall Street Apes](#)

An Insane “Conspiracy Theory”

The homes that BlackRock has been purchasing (a HUGE amount in New York) being setup to house illegal migrants.

Each home will average bringing in \$15,000 per month to house illegals.

- New York just declared that they're gonna pay homeowners there a \$125 a day to house a migrant.
- \$125 a day per migrant, per bedroom.
- And at \$3,750 per migrant, that means that property would now be bringing in \$15,000 a month.

*"Y'all wanna come with me down another rabbit hole of how the U.S. government is using private industry to f*** over the American people? This is gonna be a quick video, but I wanted to put it out because I wanna hear what people think."*

"The basic gist is that the United States government is using BlackRock to permanently house all the illegal immigrants they've been letting in. So you know how companies like BlackRock have been buying up large amounts of the single family real estate, and a shitload of the properties that they bought are in the state of New York."

"And New York just declared that they're gonna pay homeowners there a \$125 a day to house a migrant."

"\$125 a day per migrant, per bedroom. That means the taxpayers of New York are gonna be paying \$3,750 per migrant per month. Now think about all those houses that BlackRock bought. Let's say they got a 4 bedroom."

"That means they can house 4 migrants. And at \$3,750 per migrant, that means that property would now be bringing in \$15,000 a month."

"And if any of those migrants have a family, that's additional money on top. And BlackRock doesn't have to worry because the money's guaranteed by the government in New York."

"I mean, you have to think so far in Biden's presidency, anywhere from 12 to 15,000,000 illegals have crossed over. And then because of all the incentive programs that New York created, you enter this country illegally, you'd have to be stupid not to go to New York."

"You're gonna get paid. You're gonna get fed. You're gonna get housed all for the price of either a bus trip up there or maybe you can catch one of those flights that Biden's been sending under everyone's radar."

"But regardless, you're gonna go to New York where BlackRock owns thousands of homes. And I'd be willing to bet a lot of those homes are about to have an illegal immigrant as a tenant, and they're gonna make sure they get at least 1 in every bedroom."

"And I would expect that this continues at least until the census." - the older millennial

BlackRock smackrock or stone, let's get down, dirty and personal about these giant private equity firms.

Blackstone's founder CEO is billionaire Steven Schwarzman, a Las Vegas casino mover and shaker who like others in his club can't keep his hands off other people's property—its fundamental to the casino industry! True, Blackstone kick started BlackRock, another "investment firm" that can't keep its hands off other people's property. But here is where it gets even more interesting.

It's not just real estate and money that interests Schwarzman and like ilk, it's also the health care "industry". In 2016 Blackstone demonstrated its interest in "acquiring" "TeamHealth", a publicly traded consortium of emergency room medical doctors, for all the publicly stated benevolent reasons. Everyone was so happy with this love fest. And only a half dozen years after the USG stamped "Property of USG" on everybody's butt with the Affordable Healthcare Act, along comes Schwartzman et.al. with another central private owners link. It gets even better.

(Private equity firms are neck deep in the health care and elder care industries and its literally impossible for me to write about all of it here.)

Good ole Donald Trump, also a fellow casino operator and industry collaborator, made Schwarzman his Strategic and Policy Forum chairman, but he didn't last, nor did Schwarzman's love for Trump. By 2022 he had turned against Trump. Schwarzman is also a trustee of Northwestern U. of Chicago and a grad of Harvard Business School, both universities apparently teach how to separate people from their property and remain respectable. University trustees are the real power behind the university president's throne!

To add a cherry on top of this power play ice-cream sundae, it has been reported that Schwarzman's team has been in the middle of the Ukraine war and has plans for deeper ties with mainland China.

Now that readers better understand BlackRock's parent, let's take a peek at who and what it's CEO Larry Fink head of this private equity firm in the top third of all investment fund managements, with an apparent cozy relationship with CIA. This firm is a stockholder in many corporations, money management, finance firms and a participating member of the World Economic Forum! Fink is a trustee of NYU and everything I previously said about university trustees applies here also.

Anything wrong with this picture?

Coming to the USA

ALL UK AIRPORTS WILL CLOSE BY 2029 & BEEF AND LAMB WILL BE BANNED FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION TO MEET CLIMATE SCAM TARGETS ACCORDING TO UK GOV. REPORT

April 8, 2024 | ALTERNATIVE NEWS



A report produced by Oxford University and Imperial College London for the UK Government reveals that all airports will be ordered to close, eating beef and lamb will be made illegal, and construction of new buildings will not be permitted to meet the legal commitment of zero emissions by 2050.

The report states that all airports must close between 2020 and 2029 excluding Heathrow, Glasgow and Belfast airports, which can only stay open on the condition that transfers to and from the airport are done via rail.

All remaining airports must then close between 2030 and 2049 because to meet the legal commitment of zero emissions by 2050 every citizen of the United Kingdom must “stop using aero planes” for a significant period of time.

	2020-2029	2030-2049
Road vehicles	Development of petrol/diesel engines ends; Any new vehicle introduced from now on must be compatible with Absolute Zero	All new vehicles electric, average size of cars reduces to ~1000kg.
Rail	Growth in domestic and international rail as substitute for flights and low-occupancy car travel	Further growth with expanded network and all electric trains; rail becomes dominant mode for freight as shipping declines
Flying	All airports except Heathrow, Glasgow and Belfast close with transfers by rail	All remaining airports close

In addition, the report states that to obey the law of the Climate Change Act the public will be required to stop doing anything that causes emissions regardless of its energy source. According to the report, this will require the public to never eat beef or lamb ever again.

To do this national consumption of beef and lamb will drop by 50% between 2020 and 2029. Then between 2030 and 2049 beef and lamb will be “phased out”.

	2020-2029	2030-2049
Food	National consumption of beef and lamb drops by 50%, along with reduction in frozen ready meals and air-freighted food imports	Beef and lamb phased out, along with all imports not transported by train; fertiliser use greatly reduced

The report also confirms that construction of new building must cease by 2050 – *The underlying point is that any asset which uses carbon will have essentially zero value in 2050. This in turn may encourage greater use in the run up to 2050 – for example, putting up new buildings at a much faster rate for the next 30 years, knowing that construction must then halt.*

The report was released in November 2019 and was authored by ‘UK Fires’, a collaboration between the Universities of Cambridge, Oxford, Nottingham, Bath and Imperial College London – the home of Professor Neil Ferguson.

Entitled ‘[Absolute Zero](#)’, the report is a research collaboration in which the authors reveal what the UK must do to meet it’s legal requirement to reach net zero emissions by 2050, and it makes for harrowing reading.

However, the timeline of events may speed up significantly because [the Government enshrined a new target in law in April 2021 to slash emissions by 78% by the year 2035.](#)

About UK Fires

UK Fires is a collaboration between the Universities of Cambridge, Oxford, Nottingham, Bath and Imperial College London. It is funded by the EPSRC (the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council), part of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI). UK Fires also involves a subscribing consortium of industrial partners who meet as a 'Living Lab' to pose strategic challenges to the academic investigators, receive and apply their analysis, and reflect on its value.

The authors of the report state the key messages are as follows –

In addition to reducing our energy demand, delivering zero emissions with today's technologies requires the phasing out of flying, shipping, lamb and beef, blast-furnace steel and cement.

They also state this on jobs and location –

There are two key implications for how we live our lives: first, buildings will become much more expensive because the restrictions on building which generate substantial scarcities; second, transport will become much more expensive because the limits on air travel will generate excess demand for other forms of transport.

Those who are starting secondary school now, in 2019, will be 43 in 2050. Thinking about what education is appropriate for a very different set of industries is a key question. Should we still be training airplane pilots? Or aeronautical engineers?

And they state this on implementation of the requirements –

The changes in behavior to achieve Absolute Zero are clearly substantial. In principle, these changes could be induced through changing prices and thus providing clear incentives for behavior to change. The alternative is that the government prohibits certain types of behavior and regulates on production processes.

You may be wondering how on earth they are going to get the support of the public in shutting the airports and stopping the consumption of beef and lamb?

Well, we could argue they are already well on their way to ensuring the closure of many airports thanks to the draconian laws that the British people have been living under since March 2020 in the name of protecting the NHS and saving lives.

Is it just a coincidence that four months after the release of the report, the UK Government brought in the coronavirus act and implemented a national lockdown which has decimated the travel industry? A quick read through the report certainly suggests the real reason for lockdown may have been so that the Government can meet its legal commitment to reduce emissions.

They will get the support just as they got the support for implementing ridiculous, draconian laws under the guise of stopping the spread of Covid-19. Laws which have decimated small business, taken away our freedoms, and created what will be the

greatest health crisis to have ever been due to turning the NHS into the National Covid Service and then the National Vaccination Service.

They managed all the above through psychological manipulation and coercion. That is not an opinion, it is fact, and it is all documented in official UK Government documents which you can read [here](#), and [here](#).

And they are going to use the exact same tactics to ensure you allow all airports to close and never eat beef or lamb again, this is what the 'Absolute Zero' report recommends the UK Government implements to achieve their legally required targets – *Social norms and individual behaviors*

There is a misalignment between the scale of actions recommended by government (e.g. energy conservation) and those most commonly performed by individuals (e.g. recycling). Actions which can have a big effect, such as better insulation in houses and not flying, are being ignored in favor of small, high profile actions, such as not using plastic straws. This is enabling individuals to feel satisfied that they are 'doing their bit' without actually making the lifestyle changes required to meet the zero emissions target. If large scale social change is to be successful a new approach is needed.

Whilst the thought of society taking radical, meaningful steps to meet zero emission targets could be criticized for being idealistic, we can learn from historical cultural changes. Not long ago, smoking cigarettes was encouraged and considered to be acceptable in public spaces that children frequented, drink-driving was practiced with such regularity that it killed 1000 people per year in the UK, and discrimination based on sexual orientation was written into law. These behaviors now seem reprehensible, showing society is capable acknowledging the negative consequences of certain behaviors and socially outlawing their practice. Focus should therefore be centered on expediting the evolution of new social norms with confidence that change can happen. Evidence from behavioral science, and the long experience in public health of changing behaviors around smoking and alcohol, shows that information alone is not enough to change behavior. To make the types of changes described in this report, we will have to think more broadly on the economic and physical contexts in which designers, engineers and members of the public make decisions that determine carbon emissions.

At the same time, clear, accurate and transparent information on problems and the efficacy of proposed solutions is essential for maintaining public support for policy interventions. The phrasing of communication is also important. Messages framed about fear and climate crisis have been found to be ineffective at motivating change.

The longevity of the challenge of reducing emissions, and the lack of immediate or even apparent consequences of small individual actions mean it is challenging to link to them to the large-scale climate crisis. This allows individuals to make decisions which contrast with their desire to reduce emissions.

Scientific description is not always the most effective means of communication, and language used to promote zero emissions should no longer focus on an 'ecofriendly'

and 'green' lexicon, but rather candid descriptions of actions that appeal to human fulfilment. Evidence from time-use studies shows that human fulfilment does not strictly depend on using energy – the activities we enjoy the most are the ones with the lowest energy requirements.

Consumers can be satisfied in a zero emissions landscape.

But they will also get the support they need by conditioning and indoctrinating your children in schools –

'Starting with the difficult decisions, an educational setting should provide a timeline for actions to be taken by humanity in order to ensure that we hit our carbon reduction targets by 2050. By working backwards from 2050, and sequentially working out the order and timing in which key mitigation actions need to be taken, a roadmap for the necessary restraint can be established.

Across the secondary school system, this roadmap is essential in eliciting the questions which will inevitably come from the school children. This will enable an exploration of real change in the mind sets of those who will need to embrace change more than ever before later in their lives.

Huge questions will emerge, such as: will internal-combustion engines disappear, will aero planes disappear, will meat and-dairy agriculture disappear, and will we need to stop building things? By empowering school children to realize that asking the huge questions is appropriate, we will enable change to be embraced through education.

All of this will be done to allegedly reduce carbon emissions due to the alleged danger of global warming.

The [average carbon footprint per person in the UK](#), per year, is 12.7 tons CO₂e.

Your heating would need to be going full blast for 80 days straight to produce 12.7 tons CO₂e.

You would need to drive 23,000 miles in the average car to emit 12.7 tons of CO₂e (that's once around the world).

You'd have to eat over 1,000 beef steaks to produce 12.7 tons CO₂e.

In terms of global annual carbon emissions of ca. 38,000 megatons CO₂e, 12.7 tons doesn't sound like much. But when you consider a population of 68 million people in the UK alone, nearing 8 billion worldwide, all of a sudden it sounds like in order to meet a target which is enshrined in UK law and must be legally met, it may just be easier to reduce the population of the United Kingdom?

The past sixteen months have seen –

Lockdown after lockdown which has destroyed small business and the aviation industry.

Evidence emerge which suggests [the elderly and vulnerable were euthanized in care homes and you were then told they had died of Covid-19.](#)

Statistics which show [disabled people account for 3 in every 5 alleged Covid-19 deaths](#). And an experimental vaccination program which [doesn't stop you catching or spreading the alleged Covid-19 virus](#). However, authorities are extremely eager to vaccinate every man, woman and child. This is despite the fact [over 1 million adverse reactions have been reported to the MHRA Yellow Card scheme and over 1400 deaths](#). A scheme which the MHRA state only 1% – 10% of adverse reactions is even reported.

You must read [the 'Absolute Zero' report](#), authored by Oxford University and Imperial College London, the former having invented the AstraZeneca Covid-19 vaccine, and the latter being instrumental in providing flawed models that were used to justify draconian lockdowns in both the UK and USA.

Because once you do, you will realize that the past two years have been part of a much more sinister agenda that has only just begun.

Canada Following China's Path? Bank Accounts Linked To Obedience Scores

Our neighbors to the north are implementing a new system called "*open banking*" that will link citizen's bank accounts to a new social credit scoring system.

In the aftermath of the Trucker Convoy and other noteworthy protests against coronavirus restrictions in Canada, the Justin Trudeau regime is radicalizing the nation's banking system to make it much harder for citizens to express their voices against political corruption.

Proponents of the social credit score-linked banking paradigm say it will make Canadian banks more "*inclusive*," allowing them to easily access user data on demand while being able to share information with one another.

A World Bank partner called Open Banking Excellence (OBE), which originated in the United Kingdom, is proudly boasting right now that it will incorporate social credit scores with people's banking information in Canada. Canadians will likely receive digital "*cash*" and identification in a "*convenient*," all-in-one and "*inclusive*" place.

"*It's about having that fairer, more inclusive, more open society*," said OBE founder Helen Child, making sure to use all the popular buzzwords to make her project sound like a dream come true for the world.

Canada is not alone, the United Nations is unleashing its "*Global Digital Compact*" to create a global social credit scoring system for everyone eventually.

Moving towards a cashless society

Disturbingly, OBE already operates in some 40 different countries, claiming that it aims to *"create exceptional platforms and content that promotes knowledge sharing, new thinking and partnerships within the industry - catalyzing the adoption of Open Finance and Data for better financial inclusion worldwide."*

Child's use of the term *"open society"* is also disturbing in that this is the ideology championed by international billionaire agitator George Soros. It implies open borders, no more prisons, and out-of-control crime without punishment, all of this substantiating *"progressive"* changes for the world.

How forcing Canadians and others around the world to maintain high social credit scores in order to buy and sell constitutes *"inclusivity"* and *"fairness"* remains unknown. OBE officials and other proponents of the construct never really say.

"It drives financial inclusion," is all Child will say about the scheme. *"It's democratizing data."*

What we can clearly see from all this is that Child has her eyes on all the gold her data collection scheme will add to her financial stockpile. Data of the kind her group collects in order to populate social credit scores is valuable, after all, especially as the world descends into a cashless abyss.

"There is no easier way to control the masses than to control their access to money, and their ability to buy, trade and freely move about,"

The Canadian Press came right out and just said what Child is clearly thinking, explaining that one of the biggest areas of growth in the financial sector has to do with credit assessments.

"Under open banking, lenders could directly access an individual's banking data, so they can look beyond credit scores," the Press explained. *"Consumers can also use it to build their credit scores, for example, by proving reliable rent payments."*

In other words, the goal is to assess something beyond just one's credit score in order to determine whether he or she is worthy to participate in the new global economy that the globalists are unleashing.

Keep in mind that Canada is big on prosecuting *"hate"* speech. One can only imagine how people found guilty of committing *"hateful"* anything will be dinged on their social credit scores, disallowing their participation in anything commerce and finance related in light of recent legislation.

We have previously discussed the unrelenting attacks by Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and his allies on free speech. There has been a steady criminalization of speech, including even jokes and religious speech, in Canada.

Now, the Canadian parliament is moving toward a new change that would allow the imposition of life imprisonment on those who post views deemed supportive of genocide. With a growing movement calling Israel's war in Gaza "*genocide*," the potential scope of such a law is readily apparent. That appears to be its very draw for anti-free speech advocates in the country.

The Online Harms Act, or Bill C-63 increases the potential penalties from five years to life imprisonment. It also increases the penalty for the willful promotion of hatred (a dangerously ill-defined crime) from two years to five years. The proposed changes constitute a doubling down on Canada's commitment to reducing free speech for citizens despite criticism from many in the civil liberties community.

There is also a chilling option for house arrest if a judge believes a defendant "*will commit*" an offense. In other words, if a judge thinks that a citizen will be undeterred and try to speak freely again.

It is not likely to end there.

Today the rationale is genocide. However, once the new penalties are in place, a host of other groups will demand similar treatment for those with opposing views on their own causes.

EPA Phase Out of Gas-Powered Cars Has Ominous Historic Echoes

By Jon Miltimore

A parade under banners condemning kulaks (prosperous peasants) as "wreckers of agriculture," during the disastrously deadly collectivization of Russian farming. [~1929-34](#).

The Biden administration last week rolled out new emissions regulations that the [New York Times](#) said will "*transform the American automobile market.*"

In what the paper called "*one of the most significant climate regulations in the nation's history*," the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is mandating that a majority of new passenger vehicles sold in America be hybrids or EVs by 2032.

The Biden administration and defenders of the policy argue that the EPA's regulation is "*not a ban*" on gas-powered cars, since carmakers are not prohibited from producing gas-powered vehicles. Instead, automakers are required to meet a government-mandated "*average emissions limit*" across their entire vehicle line, to force them to produce more EVs and fewer gas-powered cars.

It's a clever ruse in that it allows the Biden administration to use regulatory power to force automobile manufactures off of gas-powered vehicles while denying that they are banning them.

Whatever one chooses to call the regulation, its purpose is clear. “Make no mistake,” the [Wall Street Journal](#) noted. “This is a coerced phase-out of gas-powered cars.”

This might be music to the ears of those who see fossil fuels as evil, but economics and history suggest the White House’s plan to force Americans off of gas-powered cars could be a disaster.

What’s Holding Up EV Adoption?

A major reason why the White House is forcing this “*transformation of the American automobile market*” is that Americans aren’t voluntarily adopting EVs quickly enough to satisfy the White House.

Though Americans purchased [more than a million](#) EVs last year that still represents less than 8 percent of total vehicle sales in the U.S. The government’s current target is [56 percent](#). (If the White House was serious about speeding up this transition, it might consider eliminating the [25 percent tariff](#) on cars built in China — which accounts [for some 60 percent](#) of global EV sales — but that would be too easy.)

Despite [massive subsidies](#) encouraging consumers to purchase EVs, Americans didn’t buy them as rapidly as predicted, causing auto companies to pump the brakes. Ford recently [announced](#) it was halving production of its most popular EV, the F-150 Lightning. General Motors, the largest US automaker, and Toyota, the second-largest US automaker, followed suit, announcing [significant reductions](#) in EV production.

The weak demand for electric vehicles no doubt has several sources, but the BBC identified [a few primary reasons](#), two of which appear over and over in consumer surveys: price and charging reliability.

Ford’s F-150 Lightning starts at \$50,000. Its popular Mach-e [starts at](#) \$40,000, and that’s after a recent \$8,100 mark-down. GM’s top-selling EV, the LYRIQ, [starts at](#) \$59,000. On average, EVs sell for about \$5,000 more than similar gas-powered cars. And EV prices are going up, not down, [researchers point out](#).

“In 2011, the inflation-adjusted price of a new EV was near \$44,000. By 2022, that price had risen to over \$66,000,” said Ashley Nunes, a senior research associate at Harvard Law School, in her [testimony to](#) Congress in 2023.

The second problem is that Americans have serious concerns about how they’ll charge their EVs. [A 2023 survey](#) conducted by the Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research and the Energy Policy Institute at the University of Chicago found that 77 percent of respondents cited concerns about charging stations as a reason for not purchasing an EV.

This is not an irrational concern.

When Americans drive their gas-powered cars, they are not worried about where they'll fill up when their fuel runs low. Gas stations are plentiful in the US and easy to find. Charging stations are another matter.

Bloomberg [reported last year](#) that, despite steady growth in recent years of EV charging stations, there is just one quick-turn electrical vehicle charge station in the U.S. for every 16 gasoline stations.

Federal efforts to expand charging infrastructure, including [\\$7.5 billion in new spending](#) to build half a million stations, have been embarrassingly slow.

'Subsidizing EVs With Profits From Gas-Powered Cars'

Since Americans are not voluntarily adopting EVs as quickly as the government would like, the EPA is trying to hasten the transition. This could be a disastrous move.

As the *Journal* noted, Ford last year lost nearly *\$5 billion* on its EV business. Yet the company still managed to generate a \$4.3 billion profit in 2023. It doesn't take a math genius to deduce how this happened.

"[Automobile] companies are heavily subsidizing EVs with profits from gas-powered cars," the *Journal* notes.

Forcing automobile companies to expand production of their least-profitable product lines at the expense of their best-performing ones is economic madness. It calls to mind collectivized agricultural policies in the Soviet Union, where central planners embraced the worst farming methods.

While Stalin's [collectivization of farms](#) in 1929 was a massive failure that led to the deaths of millions, agriculture in the USSR of course continued during and after his lifetime. But two distinct sectors emerged: a tiny private sector that produced a bumper crop of food, and a massive collectivized sector that produced very little.

The late economist [James D. Gwartney](#) (1940–2024) explained that families living on collectives in the USSR were allowed to farm on small private plots (no more than one acre) and sell their produce in a mostly free market.

Historians [point out](#) that in the 1960s these tiny private farms, which accounted for just 3 percent of the sown land in the USSR, produced 66 percent of its eggs, 64 percent of the potatoes, 43 percent of its vegetables, 40 percent of meat, and 39 percent of its milk.

Gwartney and economist Richard Lyndell Stroup note that by 1980, private farms accounted for just one percent of sown land in the USSR, but a *quarter* of its agricultural output.

“The productivity per acre on the private plots was approximately 33 times higher than that on the collectively farmed land!” they wrote.

In a free-market economy, farmers within the Soviet Union would have been allowed to shift toward private production — just like US automakers today would be allowed to shift away from EVs until the industry becomes more profitable.

But... the Environment?

Supporters of the Biden policy are likely to respond that we have no choice but to transition to EVs because of climate change. There are several problems with this argument.

For starters, [EVs are not](#) the green panacea they seem to be. Electrical vehicles actually require a massive amount of energy and strip mining. [Half a million pounds of rock and minerals](#) have to be [mined to build](#) just *one* battery, on average. EVs require far more energy and cause far more pollution when they are manufactured than gas-powered automobiles.

“[I]t’s true that the production of a BEV (battery electric vehicle) causes more pollution than a gasoline-powered counterpart,” the [New York Times admitted](#) in a 2022 article headlined “EVs Start With a Bigger Carbon Footprint. But That Doesn’t Last.”

If you weren’t aware that EVs cause more pollution on the production side than gas-powered cars, don’t be embarrassed; few do. It’s one of the dirty secrets of EVs: they start with an enormous carbon footprint. At a climate summit a few years ago, Volvo [noted its C40 Recharge](#) had to be driven about 70,000 miles before its total carbon footprint was smaller than the gas-powered version.

As the *Times* says, the footprint of EVs shrinks over time. But not as fast as many think. One big reason for this is that the bulk of the electricity produced in the U.S. is produced by... you guessed it... fossil fuels. As the Energy Information Administration [points out](#), fossil fuels generate about 60 percent of the electricity in the U.S., which means that most people charging their EVs are using electricity generated from fossil fuels.

Reducing that carbon footprint is also exacerbated by the fact that people tend to rack up fewer miles with EVs than gas-powered vehicles, which makes it more difficult to offset the large carbon footprint on the production side.

“[Our] data show that electric vehicles are driven considerably less on average than gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles,” researchers at the Haas School of Business at the University of California, Berkeley [noted in a 2019 study](#). “*In the complete sample, electric vehicles are driven an average of 7,000 miles per year, compared to 10,200 for gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles.*”

All of this helps explain why a 2023 *Wall Street Journal* analysis found that shifting *all* personal US vehicles to electric power would barely make a dent in global CO₂ emissions, [reducing them by less than 0.2 percent](#).

Who Chooses?

Forcing U.S. automakers to expand their least-profitable autolines is backward economics. It puts automakers at risk, not to mention their workers and shareholders.

The higher profits automakers are reaping from gas-powered vehicles isn't an accident. [It's a signal](#) that consumers prefer them at the prices being offered, and heeding consumers is what separates capitalism from the failed collectivist systems of the past.

The Austrian economist Ludwig von Mises explained that in a free-market economy, it's the consumers who ultimately call the shots, not the state or even the corporations. This idea is known as [consumer sovereignty](#).

"The real bosses [under capitalism] are the consumers," Mises wrote in [Bureaucracy](#). "They, by their buying and by their abstention from buying, decide who should own the capital and run the plants. They determine what should be produced and in what quantity and quality."

The real question here isn't about which is better, gas-powered cars or EVs. It's about who gets to *choose*. By allowing unelected regulators to decide what kind of cars are built instead of consumers, the U.S. is crossing an ominous line. This kind of central planning failed miserably in the 20th century. Don't expect it to be any different this time around.

Climate Change Justifies Killing 2 Billion People to Save the Planet Before 2027

Posted Apr 5, 2024 By Martin Armstrong |

I have written in the past few weeks that all my sources are DEEPLY concerned that the Climate Change movement is transforming into using war to reduce the population. I have warned that the Climate Change zealots who have usurped the White House along with the NEOCONS are in bed together. They are pushing for World War III and are trying to get Russia to attack anything in NATO, the same way Roosevelt got the Japanese to attack Pearl Harbor because Congress would not pass a resolution to enter World War II.

Elon Musk has obviously been talking to people who are behind the curtain and been laying out this unholy marriage between the **Climate Change nut-jobs** and the **NEOCONS**. I have to hand it to Musk for having the courage to speak about those that **NONE** of the mainstream media will dare to report that these Climate Change

lunatics want to kill off 2 billion people ASAP to save the world because their clock is ticking.

These people want to kill 2 billion to save the planet. I guess that makes **Hitter, Mao, and Stalin** really just poor misunderstood climate change advocates. They were not evil; they were just trying to save the planet. They merely failed to kill off enough, and this clock is ticking down, and the world all comes to an end in 2027 if they fail. So they are out to kill you, but it's for the planet – and naturally, they have to survive to make sure they got enough of us.

The New York Times wrote how one of them wanted to kill **all** human beings to save the planet. I guess that brings the old question to the surface:

If a tree falls in the forest, but nobody is there, does it still make a sound?

Jesuits and Evangelicals Met with US Lawmakers to Promote Laudato Si'



On March 20, 2024, Evangelical Christians and representatives of Rome's extensive network of climate organizations, including the Jesuits, gathered on Capitol Hill with the sole intention of pressuring our legislators to enact

climate policies, namely those outlined in Pope Francis' encyclical *Laudato Si'*. This is the same document that calls for Sunday to be the "law of weekly rest" in order to save the environment (*Laudato Si'* #237). Without a doubt, Protestants and Catholics were in Washington, D.C., to influence government policy on behalf of their respective organizations - Rome. They were there to advocate for policies, legislation, and regulations that aligned with their own personal interests.

The National Catholic Reporter published an article titled "Catholic, Christian Groups Share Faith-Driven Plan for Climate Adaptation with Congress" on March 21, 2024. Whose "faith-driven" plan was proposed to "Congress" for consideration? It was Rome's plan, as contained in *Laudato Si'*. The article states, in part:

- *"Catholic and Christian groups joined together March 20 to discuss a faith-driven approach to solving problems associated with climate change in a panel discussion on Capitol Hill."* [1]

- *"At the event sponsored by Catholic Relief Services, the offices of Sens. Bill Cassidy, R-La., and Tim Kaine, D-Va., National Latino Evangelical Coalition, National Association of Evangelicals, Evangelical Environmental Network, Laudato Si' Movement, Kingdom Mission Society, Catholic Climate Covenant, Jesuit Conference Office of Justice and Ecology, World Relief and World Vision, participants discussed the need to help vulnerable communities adapt to changes in climate."* [1]

- *"The event brought together staffers from offices in both chambers and both main political parties. Amid a time of intense partisanship and polarization, some recent data indicates Republicans' views on climate change have shifted, particularly among younger Republicans."* [1]

- *"Meghan Goodwin, senior policy and legislative specialist for CRS (Catholic Relief Services), said that 'the Catholic faith considers reason, including both philosophy and science, as a crucial element in interpreting the scriptures to apply to the world today'."* [1]

- *"Citing Pope Francis' interpretation of Genesis in his encyclical on caring for creation, Laudato Si', Goodwin said Francis 'calls us to remember the human face of the climate crisis. He (Pope Francis) writes that we are faced with one complex crisis, which is both social and environmental. Strategies for a solution demand an integrated approach to combating poverty, restoring dignity to the excluded, and at the same time, protecting nature,' Goodwin said."* [1]

Do you not see the problem when religious agitators, church organizations, and even the Jesuits begin pressuring our politicians? There is a “faith-driven” climate agenda called *Laudato Si’* that is being pushed in our US Congress. Jesuits are using their influence to lobby political leaders by urging them to adopt *Laudato Si’*. They are petitioning policymakers, including members of Congress, their staff, and government officials, to follow the Pope’s message on the environment.

Here is the real problem and fulfillment of what we are seeing today:

“The church appeals to the strong arm of civil power, and, in this work, papists and Protestants unite”.

“Political corruption is destroying love of justice and regard for truth; and even in free America, rulers and legislators, in order to secure public favor, will yield to the popular demand for a law enforcing Sunday observance”.

“To secure popularity and patronage, legislators will yield to the demand for Sunday laws. But those who fear God, cannot accept an institution that violates a precept of the Decalogue”.

Rome is working tirelessly to spread Catholic social doctrine, her wine, throughout the world. Her Jesuits are about to strike a decisive blow against our liberties. How blind are the Protestant and political worlds to come together to help her achieve her goal? In this moment of great urgency, as Roman Catholics around the world lobby for global climate change and a Sunday law, *Laudato Si*, may we also rise up and fulfill our work of spreading the Three Angels’ Message.

There will be two clear voices being heard as we enter the final crisis. Rome’s clear call that Sunday is the solution to saving the planet and the warning message found in the Third Angel’s Message against the mark of the beast. God will always have a people who will step up in every crisis to meet the challenge. Praise God!

Sources

^[1] <https://www.ncronline.org/earthbeat/justice/catholic-christian-groups-share-faith-driven-plan-climate-adaptation-congress>

**Satan’s Other Presidential Candidate
Further Exposed!**

Melania Trump to host Mar-a-Lago fundraiser for pro-homosexual Log Cabin Republicans

Former First Lady Melania Trump is helping the homosexual ‘conservative’ group Log Cabin Republicans kick off its ‘Road to Victory’ campaign at her and her husband’s Florida resort home on April 20.

PALM BEACH, Florida ([LifeSiteNews](#)) — After an extended absence from public view, former First Lady Melania Trump is reportedly set to return to the campaign trail for her husband starting with a fundraiser for homosexual “conservative” group Log Cabin Republicans at her and husband Donald’s resort home of Mar-a-Lago.

Politico [reports](#) that it obtained an invitation to the event, billed as the beginning of LCR’s “Road to Victory” initiative targeting swing-state voters.

“The host committee for the event includes Republican donors Saul Fox, Amanda Schumacher, Bill White, Bryan Eure and Richard Grenell, who had served as Trump’s ambassador to Germany and acting director of national intelligence,” the report says. “Also listed are Elizabeth Ailes, a former NBC News executive and the widow of the late Fox News chief executive officer Roger Ailes, and Deborah Magowan, the widow of the late San Francisco Giants owner Peter Magowan.”

The news puts to rest unsubstantiated rumors that Mrs. Trump was distancing herself from the former president’s 2024 campaign, while at the same time highlighting the Trumps’ support for aspects of the LGBT agenda, particularly homosexuality, despite effectively dominating the GOP and American conservative movement.

Log Cabin Republicans [advocates for](#) homosexual “marriage,” homosexual adoption – which has led to [numerous cases](#) of child sex abuse – a nationwide ban on so-called “conversion therapy,” and even forcing government-assisted adoption agencies to place children in same-sex households, among other things.

Trump has a mixed history on LGBT issues, starting with his status as a mainstream celebrity and conventional liberal New Yorker before his entry into Republican politics. In 2012, as the owner of the Miss Universe beauty pageant, Trump [repeatedly endorsed](#) the inclusion of “transgender women,” i.e. men, in competition with actual women, in the name of what the Trump organization called “modernized” rules at the time, eliciting praise from LGBT pressure group GLAAD.

While running for president in 2016, Trump [criticized](#) a North Carolina law banning male students from female restrooms and said anyone should be allowed to “use the bathroom that they feel is appropriate.” By the time he was in

office, he [flipped on the issue](#), rejecting Obama-era guidelines on the subject and announcing that the Department of Education would no longer indulge bathroom-related “discrimination” complaints.

A [supporter](#) of same-sex “marriage,” Trump nominated a variety of pro-LGBT officials to various [government posts](#) and [judicial vacancies](#) and continued an [Obama-era executive order](#) on “gender identity nondiscrimination” and U.S. support for international recognition of homosexual relations at the United Nations Human Rights Council. His campaign [actively courted](#) LGBT-identifying voters with rainbow merchandise.

At the same time, Trump [prioritized](#) religious liberty and was generally aligned with social conservatives against the gender-fluidity movement, from [banning](#) gender-confused soldiers from the military to [protecting](#) women from having to share close quarters such as homeless shelters with men claiming to be transgendered. His White House also [opposed](#) the so-called “Equality Act” and [maintained](#) a biological definition of sex in its implementation of federal laws and regulations.

While running for reelection, Trump has [pledged](#) to “*protect children from left-wing gender insanity*” including banning federal funding, approval, and promotion of “*gender transition*” practices. In December 2022, however, he [hosted](#) a gala for the Log Cabin Republicans at his Mar-a-Lago resort home, where he declared, “*we are fighting for the gay community, and we are fighting and fighting hard. With the help of many of the people here tonight in recent years, our movement has taken incredible strides, the strides you’ve made here is incredible.*”

Many at the event reportedly celebrated Democratic President Joe Biden’s [signing](#) of the so-called “*Respect for Marriage Act*,” which forces all 50 states to recognize homosexual relationships as marriage, though Trump himself did not mention it.

In February, Trump [allowed](#) Mar-a-Lago to host a same-sex “wedding” for two men from LCR’s Tennessee chapter. Grenell, a top Trump 2024 surrogate who is himself openly homosexual, has hailed Trump as “*the most pro-gay president in American history.*”

Despite the 45th president’s dissension from conservative orthodoxy on sexuality [and other issues](#), he swiftly amassed endorsements from Republican officeholders and enjoyed favorable treatment from conservative media and had little difficulty besting his two closest competitors in the GOP presidential primary, conservative Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis and moderate former UN Ambassador Nikki Haley.

Polls currently have Trump leading Democrat incumbent Biden, although voters also say that convictions in Trump's various ongoing legal battles would make them less likely to support him. However, serious concern among Democrats over Biden's age and mental health, and deep dissatisfaction with his job performance, give the current president comparable electoral challenges.

Third-party candidate Robert F. Kennedy Jr. could be a wild card, as he has qualities that appeal to each major candidate's base. At the moment, the aforementioned polls show Trump's lead persisting even with Kennedy factored in, but given how close many are predicting the election to be, concern persists that even small defections could impact the outcome.

[[“Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” -(Matthew 7:14). The Lord Jesus Christ summed up this matter in this passage. It's a reminder that Scripture is definitive on this issue that marriage is between a man and a woman. The Bible notes some 47 verses about same-sex marriage, and at least 50+ passages address the issue of marriage. The Scriptures are quite clear on this matter, regardless of cultural beliefs. Although most denominations have caved to the cultural mores and the U.S. Supreme Court may have given legal sanction, it does not nullify the words of the Bible.

Marriage between a man and a woman was instituted by God with Adam and Eve. Genesis 2:24 states: **“Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh.”**

In Matthew 19:4-5, Jesus reaffirms this: **“He answered, ‘Have you not read that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female,’ and said, ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one’?”**

I revealed information and evidence in Blessed Hope #320 the fact that Donald J. Trump is a British Crown Agent and out to destroy America for his British handlers.

Blessings,

Pastor Bob, EvanTeachr@aol.com
www.pastorbobreid.com

The **A B C**'s of Salvation

A Admit that you sin.



Your sin separates you from God and keeps you from Heaven. Every sin must be punished. Your punishment for sin is Hell.

Romans 3:10 • Revelation 21:8

For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.

Romans 3:23

For the wages of sin is death...

Romans 6:23a

B Believe in Jesus.



Jesus Christ, God's own Son, came to die for your sins. His death on the cross can replace your death in Hell. He only asks that you believe Him.

John 3:16 • 2 Corinthians 5:21 • Isaiah 53:5-6

...but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Romans 6:23b

But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us

Romans 5:8

C Choose to allow Jesus to save you.



God is waiting for you to receive His gift of salvation. If you ask Him, God will remove your sin and give you a home in Heaven!

John 14:1-2 • Titus 3:5-7 • John 1:12

For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

Romans 10:10

For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

Romans 10:13