

# **The Victims of Illegal Immigration**

And with the Biden administration now overseeing a mass entry of illegal aliens, more and more of your fellow Americans are at risk. Let's bring this ongoing tragedy to an end as soon as possible!

---

## **Eight Ways to Help Trump Win the Election**

The 2020 Presidential Election is forty days away. President Donald Trump has the most powerful forces of our society arrayed against him. The overlapping forces of the Mainstream Media, the Democrats, the Deep State and traitorous Republicans are out to defeat Trump.

---

## **The Tulsa Rally And The Trump 2020 Campaign – Getting Things Right**

Trump needs to dismiss or transfer a number of his officials, who are sabotaging his policies. But the time is short, with the election only months away. The big priority now is to get control of the rioting and speak clearly to the public about

it, showing them why he, and not Biden, is the Law and Order candidate.

---

## **Tech Censorship: Vdare.com Today, NewsWithViews Tomorrow?**

The big tech companies support leftism and globalism. They don't like dissidents reaching Americans with their views. And so they are moving to shut down dissent. It doesn't all happen at once. But by brandishing the banners of tolerance, multiculturalism, "anti-racism", "hate speech", etc. they can squeeze us out eventually.

---

## **San Antonio City Council Denounces The Utterance of Chinese Flu "Hate Speech"**

Freedom of speech is under attack in our country. Much of this is driven by the so-called "politically correct" hysteria which sweeping our nation. We find a recent eruption of this mentality in San Antonio, Texas, the city of the Alamo.

---

# **Trump Immigration Order Falls A Little Short Of Expectations**

By “Invisible Enemy” the President means the COVID-19 Coronavirus. The point is, with all the Americans not working as a result of the Coronavirus Crisis, we shouldn’t bring more people into the country. And that makes perfect sense to me.

---

## **Why Does Samaritan’s Purse Get Attacked for Helping People?**

Samaritan’s Purse organization, in partnership with Mount Sinai Hospital, recently set up a field hospital in New York City’s Central Park, to treat COVID-19 patients. The field hospital consisted of 14 tents and 68 beds, including 10 ICU beds with ventilators.

---

# **Chick-Fil-A Works To Get The Gay Lobby Off Its Back**

Regarding Chick-fil-A, Drew Anderson declared that: “If Chick-fil-A is serious about their pledge to stop holding hands with divisive anti-LGBTQ activists, then further transparency is needed regarding their deep ties to organizations like Focus on the Family.

---

## **Why Are They Bashing Chick-Fil-A Now?**

To summarize, Dan Cathy of Chick-fil-A opposed same-sex marriage, stood up for traditional marriage and was attacked. Grassroots supporters turned out to support the company, and Chick-fil-A profited. Rather than follow up on that victory, Chick-fil-A chickened out and surrendered to the Same-Sex Marriage Agenda.

---

## **Support Trump – Get Out And Vote For The GOP On Tuesday November 6th**

Mid-terms are held on November 6<sup>th</sup> and if you support President

Trump you'd better get out and vote.

Two years ago, we elected Donald Trump, hoping for a new opportunity for our nation.

President Trump has accomplished a lot, but he has also been hindered by strong opposition.

Who is the opposition?

The opposition includes, but is not limited to:

The Democrats as well as many Republicans. Most of the Mainstream Media. The Hollywood Left. Much of the federal judiciary. The "Deep State", a collective term for government employees who sabotage Trump's policies. And so on...

When you look at all the opposition facing Trump, it's quite admirable that he has accomplished what he has.

Now we face the mid-term elections, in which a third of the Senate, and 100% of the House will be chosen. It is absolutely imperative to get as many Trump supporters in Congress as possible.

So get out there on November 6<sup>th</sup> and vote for the Republicans for Congress.

Yes, I know some of these Republican candidates aren't as good on the issues as we'd like.

But just imagine what a Democratic takeover of Congress would mean. The Democrats would shut down the Trump Agenda and even, if possible begin impeachment proceedings.

Even a divided Congress, in which each party has a chamber, could effectively freeze the Trump Agenda until the next election.

Thanks to years of mass immigration, the demographics of the

United States are changing. Mass immigration is a Democratic voter importation scheme. You've got to wonder why so many Republicans supported it over the years. If current mass immigration continues much longer, the Republicans will cease to be a national party.

Already, it's getting harder and harder to elect Republicans. So we need to get out and vote on November 6<sup>th</sup>.

What is your cause?

The Constitution? Limited government? American sovereignty? Do you want to protect babies in the womb? Do you want to protect religious freedom? Do you want to defend the right to bear arms? Do you favor immigration reduction? Do you want to decrease U.S. interventionism abroad?

If you support any of these causes, or all of them, your best bet is with President Trump. But Trump needs help. Trump can't do it alone. Trump needs help in Congress.

The primaries are over. Maybe your favorite candidate didn't win. OK, that candidate may have more success another year. Or maybe not.

The point is, on November 6<sup>th</sup>, it's not time to quibble about who should have won a GOP primary. It's time to get out and vote for the GOP candidates, to keep as much of the Congress as possible out of the hands of the Democrats.

The Democratic Party, in case you hadn't noticed, is getting more radical than ever. It is not the party of FDR or of JFK, both of whom were more conservative than today's Republicans.

Today's Democratic party is not even the party of Bill Clinton in the 1990s. That incarnation of the Democratic Party looks conservative in contrast to the Democrats of today.

The Democratic Party of today, on the federal level, is the

party of radical socialism, open borders, extreme PC fanaticism, the radical homosexual lobby, transgender lobby and the abortion lobby. It's not real big on freedom of speech either.

Many Democrats on the local level are good Americans, but their party has been hijacked on the national level.

Donald Trump's election in 2016 gave us an opportunity (not a guarantee) to turn things around.

Yes, Trump has made mistakes, but he's still our best hope at this time to protect American sovereignty and at least to attempt to stop (or at least slow) the downward slide of our nation.

That's why we've got to support Trump. And on November 6<sup>th</sup>, the best way to support Trump is to vote for Republican candidates for the U.S. Congress. We've got to send as many Republicans to Capitol Hill as possible. Tell your friends to vote GOP also, and give them a ride to the polling station if they need it.

Support Trump – Vote GOP on the 6<sup>th</sup> of November!

© 2018 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Allan Wall: [allanwall39@gmail.com](mailto:allanwall39@gmail.com)

---

## **Mexican Retaliatory Tariffs Target Republican Areas In**

# The United States

President Trump recently imposed tariffs on steel and aluminum from Mexico. Mexico retaliated by imposing tariffs on certain exports from the United States.

That's not too complicated.

However, there's more to it than that.

Mexico's recently-announced [retaliatory tariffs](#) were specifically imposed *on products produced in Republican areas of the United States*.

It almost makes one suspect that Mexican policy-makers actually pay attention to U.S. political trends, doesn't it?

As Candidate Trump said, Mexico has smart leaders.

Here's a quotation from *Expansión* (my translation): "The tariffs that Mexico is imposing on the United States are a political attack to get the Donald Trump administration to withdraw the tariffs imposed on Mexican steel and aluminum."

(Source: [Los aranceles de México a EU dolerán a estados republicanos](#) ["Mexican Tariffs on the U.S. Will Hurt Republican States"] Dainzú Patiño, *Expansión*, June 4, 2018)

Many American products are exported to Mexico. But these Mexican retaliatory tariffs don't impose tariffs on all of them. Just certain selected products.

According to the same source quoted above, "...the Mexican government announced it would impose tariffs on flat steel products, lamps, pork, sausages and prepared foods, apples, grapes, blueberries, and various types of cheese from the United States."

Is this a random list of products? Or do they have something in common?



Here's how that *Expansión* article explains it: "These products are not exactly the most common products sold by the U.S. to Mexico. Instead, they were strategically selected by the Secretary of the Economy. According to Alejandro Arzate Mejia, member of the *Comisión Fiscal del Colegio de Contadores Públicos de México* [Tax Commission of the Association of Public Accountants of Mexico], the states and counties where most of these goods are produced support the Republican party and Trump's administration."

As Arzate puts it, "Mexico's action is not to protect Mexican producers as is Trump's goal with the [Mexican] steel. It's a political point."

Did you get that? A political point.

The goal is for the price of these products to rise in Mexico, forcing consumers to substitute them with cheaper Mexico or foreign products, thus "lowering the demand of these products, to decrease the sale of these products located in Republican territory".

In an interview with *Televisa*, Juan Pablo Castanon, president of the CCE (*Consejo Coordinador Empresarial* [Business Coordinating Council], said that "It's part of a strategy in which we have worked with the Secretary of the Economy."

What's supposed to happen next, according to Arzate, is "With producers in the United States affected by the low sales, Mexico's goal is that they begin to pressure their legislators and representatives in the Chamber of Commerce so that the Trump administration will remove the tariffs on Mexican steel and aluminum".

According to Manuel Padron-Castillo (photo [here](#)), of Baker McKenzie, "Many of the products that Mexico, Canada and Europe have promised to impose retaliatory tariffs on, such as pork, textiles, tobacco and other goods, come from states that this year have competitive elections for Congress and that

President Trump must win in 2020 to be re-elected”.

Two days later [an article](#) in Mexico’s *Excelsior* reported that Mexico’s Economy Secretary Ildefonso Guajardo “neither denied nor confirmed” that the tariffs had as a goal “to damage Republican states in the United States” but the article went right on to point out specific products originating from specific Trump-voting states.

And what do you know, that same day Reuters came out with an article entitled

[Republicans in tight House races feel heat from Mexican tariffs](#) (Jason Lange, Anthony Esposito)

which said that “Mexican tariffs are roiling U.S. congressional campaigns in states where U.S. exporters could take a hit and President Donald Trump’s Republicans face tough races in November congressional elections.” The strategy even targets some specific congressional districts.

Quoth Reuters, “Mexico announced the levies ... in retaliation to Trump’s decision to slap tariffs on metal imports from Mexico and other countries. They fall on only about \$3 billion in U.S. exports, but were crafted to have a ‘very specific’ focus on vulnerable Republicans, said one senior Mexican official who asked not to be named. ‘We wanted to ensure that the issue is a top priority for key decision makers at the highest level,’ said another Mexican official who requested anonymity.

It sounds like Mexican policymakers know exactly what they are doing.

Mexican analysts pay attention to the United States, to the economy, the politics, and the demographics. So when it comes to trade and immigration, the Mexican government is promoting its interests in the United States.

So how about our policymakers? Are they promoting our interests?

# 12 Mexican And 5 U.S. Cities On World's Most Murderous Cities List

A Mexican NGO called the *Consejo Ciudadano para la Seguridad Pública y Justicia Penal, A.C.* (Citizen Council for Public Security and Penal Justice), whose president is Jose Antonio Ortega Sanchez, released a list of the world's 50 cities with the highest homicide rates in 2017.

In order to be on the list, the city must have at least 300,000 inhabitants. The ranking is based on homicide rates calculated per 100,000 inhabitants. (Cities in war zones are not included in the ranking.)

Of the 50 most murderous cities, 42 were in Latin America and 47 (all but three) were in the Western Hemisphere.

The country with the most cities on the Top Fifty list was Brazil, with 17 cities.

Mexico was in second place with twelve cities. Plus, half the Top Ten cities were in Mexico.

In third place was Venezuela, with five cities on the most murderous cities list.

The United States was in fourth place, with five cities on the list, including one in Puerto Rico, a U.S. territory in the

Caribbean.

South Africa, the only country on the list not in the Western Hemisphere, had three cities.

Colombia also had three cities on the list.

Honduras had two cities on the list.

El Salvador, Guatemala and Jamaica each had one city on the list.

Los Cabos, located on the tip of Mexico's Baja California Peninsula, entered the Fifty Most Murderous Cities list for the very first time and went straight to the top, to be the world's most murderous city. There were 365 murders in Los Cabos (one for each day of the year), among a population of only 328,245, making for a murder rate of 111.33 per 100,000.

Caracas, Venezuela was the second-most murderous city on the planet, with 3,387 murders in a population of 3,046,104, which was a murder rate of 111.19 out of 100,000.

Acapulco, Mexico was #3 with a rate of 106.63.

Natal, Brazil was #4 with a rate of 102.56.

Two Mexican cities were in fifth and sixth place: Tijuana at #5 with a rate of 100.77, and La Paz at #6 with a rate of 84.79.

Fortaleza, Brazil was #7 with a rate of 83.48.

Ciudad Victoria, Mexico was #8 with a rate of 83.32 murders per 100,000 inhabitants.

A city in Venezuela called Guayana (not to be confused with the country Guyana) was #9 with a murder rate of 80.28

Rounding out the Top Ten Most Murderous Cities list was Belem, Brazil, with a rate of 71.38.

As for Mexico, it had 12 cities on the list, in contrast to only [8 cities last year](#).

The Mexican Cities:

- Los Cabos, at the southern tip of the Baja California Peninsula, which has never been on the list before and went straight to #1.
- Acapulco (on the Pacific Coast), at #3 on the list. Its murder rate of 106.63 was, however, a decrease from that of last year, which was 113.24, when it was #2 on the most murderous cities list. So that's progress.
- Border Town Tijuana was #5 on the list. Its 2017 rate of 100.77 was almost double its 2016 rate of 53.06.
- La Paz, on the Baja California Peninsula, was the world's sixth-most murderous city.
- At #8 was Ciudad Victoria, in the northeastern state of Tamaulipas. Its murder rate of 83.32 was a slight decrease over last year's rate of 84.67.
- Culiacan, capital of the western state of Sinaloa, was at #12, with a murder rate of 70.10. That's actually an increase over the 2017 rate of 51.81.
- Ciudad Juarez, across the border from El Paso, Texas, was the world's twentieth-most murderous city with a rate of 56.16, an increase over last years rate of 43.63.
- Chihuahua City, Chihuahua, in western Mexico, was #29 with a rate of 49.48, an increase over last year's 42.02 rate.
- At #31 was Ciudad Obregon in western Mexico, with a murder rate of 48.96, an increase over the previous year's 40.95 rate.
- Tepic, capital of western Nayarit state, was #36 on the list.
- Reynosa, a border town across from Hidalgo, Texas, was #38.

- Mazatlan, on the west coast, was #43 with a murder rate of 39.32, a decrease over the 2017 murder rate of 48.75.

U.S. cities on the list were:

- St. Louis, Missouri, the 13<sup>th</sup>-most murderous city in the world at 65.83, an increase over the previous year's 60.37.
- Baltimore, #21, its 55.48 rate an increase over the previous year's 51.14.
- San Juan of Puerto Rico (a U.S. territory), at #32, had a rate of 48.70.
- New Orleans, #41, a rate of 40.10, a decrease from the previous year's 60.37 murders per 100,000 inhabitants.
- Detroit, at #42, with a rate of 39.69, a decrease from the 44.60 of 2016.

Each of these deaths is a human tragedy. So why study such a morbid subject? The hope is that by studying these patterns, strategies to decrease the violence might be found and enacted.

To peruse the data yourself, click [here](#).

© 2018 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Allan Wall: [allanwall39@gmail.com](mailto:allanwall39@gmail.com)

---

# **Are Army Green Berets Gutting Their Standards For Women**

# Recruits?

US Army Special Forces, the famed Green Berets are admired and feared throughout the world. The Green Berets have earned that respect through their effective operations throughout the world. These effective operations were results of their demanding standards, selection process and the motivation of the Green Berets themselves.

Could that be changing?

Ray Starmann over at [U.S. Defense Watch](#) has an eye-opening expose of what he says is happening to U.S. Army Special Forces (the Green Berets), as Army leadership doggedly rams through the 2015 Obama Administration directive to open all combat slots to females. Where is Trump on this issue?

Reportedly, standards are being relaxed because leadership wants women warriors, so that's what they're going to have, willy-nilly, even if it destroys readiness. Starmann writes that...

It was only a matter of time...

Since 2015, no woman has successfully made it through SFQC, or the Special Forces Qualification Course since Ash Carter, with a stroke of a pen, created the single greatest disaster in US military history, the authorization for women to serve in the combat arms and special operations units.

But, that is about to change...

The army's leaders, which in 2017, consist mainly of social justice warriors, flaming liberals and back-stabbing ticket-punching, perfumed princes, have consistently demonstrated that they possess neither the warrior ethos nor the moral courage to challenge the social engineering insanity invading the lean green machine. Our country's national security is being damaged every day and the army's senior leadership is more focused on political correctness and

diversity than war fighting.

### [Green Beret Training Standards Now Lower than Army ROTC Camp in the 80's](#)

Ray Starmann, US Defense Watch, Dec. 19, 2017

Starmann quotes from an anonymous letter from within Special Forces, complaining about this. The letter was "...written by one or several training personnel from the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School...indicting senior Green Beret officers and enlisted men for essentially erasing any physical standards for those who seek the Green Beret, in order to successfully pass females through the program, while placating feminists in the Pentagon."

If what the letter says is true, it's very disturbing.

The Green Beret runs a demanding training program for applicants, and trainees can wash out if they don't pass the tests. According to the letter, however, the program is being altered so that trainees so graduates can complete the training without passing physical tests or land navigation tests. Can this really be?

Starmann even compares it with an ROTC course he took in the 1980s, which he finds more demanding than the requirements of current Green Beret training.

You can read the whole article [here](#).

Major General Kurt Sonntag, who runs the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School at Fort Bragg says that "no fundamental SF standard has been removed. No academic or character performance standards have been adjusted." (See [here](#)).

Supposedly the Army is investigating. Are Army investigators going to get to the root of the issue though? Would they question the whole rationale for having women in the Green Berets and combat units in general?



Where is the Trump administration on this?

© 2018 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Allan Wall: [allan39@provalue.net](mailto:allan39@provalue.net)

---

## Support The RAISE Act

Amidst all the hoopla surrounding the Trump Administration, a new legal proposal put forth by two senators (and supported by the administration) is a potential turning point in U.S. immigration history.

It's called the RAISE Act, which besides meaning "raise" is an acronym for "Reforming American Immigration for Strong Employment".

It is sponsored by Senator Tom Cotton of Arkansas and Senator David Perdue of Georgia. This bill, if it were eventually to become law, would revolutionize our legal immigration system.

Currently, our legal immigration system awards over 1 million green cards a year. One million. Think about that figure, and compare it to your own state's population.

Do we really need a million immigrants annually?

And how are they chosen? Given that the United States is the number one destination of immigrants worldwide, shouldn't we have a rigid selection system, selecting the immigrants most likely to add economic value to our nation and to assimilate?

That's not how our current system works. Our current system gives preference to unskilled workers. That of course provides more competition for our own lower skilled workers.

Not only that, but we allow chain migration. It's really a form of nepotism. In chain migration, once a person gets a green card, he can bring in more relatives, and pretty soon the whole village can be living here.

And today's legal immigrants use a lot of welfare. About half of them are on welfare.

Furthermore, many don't learn English well, and the English test for naturalization has become something of a joke.

Plus, many immigrants retain the citizenship of their home country, despite the fact that that's a violation of the naturalization oath. Now there are many dual citizens. Mexico, for example, encourages its citizens to become U.S. citizens in order to manipulate our political system.

Politically, immigration helps the Democratic party, as most immigrants, when naturalized (and some even who are not naturalized) vote for the Democrats. Most immigrants nowadays want Big Government so that's what they vote for.

So, bottom line, our legal immigration system is a mess, and it's not in our country's interests. We really don't need any more immigrants. Automation is eliminating jobs, and in future decades we will be hard-pressed to have enough jobs for our own people.

The RAISE Act has been introduced in the Senate, and is supported by President Trump. Although it's not perfect, it's a great improvement on our present system and a great big step in the right direction.

The RAISE Act would end chain migration, allowing only spouses and minor children to enter with the green card recipient.

Also, the issuance of green cards would depend upon a point system. This would be modeled after the immigration systems of Canada and Australia in which different characteristics

would earn points to qualify one to be a green card recipient.

Here's how it was described by Trump's Senior Policy Advisor Stephen Miller in a press conference on August 2<sup>nd</sup>: "Additionally, we're establishing a new entry system that's points-based. Australia has a points-based system, Canada has a points-based system. And what will this system look at? It will look at: Does the applicant speak English? Can they support themselves and their families financially? Do they have a skill that will add to the U.S. economy? Are they being paid a high wage?"

Isn't that something? And why not? After all, the U.S.A. is the number one destination for immigrants. Why not be selective?

As far as the numbers go, once the system kicks in, it will begin to reduce the quantity of immigrants. If things go as planned, during the following decade, the quantity of green card recipients will be halved, from over a million to half a million.

It would be good to reduce it even more, down to about 200,000 or less. But, at least the RAISE Act is heading in the right direction.

If you haven't already, I recommend you watch a video of Stephen Miller's masterful explanation of the RAISE Act, even facing opposition. You can watch the video [here](#), and [here](#) is the written text. And click [here](#) for an article about the RAISE Act on the invaluable Numbers USA website.

If you agree with the RAISE Act, then you need to start educating people you know and you need to start hounding your senators and representatives. They may need a lot of pressure. You can contact them [here](#).

# Mexico's Violence Continues To Worsen

There's no way around it- Mexico's violence is worsening. No matter how you slice and dice the statistics, that conclusion is unavoidable.

1. According to statistics of the Mexican government itself, murders in Mexico increased in 2016. See [Mexico's Murder Rate Rose in 2016](#).
2. The consulting firm Verisk Maplecroft compiled a Crime Rate Index for calendar year 2016, and ranked Mexico as the third most dangerous country in the world. (See [UK-Based Firm ranks Mexico as World's Third Most Dangerous Country](#)).
3. A Mexican NGO called the Consejo Ciudadano para la Seguridad Pública y Justicia Penal, A.C. (Citizen Council for Public Security and Penal Justice) released a list of the world's 50 cities with the highest homicide rates in 2016. Mexico has eight cities on it (while the U.S. has four). See [Eight Mexican, and Four U.S., Cities on World's Most Murderous List](#).
4. In its Armed Conflict Survey 2017, London-based International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS), which listed the Mexican Drug War as the world's second-deadliest conflict, after the Syrian Civil War. So, when you classify Mexico as a war zone it stacks up comparably in quantity of deaths with the current civil wars in the Middle East, only being surpassed by Syria.

U.S. President Donald Trump heard about that one and tweeted

that “Mexico was just ranked the second deadliest country in the world...” which was not exactly what the IISS said, rather that the Mexican Drug War was the world’s second-deadliest conflict.

The next day, [IISS announced](#) that even that second-place position might be in doubt, that “...there was a methodological flaw in our calculation of estimated conflict fatalities that requires revision. Our researchers are working to rectify this and we will share the results in due course. We anticipate this will result in Mexico’s conflict remaining among the ten most lethal in the world, by estimated fatalities attributable to an armed conflict.”

In other words, even if Mexico is not #2 on the IISS list, it’s likely to be in the Top Ten.

Of course, all these stats deal with Mexico in 2016. But more recent stats show that things are actually getting worse in 2017.

In June of 2017, according to government statistics, there were 2,186 murders reported in the month of May 2017, which was a twenty-year high.

The very next month, June of 2017, even that high was topped, as there were 2,234 homicides from that month under investigation.

An article by Kate Linthicum appeared in the Los Angeles Times appeared on July 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2017, entitled [Mexico’s bloody drug war is killing more people than ever](#) . This article painted a grim picture of how bad the violence in getting in Mexico.

It reports that-

- The first half of 2017, with “12,144 homicide cases”, was “the deadliest first half of a year” since relevant records began to be kept in 1997.

- The most violent Mexican state, by quantity of murders, is Guerrero state, with 1,161 murder cases since January of 2017.
- In comparison to last year, 27 of Mexico's 32 states saw increases in homicides.
- The violence has even been inching closer to tourist areas. This could be disastrous for Mexico's tourist industry. (The country is the 9<sup>th</sup> most popular tourist destination in the world.

To what factors does author Kate Linthicum attribute this disastrous situation? Well, as usual there are several factors, here are two big ones:

– “Rising demand for heroin in the United States” which puts more money (and thus more power) in the hands of drug cartel leaders. According to Linthicum, “In recent years, Mexico has surpassed Colombia to become the largest supplier of heroin to the U.S.

Security analysts say the opioid epidemic in the U.S. has left cartels flush with cash, which has allowed them to step up the warfare.”

– The famed drug cartel boss Joaquin “el Chapo” Guzman was arrested and extradited to the United States. The capture of a such a high-profile individual as Guzman is a victory, but a result may be to unleash more violence. Linthicum reports that “Guzman's sons have been fighting another clique for control of the powerful Sinaloa cartel since his arrest last year. The cartel's instability has allowed other criminal groups, including the Jalisco New Generation cartel, to move in, driving violence in Mexico's northwest.”

So there you have it. What can Americans do ?

Quit doing heroin and build a wall on the border.

© 2017 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Allan Wall: [allan39@provalue.net](mailto:allan39@provalue.net)

---

# Brexit Letter Officially Begins Process Of Britain's Withdrawal

Something historic is afoot across the pond, as, for the first time ever, a member state of the European Union is withdrawing from the European Union.

It came in the form of a letter sent from UK Prime Minister Theresa May, which was hand delivered by diplomat Sir Tim Barrow to European Council President Donald Tusk (not Donald Trump) in Brussels.

It's the Article 50 process – withdrawal from the EU.

A referendum was held in the UK this past June 23<sup>rd</sup>. It was known as “Brexit”, a portmanteau of “Britain” and “exit”.

The Brexit vote was conducted in the United Kingdom (including England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and the small British territory of Gibraltar in the Mediterranean).

For the voters on that fateful day, there was one simple question on the ballot: “Should the United Kingdom remain a member of the European Union or leave the European Union?”

There were only two options: “Remain a member of the European Union” or “Leave the European Union”.

The Brexit vote was a hot topic in international news, with many prominent persons weighing in on it. There were dire predictions of what might follow a British departure. The globalist elite was certainly against it.

Our own President Obama (at the time) weighed in on Brexit, declaring in a visit that Britain shouldn't leave the European Union.

Donald Trump, then a candidate, thought that Britain would be better off leaving the EU, but hastened to add that "I want them to make their own decision."

(For more pre-referendum details, see [Will "Brexit" Lead to a British Departure from the European Union?](#))

Finally, the fateful day of decision, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, arrived, and the British people voted.

My family and I were vacationing in a colonial city in Mexico as the results were being announced on the television. It was exciting, and the "Leave" side won, thus calling for a British withdrawal from the EU.

(The Leave triumph in the UK gave hope that five months later, Donald Trump would be triumphant in the U.S. election. And that's exactly what happened.)

Almost immediately after the UK referendum, some Remain supporters started to whine and call for another referendum. Why didn't they just call for two out of three? At what point is a referendum valid?

Anyway, various things occurred before the actual withdrawal process began nine months later.

There was a change in leadership, as David Cameron, the pro-Remain Prime Minister, stepped down and was replaced by Theresa May in July of 2016.

Then the question arose as to what Parliament's role in all this should be. It took until January 24<sup>th</sup> of 2017 for the United Kingdom's Supreme Court to rule that yes, it needed parliamentary approval.



On January 31<sup>st</sup>, the UK government introduced to Parliament the European Union (Notification of Withdrawal) Bill. By March 16<sup>th</sup> it had passed both chambers (the House of Commons and House of Lords), had been signed off by the Queen and was an official Act of Parliament .

Finally, on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017, the official letter from the British government addressed to the European Union was signed by Prime Minister Theresa May and delivered to EU headquarters by Sir Tim Barrow.

“Dear President Tusk”, it began, “ On 23 June last year, the people of the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union.” And it goes on from there for several pages.

So the two-year process of leaving the European Union began on March 29<sup>th</sup>, and thus should end on March 29<sup>th</sup> of 2019.

This has never occurred before and should be interesting. There is also anti-EU sentiment in continental European countries. Could any of them follow suit?

Also, there are complications within the United Kingdom.

There is an independence movement in Scotland, but paradoxically, support for the EU is higher in Scotland than in England.

So what if the UK withdraws from the European Union and then Scotland withdraws from the UK and rejoins the European Union?

And supposing that Scotland does leave the UK, would it still be correct to even refer to the entity as the United Kingdom? After all, the “United Kingdom” actually refers to the union of England and Scotland.

As I say, this should be interesting.

© 2017 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

# Mr. Trump now president of the United States

On January 20th, 2017, in an Inauguration Day ceremony full of tradition, Donald Trump was sworn in as President of the United States.

Two years ago, who would have believed this? Trump had talked about running for president before, and even had considered running against Obama in the latter's re-election campaign in the 2012 election.

But it wasn't until June of 2015 that Trump threw his hat into the ring, and after that moment, the American political scene was not the same.

Pundits and politicians had confidentially assured their listeners that Donald Trump couldn't win. And yet, he did.

Bernie Sanders, who ran against Hillary Clinton in the Democratic primaries, recently recognized Trump's Triumph. Quoth Bernie, "Trump took on the Republican establishment, he took on the Democratic establishment, took on the media establishment, and he ended up winning the election to become President of the United States. And that is an extraordinary accomplishment. And it talks about perseverance, it talks about very strong political instincts, it talks about a way to connect with people."

It's true. My family and I went to see Trump twice in rallies in the state in which I reside. Trump had a way of connecting with people. Despite being a billionaire New Yorker, he could relate to working class folks and rednecks throughout the country, including in the South, the Midwest and the Upper

Midwest, which helped push him to a majority in the electoral college.

Trump's forthright way of speaking can get him into trouble, but it also served him well, as he smashed conventional paradigms and brought taboo subjects into the mainstream.

For example, there was the proposed ban on Muslim immigration, which he backed off somewhat. But the very fact that he raised it put it on the mainstream front burner.

On foreign policy, Trump's campaign brought a new perspective, making it possible to consider a new approach.

It's been twenty-five years since the Cold War ended, and the world has changed. Yet many American policy-makers seem stuck in the Cold War.

Russia, for example, is no longer communist and is a great nation. Doesn't it make sense to improve relations with Russia? This does not mean we will always see eye to eye or that there are no differences. But pretending that Russia is a world threat as it was during the Cold War is a serious error when we should be looking at common interests.

On immigration, Trump's campaign brought up subjects that some of us have been writing about for years, and which some have been dealing with for decades. But the Republican establishment didn't want these issues really dealt with and continued to placate the Cheap Labor Lobby.

Trump began by talking about illegal immigration, but before it was over his campaign had actually moved into the area of legal immigration as well. These are issues of public policy that Americans have a right to discuss. Election night was a great one, as by early a.m. of November 9th it became obvious even to the Mainstream Media that Donald Trump had triumphed. What a great night.

Several months later, on January 20th, 2017, Donald Trump was

inaugurated as President of the United States.

The Inauguration ceremony is a part of American history and civic life, and is always interesting to watch. And this time, we were able to see the inauguration of Donald Trump, a man who defied the odds and the political establishment and who, we hope, can move our country in a different direction.

I was at school during the ceremony, so I showed it in my classroom. It was a great day.

My 17-year old son David was actually at the inauguration in Washington, D.C, attending as part of a 4-H Club trip.

David had already been selected for the trip even before the nomination. So he could have wound up being at Hillary's inauguration!

But, Trump triumphed and that's good, as David is an avid Trumpster even though he wasn't quite old enough to vote.

David had a great time in Washington, and returned with various sorts of Trump presidential paraphernalia: President Trump caps, t-shirts, flags, newspapers, keychains, a stocking cap, a button, a Donald Trump bobblehead, a stocking cap and even a pair of President Trump socks!

To conclude: Donald Trump is now the 45th President of the United States. Let us hope he makes great strides to improve our national situation, and let us do our part as well.

© 2017 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

# Trump triumph gives us a change – not a guarantee – to save our country

Wasn't it great? I refer to Donald Trump's Triumph in the U.S. Presidential Election. Right up until the end experts were predicting a Hillary victory, which is clearly what many of them wanted.

At our house, we stayed up to the wee hours of the following morning and it was fun. Did you see the shots of the activists at Hillary's watch party? They were devastated.

It was great to see Trump defeat the Democrats and Mainstream Media (or do I repeat myself?).

Look at everything Trump and his campaign endured. The Republican elite tried to stop Trump, as did the Democrats, the Mainstream Media, and the government of Mexico.

And yet, Trump won. And part of the fun of it was the comeuppance received by the Bush Family and the Republican Establishment, the Mainstream Media and the Clinton Machine.

You've got to just bask in the glow of the Trump Triumph.

But after celebrating, we have to look at the big picture and steel ourselves for the battles that yet remain to be fought. For the Trump victory is not the end by any means.

To be sure, keeping the Clintons out of the White House was, in itself, a great public service.

Can you imagine a President Hillary Clinton as president enacting her agenda and appointing Supreme Court justices?

As a sideshow, can you imagine former president Bill Clinton

as – well, there's no precedent for it in American history – “First Gentleman” (though that doesn't sound quite right). Can you imagine Bill Clinton loose in the White House with no responsibilities?

The Clinton Machine was stopped, and that's great. Beyond that, there are plenty of things about the Trump Platform that are worthy of celebration.

Trump has pledged to secure the border with Mexico and start enforcing the law, and has even put such formerly taboo subjects as legal immigration and Muslim immigration on the table.

Trump has pointed the way to a less interventionist foreign policy and better relations with Russia. Hey, the Cold War has been over twenty-five years, it's about time! Plus, we have common interests with Russia and we ought to cultivate them.

Trump has been bold in his speech, not always careful about how he said things, but willing to buck the tyranny of “political correctness”. And that's a step in the right direction.

It's great that Trump won. But let's not kid ourselves into thinking that a Trump presidency will, in and of itself, save the country. It's really an opportunity to save our country, if we take advantage of it.

To save America, the Trump Triumph was necessary, but in and of itself it's not sufficient.

There are so many problems in our country, and you can't blame them all on Obama, or Hillary, or the Democrats, though they've worked to make things worse.

The loss of traditional moral values and a common American identity, family disintegration, the brainwashing of our young in public institutions of “learning” – these are all very

deeply rooted problems that aren't going away soon.

Our families are in trouble and our schools are in trouble. Our entertainment industry is a bad influence. Even the churches are not doing all that they should to properly educate American Christians. Many churches are too influenced by pop psychology and have compromised on important doctrinal and moral issues.

Add to that the continuous arrival of new immigrants who, if they vote, overwhelmingly vote for the Democrats. This process would eventually transform the U.S. into a one-party socialist state. If mass immigration isn't radically reduced, and if the immigrants already here don't assimilate, then the United States as we know it is doomed.

If the Trump Administration could slow the demographic transformation of the U.S., it might give us more time to get our act together. Maybe. We hope.

We also need to be prepared to hold Trump's feet to the fire, in case he wavers in some of his principal campaign pledges. We need to keep a lot of pressure on the U.S. Congress.

And we need to educate our fellow citizens.

Maybe, just maybe, if we do all this, we can slow and hopefully reduce America's decline, and maybe even reverse it.

Thank God for the Donald Trump Triumph, and let's make the best of it. There may not be another such chance.

© 2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

# Allan Wall to America: vote for Trump

American Voter, you have a great opportunity on November 8th. You have the opportunity to choose between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump.

A vote for Hillary Clinton is a vote for the status quo. It's a vote for the same gang of Big Government Globalists who have been running the country. And it's a moving status quo – moving constantly to the left, to a more intrusive Big Government, restrictions of freedom of speech and religion, more mass immigration and more foreign policy interventionism.

A vote for Donald Trump is a vote for an outsider who opposes the direction in which our country is headed.

When outsider Donald Trump tossed his hat into the ring, our ruling class went beserk. Trump was under fire from all sides, from other Republicans, the media and even foreign politicians. The Mexican government was so incensed that it has meddled in our election to impede a Trump triumph.

Yet through it all, Trump has survived politically, and is now on the verge of winning the presidency. If enough of us vote for him.

Trump is a fighter, unlike the two previous Republican candidates. You get the impression that McCain (2008) and Romney (2002) just didn't have the will to fight to win. They seemed willing to lose to Obama.

Not Trump. Trump is a fighter who is not going to let his supporters down. If he loses, he's going down fighting.

What can we expect if Hillary Clinton wins?

Just imagine what Hillary could do on the Supreme Court with



just a few appointments.

With the inordinate power the Supreme Court now has, this may be irreversible. Just think of religious freedom for example, or the right to bear arms, or freedom of speech. It's all in danger.

On the other hand, Donald Trump specifically said he would select Supreme Court justices like the late and lamented Antonin Scalia. Honestly, is there anything else we need to know? For the Supreme Court, we need to elect Trump, or the leftward movement could be irreversible.

Conservative Christians, who are not favorites of the U.S. media, receive more respect from Trump than Hillary Clinton, who thinks that they should change their beliefs to suit her agenda.

On foreign policy, Trump's statements indicate that he doesn't favor more Middle Eastern interventions and "nation building".

The candidate's proposals on the immigration of Muslims indicate that he is moving in the right direction, that he's realizing that the "Religion of Peace" (as Dubya Bush called it) may not be so peaceful.

Trump wants better relations with Russia, which would be a good thing. The Cold War ended twenty-five years ago, after all.

Then there's immigration. In Trump's initial speech, he talked about illegal immigration, and his proposal to build a wall has become a trademark of his campaign. Trump has also taken up the matters of birthright citizenship and legal immigration.

This is very important because everything revolves around immigration. Whatever issue you are concerned about (and there are many) it's related to immigration.

Our country takes in over a million legal immigrants a year, and who knows how many illegal immigrants. Not only does it hurt working-class Americans, but it is changing the country politically.

The majority of immigrants who vote, vote for the Democrats. That's why they are bringing them in! Therefore, if Trump loses in 2016, it is quite possible that the Republican Party (or any party with similar values) will never be able to win a presidential election again!

Once again, for any conservative or constitutionalist this should decide the question right here and now. Hillary wants to amnesty millions of illegals who can be expected to vote Democrat and allow in plenty more.

Donald Trump, on the other hand, has defended ordinary Americans from the mass invasion and has promised to stop illegal immigration and even to calibrate our legal immigration system in favor of the American people.

If Trump loses, the U.S.A. is well on its way to becoming a Third World

One-Party State. You can probably forget about the GOP (or any party with similar values) ever winning a presidential election at the national level again.

That's what's at stake. That's why we need to show up on November 8th and vote. We need to vote for the candidate with the best platform for the future of our nation. Go to the polls on November 8th.

Vote for Trump!

© 2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

# Anti-Trump conservatives – what on earth are they thinking?

The 2016 Presidential election nears its end and the attacks on Trump continue.

And that's totally understandable. Of course leftists, globalists and anti-Americans would oppose a Trump candidacy. I totally get that.

What's harder to explain is the bitter opposition to Trump among some Republicans, conservatives, constitutionalists and Christians. What's going on there?

This election could be a very tight one. Every vote counts. So if enough Republicans vote for another candidate, or withhold their vote, it could cost Trump the election.

So why do some conservatives oppose Trump?

Well, it was a hard-fought Republican presidential primary, with 17 candidates. Some voters were attached to another candidate who didn't win the nomination. Some even continue to say that "XYZ Candidate would do better against Hillary than Trump." But hey, that's all theoretical. It's time to live in the present. Trump is the party candidate.

Some say that Trump is not a true conservative.

Well, it's true that Trump is not a conventional conservative. His background is different, and he didn't work his way up through the traditional routes of being a senator or governor or some such position.

Trump has jumped right into being a candidate by starting at the top – running for president.

As for Trump not being a true conservative, let me ask this question. How many conservative Anti-Trumpers voted for Romney, McCain and the Bush Family? Probably most of them.

I suggest you get past the rhetoric and study up on former Republican presidents George H.W Bush, George W. Bush, and candidates John McCain and Mitt Romney. Frankly, none of these individuals were really all that conservative, and they had many personal and political strikes against them that would disqualify them among the voters.

And yet, Republicans voted for these guys. Why is it suddenly taboo to vote for Trump?

As for the American conservative movement, let's be frank. In recent years it's been an abject failure. It has failed to halt the growth of Big Government, the erosion of personal liberty, and the moral degradation of our society.

It hasn't even protected our borders.

And it's not all incompetence. In many cases, Republicans (and the donors who support the GOP) have intentionally worked against conservative principles.

Look at the Republicans in Congress. It would be hard to find a bigger bunch of collaborators with the liberal Democratic agenda. They boast of their great conservative principles to the rubes back in their states. But they won't effectively oppose the leftist agenda in Washington, and sometimes openly collude with it.

Look at Paul Ryan, the GOP's leader in the House of Representatives. Ryan is an open borders globalist fanatic who has worked to sabotage Trump's candidacy.

Social conservatives have failed to stop same-sex marriage. Is that Trump's fault?

Some say it's a Christian duty to refuse to vote for Trump.

Really?

Whatever the state of Trump's personal faith, Trump is more sympathetic to American Christians and supportive of religious freedom than is Hillary. Can't the Anti-Trump conservatives recognize that?

If Hillary can just put a few justices on the Supreme Court, our freedoms are in danger, including (but not limited to) freedom of speech, freedom of religion and the right to bear arms.

But the conservative No Trumpers would rather feel good about themselves than vote for the good of our country.

Some Anti-Trumpers have this deep-seated resentment of Donald Trump. They need to grow up and get over it.

Remember, this is not a junior high popularity contest. It's not just about Trump the man. It's about Trump the candidate versus Hillary the candidate, and what their respective candidacies mean to the future of the country.

Consider immigration. Everything revolves around immigration. That's because most immigrants who vote cast their ballots for the Democrats.

So if mass immigration (legal and illegal) continues, the government will become a one-party state. The GOP (or any party with similar purported values) will not be able to win national elections.

That's what we're talking about, the future of our country, of your children and grandchildren. So yes, this election of is enormous importance.

It's time to vote for a chance to preserve our country, our constitution, our religious freedom. If Hillary wins, you can forget about all that. And nobody can stop Hillary but Trump.

That's why the Mainstream Media is doing everything it can to stop Trump. And we can't let them do that.

Vote for Trump!

© 2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

## **Pope Francis visits Poland, scolds poles who don't want their country invaded**

I'm not a Catholic, but I do appreciate the importance of the Papacy in Western history. And I would admire a pope who would defend Western Civilization, traditional values and Christendom.

Apparently, Pope Francis is not that guy. The Argentine Pope steadfastly refuses to fault Islam in any way, shape or fashion for the recent spate of Islamic terror attacks on the European continent and beyond.

This stubbornness was on blatant display on the Pope's recent visit to Poland, a country which is still attempting to defend its sovereignty.

Ironically, the Polish government may be the most pro-Catholic government in Europe. But it doesn't matter to this Pope, who for some inscrutable reason wants Poland to open its gates to the Muslim masses.

The expression "More Catholic Than the Pope" might well be an apt description of Poland's ruling Law and Justice party, which currently enjoys a majority in both houses of the Polish

parliament.

Law and Justice is a pro-Catholic party, and its policies exemplify Catholic social teachings. Law and Justice opposes abortion and the homosexual agenda, and it also supports universal health care.

So naturally, when the current Pope Francis visited Poland, he had to scold the Polish government for its opposition to being swamped by Muslim “refugees”.

Looking at Polish history, one might sympathize with a strong Polish aversion to being invaded.

In 1939, in the now mostly-forgotten secret protocol of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, Hitler and Stalin divvied up Poland. The Nazis invaded from the west and the Communists from the east.

Going back a few hundred years, in the 18th century Poland was partitioned between Russia, Prussia, and Austria and ceased to exist as a national entity for over a century.

So yes, it’s totally understandable that Poles don’t want to be invaded by Muslims.

As the Daily Mail reported, “Pope Francis has urged Poland’s leaders to ‘overcome fear’ and welcome desperate migrants fleeing conflict and hardship. In his first speech in the city of Krakow, at the start of his five-day visit to the country, the Pontiff said opening doors to migrants requires ‘great wisdom and compassion’. Francis chastised the right-wing Law and Justice government for refusing to share the burden during Europe’s worst refugee crisis since World War II.” (Source: Pope Francis slams Polish government and demands they admit more refugees who are fleeing the horrors of war Jake Polden, Daily Mail, 27 July 2016)

One might point out to the pontiff that if the goal is really

to aid real Middle Eastern refugees, it is cheaper to help them in the Middle East than move them elsewhere. If your goal, however, is to transform Europe (and America) then it would be logical to import Middle Eastern refugees.

According to the Daily Mail, "Fears run deep in the strongly Catholic nation that Muslim refugees could endanger its security and erode its Christian traditions." Well, duh.

And the Mail reported this profound quote from Pope Francis, which ought to rank up there with the sayings of the great doctors of the church: "In Poland, the Pope declared that 'We must not be afraid to say the truth, the world is at war because it has lost peace.'

Pope Francis followed that up with this little gem: "When I speak of war I speak of wars over interests, money, resources, not religion. All religions want peace, it's the others who want war."

The Pope said that "Needed is a spirit of readiness to welcome those fleeing from wars and hunger, and solidarity with those deprived of their fundamental rights, including the right to profess one's faith in freedom and safety."

Once again, true Middle Eastern refugees can be helped in the region. There's no need to bring them to Europe. And, when you Islamicize a society, then "the right to profess one's faith in freedom and safety" is in danger. If Pope Francis really supports religious freedom, he ought to be aware of that.

Poland's President Andrzej Duda, according to the Daily Mail article, "did appear to signal a softening of Warsaw's stance following closed-door talks with the Pope". Duda said that "If someone wants to come here, especially if they are a refugee, fleeing war to save their life, we will of course accept them." Well, I hope President Duda isn't planning to go full Merkel over this.



Coincidentally, The Daily Mail also reported that on July 25th, Polish authorities had “charged an Iraqi man...with possessing trace amounts of explosive material.”

Consider that, out of a total population of over 38 million, Poland has an estimated 31,000 Muslims, with about two-thirds of them of the Lipka Tatar ethnicity which has resided there for centuries and is well-integrated.

So how prudent is it for Poland to start bringing in hordes of “refugees”?

On the 31st of July, Pope Francis spoke to a mass rally of 1.5 million youth. As the Associated Press reports, “Pope Francis told young people who flocked by the hundreds of thousands to his words Sunday that they need to ‘believe in a new humanity’ stronger than evil, and cautioned against concluding that one religion is more violent than others.” (Source: POPE TO YOUNG ON POLAND TRIP: BELIEVE ‘IN A NEW HUMANITY’ Frances D’Emilio, Associated Press, 31 July, 2016)

That sounds more like New Age mumbo jumbo than traditional Catholic doctrine. Indeed, in that speech Francis started to sound more like John Lennon than St. John.

Quote the Pope, “People may judge you to be dreamers, because you believe in a new humanity, one that rejects hatred between peoples, one that refuses to see borders as barriers and can cherish its own traditions without being self-centered or small-minded.”

Actually, Pope Francis, borders are by definition barriers.

According to the AP, Francis went “...to a church in Krakow, where he prayed that God protect the world from the ‘devastating wave’ of terrorism.”

So Francis prays for protection from terrorism while he urges Europeans to bring in more Muslims?

On the way back to the Vatican, some reporters on the plane tried to put him on the spot.

As reported by the AP, "Flying back to Rome Sunday night from Krakow, [Pope Francis] was asked by reporters why he has never used the word 'Islam' when denouncing terrorist attacks. Francis said he thinks 'it's not right to identify Islam with violence.' He added that every religion has its "little group of fundamentalists.'" He said that if he speaks of violent Islam, he'd have to speak of violent Catholicism, since Catholics kill, too. [See A.W. Morgan's excellent refutation of that argument [here](#).] Referring to Isis, also known as Islamic State group, Francis said it 'presents itself with its violent identity card, but it's not Islam.' "

The Caliph of the Islamic State, Abu Bakr al -Baghdadi, reportedly has a PhD in the study of the Koran, the source book of Islamic doctrine. But we're to believe that Pope Francis knows more about Islam than Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi?

Although Francis tells Europeans how they need to open the floodgates to Middle Eastern Muslims, the Pope himself has very good security while traveling.

According to the AP, "When the pope travels, a corps of Vatican bodyguards travels with him, running alongside his popemobile or scrutinizing crowds along the route. At Sunday's Mass, several Polish police vans followed the pope's open-sided popemobile as he rode through the wide flat meadow in the middle of hundreds of thousands of pilgrims. Motorcycle police rode close to metal barriers keeping the crowd away."

Wait a minute Francis, what about that "new humanity" you were lecturing the young Poles about? What about that "refusing to see borders as barriers"? You actually had a barrier between yourself and the friendly crowd you were talking to!

Surely all European Catholic clergy can't be living in La La land like Pope Francis?

Well, no, they aren't. In fact, that previously-cited Daily Mail article reported that "Christopher Lamb in Catholic weekly newspaper The Tablet added that many of Poland's bishops are 'at odds with the direction of his papacy.' "

Several days after Pope Francis' Polish trip, Gyula Marfi, Archbishop of Veszprem in Hungary, was interviewed, revealing a European Catholic clergymen whose view of Islam is radically different from that of the Pope.

Archbishop Marfi asserted that the Muslims' "will to conquer" is a key factor in the current influx into Europe. (Source: Archbishop Warns Europe Migration Crisis Fueled by Muslims' 'Will to Conquer' Thomas D. Williams, PhD., Breitbart, Aug. 3, 2016)

Archbishop Marfi was even asked about the Pope's approach, and he said that the Pope didn't criticize Islam so as not to endanger Christians in the Middle East. There might be something to that. But Pope Francis' comments go beyond not criticizing Islam. The current pontiff goes out of his way to justify Islam and its invasion of Europe, suggesting there is something else going on there.

Anyway, Archbishop Marfi's comments displayed understanding of the topic and a loyalty to Christendom and Western Civilization.

Some relevant comments by the Archbishop:

Migration Cause and Purpose "Migration does not only have causes, it also has a purpose such as the destabilization of Europe and the Euro."

Jihad and Shariah – "Jihad is a principle for Muslims that means they must expand. The earth must become dar al-Islam, that is, Islamic territory, by introducing Shariah-Islamic law."

On Muslim Morality: “I have never dishonored the Muslims but their morals are completely different from ours. What for us is a sin, for them is a virtue.”

Christian Love – “...just because we love the wolves, as God’s creatures, doesn’t mean we let them enter among the sheep, even if they come in sheep’s clothing...Jesus told us to be as gentle as doves, but also as astute as serpents.”

Archbishop Marfi has a good understanding of the situation and when it comes to the “refugee” question, it would be more advantageous for Europeans to listen to the Archbishop than the Pope.

© 2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

## **Did Donald Trump call a U.S. Judge a “Mexican” as an insult?**

The Donald Trump campaign continues to evoke controversy. But in order to really understand what is going on, one must often dig below the surface, because you may not get the full story from the Mainstream Media.

For example, Trump has been criticized, even within the GOP, of asserting that Gonzalo Curiel, a U.S. judge of Mexican ancestry is not going to give him a fair shake in the currently pending “Trump University” case.

Not only that, but Trump has been accused of using the term “Mexican” as a slur in his criticism of Judge Curiel.

A recent piece on the Associated Press, by Russell Contreras is entitled: "Trump's 'Mexican' Label Against Judge Brings Up Word's History". The article was published June 18th, 2016.

The Contreras piece begins thusly: "Presumptive GOP nominee Donald Trump referred to a U.S.-born federal judge as a 'Mexican' and saw a backlash, even from other Republicans."

Judge Curiel, it's important to point out, is a member of the San Diego La Raza Lawyers Association. The La Raza ideology has no place in American jurisprudence and no American judge should be a member.

(For more on the "La Raza" concept, see my previous article entitled: "Yes, La Raza Really Does Mean "The Race" – And The Idea Was Invented By a Nazi Sympathizer".)

The goal of the San Diego La Raza Lawyers Association is "to promote the interests of the Latino communities throughout the state." Isn't the goal of a federal judge to judge all Americans fairly?

Furthermore, the National Hispanic Bar Association, parent organization of San Diego La Raza Lawyers, has called for a boycott of all Trump business enterprises. So how can Trump expect fair treatment from this judge?

So why isn't the Mainstream Media pointing all this out? Oh, right, that would be journalism and not agenda-driven propaganda.

As for the Contreras article, it ignores the La Raza activism context and attempts to link Trump's statement to other incidents and unrelated historical situations.

For example, it discusses

1. "A black Democratic lawmaker" calling New Mexico Governor Susana Martinez a "Mexican".
2. A coach of the New Jersey Nets calling a Hispanic reporter

a “Mexican idiot”.

3. A 1954 Supreme Court case.

What’s that all have to do with Trump?

Contreras says that the term ‘Mexican’ “has been used as a slur against U.S.-born Latinos as a way to dehumanize them and dismiss them as foreigners, according to scholars and those who’ve been targeted by the loaded word.”

Well, Contreras is getting into a bigger issue than there might be space for in an AP article. Some Mexican-Americans refer to themselves as “Mexicans”. Is that bad?

It might be, if they identify more with Mexico than with the United States.

In Mexico they see all people of Mexican descent in the United States as Mexicans, as essentially Mexican regardless of citizenship. In recent years, as I’ve pointed out in various articles, the Mexican government has begun to attempt to gain the loyalty and maintain the loyalty of Mexican-Americans as a way of exercising hegemony over the United States. It’s conquest through demographics.

The Contreras article trots out the testimony of Alexandro Jose Gradilla, “a Chicana and Chicano Studies professor at California State University, Fullerton”.

The name “Gradilla” rang a bell, and I looked it up. Sure enough. I’ve quoted this professor before. Gradilla earlier declared that Ted Cruz is not a real “Latino” because he’s not down with the struggle in Gradilla’s eyes. (See my previous article “Un-American Activities – What Marco Rubio’s Latino Activist Friends Really Want, Etc.”)

So bear in mind that Professor Gradillo thinks he has the authority to declare who is and who is not, based on a political agenda, a real “Latino”. Now he’s going to tell us

the true import of Trump calling a judge a “Mexican”.

Contreras quotes Dr. Gradilla on the matter,

GRADILLA QUOTE:

Alexandro Jose Gradilla, a Chicana and Chicano Studies professor at California State University, Fullerton, said the way the word “Mexican” was used to describe a Mexican-American judge likely helped fuel the widespread criticism “Donald Trump’s use of the term represents the long history of the word in the U.S.,” Gradilla said. “‘Mexican’ was often a stand-in for one of many closely related epithet targeting Mexican-Americans.”

That’s because the term “Mexican” often was tossed at Mexican-Americans to remind them that whites didn’t think they belonged in the country or were part of the nation’s history, especially after the U.S.-Mexico War, Gradilla said.

“That’s what Trump is playing with when he described (Curiel) as simply a ‘Mexican,’” Gradilla said.

END GRADILLA QUOTE

The Contreras article also quotes another academic with an agenda, Michelle Tellez, who is “a Mexican-American Studies professor at the University of Arizona”. She complained about the use of “Mexican” in reference to Mexican-Americans, and complains about having been called a “Mexican” growing up in San Diego. “It’s a reminder that we don’t belong.” Well, do you?

The Contreras article closed out with this ominous statement from an economically successful and famous Mexican-American, Steven Michael Quezada. Quezada is an Albuquerque-born Mexican-American actor who portrayed a DEA agent in the Breaking Bad series and is now getting into politics.

Quoth Quezada, who resides in Albuquerque, “At the end of the

day, we're Mexican. I'm Mexican. After all, this was all once Mexico."

Quezada seems to be expressing the sort of sentiments found in the irredentist/reconquista ideologies, of which there are several. (See [here](#))

So, big surprise, the Mainstream Media, and their partners in the Mexican Mainstream Media, are going to slam on Trump over this Curiel statement, but not get into the deeper issues involved.

But Trump shouldn't let the Multicultural Left set the agenda. As he's already been doing on other issues, Trump should continue to inject formerly taboo issues into the political discourse.

If I had Donald Trump's undivided attention, I would advise the candidate (and his staff) to get up to snuff on the reconquista movement, dual citizenship, the La Raza ideology and Mexico's blatant meddling through dual citizenship and its consular network. Trump should start talking about this stuff in his speeches.

What about Mexican-American voters? Trump should neither pander nor insult, he should invite Mexican-American voters to identify as Americans and vote accordingly.

As for loyal Americans of Mexican descent, they have nothing to be offended about here. If they consider themselves Americans, and are thinking of the interests of Americans when they vote, they ought to be voting for Trump. And, as we've pointed out before, there are a number of Mexican-descended Trump supporters.

But Mexicans and Mexican-Americans who wave Mexican flags outside Trump rallies and attack Trump supporters are not showing loyalty to the United States and our political traditions. These people ought to be sent back to Mexico where



they can wave the Mexican flag and glory in their Mexican identity 24/7, to their hearts' content.

After all, isn't that what different countries are for?

© 2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

# **Will “Brexit” lead to a british department from the european union?**

While the United States is already engaged in an exciting presidential campaign, across the Atlantic, our British cousins are scheduled to vote in an important referendum, “Brexit”, on June 23rd, 2016.

The big question is whether to stay in or get out of the 28-country-member European Union.

No nation has ever withdrawn from the European Union. Should the United Kingdom (UK) successfully do so, it might actually inspire citizens of other member states to organize referendums also.

Needless to say, the Eurocrats and globalists are not keen on Brexit and are hoping it fails.

The election is scheduled to take place on June 23rd in the United Kingdom and the small British territory of Gibraltar in the Mediterranean.

Who is eligible to vote? According to a BBC article, eligible voters are “British, Irish and Commonwealth citizens over 18

who are a BBC article resident in the UK, along with UK nationals living abroad who have been on the electoral register in the UK in the past 15 years. Members of the House of Lords and Commonwealth citizens in Gibraltar will also be eligible, unlike in a general election. Citizens from EU countries – apart from Ireland, Malta and Cyprus – will not get a vote.”

For the voters on that fateful day, there is one simple question on the ballot: “Should the United Kingdom remain a member of the European Union or leave the European Union?”

There are only two options: “Remain a member of the European Union” or “Leave the European Union”.

If the “Leave” option wins, that doesn’t mean that the UK will immediately exit the EU. There are issues to negotiate. And forces within both the UK and the European Union may still try to derail an exit.

But it would mean that the British electorate has spoken and wants out.

It’s controversial, and people are speaking out. And I don’t just mean British people, you know, the actual people who are supposed to be voting in this referendum.

The German Foreign Minister warned that such an exit could inflame relations between Britain and the Republic of Ireland (another EU member).

But Britain and the Republic of Ireland have their own relationship and even share a peaceful land border. British-Irish relations don’t depend upon the European Union at all. So that’s a red herring.

Not to be outdone, Donald Tusk, Polish-born president of the “European Council” has apocalyptically warned that by just voting on the issue, Britain is threatening “Western political

civilisation”.

Wow. Just voting on an issue could destroy Western political civilisation? I thought that voting was part of Western political civilization!

(By the way, “civilisation” and “civilization” are variant spellings of the same word, going back to Oxford University’s preference for –z and Cambridge University’s preference for –s).

Here’s more of what President Tusk said, “As a historian I fear Brexit could be the beginning of the destruction of not only the EU but also Western political civilisation in its entirety.”

Douglas Carswell, British Member of Parliament belonging to UKIP, the United Kingdom Independence Party, responded to Tusk by asking “Why hasn’t Western civilisation come to an end already seeing as how most countries are self governing?”

Minister of State for Employment Priti Patel (the first Hindu woman elected to the British parliament) said “This is extraordinary language from the EU president, and serves only to reveal his own desperation. The only thing that is destroying civilisations is the euro , which has ruined economies and led to youth unemployment soaring to nearly 50% in southern Europe.”

(The UK never adopted the euro currency and still has its own currency, the pound sterling).

Our own President Obama weighed in on Brexit, declaring in a visit that Britain shouldn’t leave the European Union.

Donald Trump thinks Britain would be better off leaving the EU, but hastened to add that “I want them to make their own decision.”

Hysterical warnings that a British departure would hurt the

country's international trade seem unlikely. After all, Britain was an international trading nation centuries before the EU even existed. There are plenty of countries Britain already trades with outside Europe.

A British exit from the EU could allow the country more of a say in its own future. For one thing, it could obtain better control of its immigration policy.

In one word, Brexit is about independence.

June 23rd – the big day for Brexit.

© 2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

## **Donald Trump, the Pope, Mexico, walls and bridges**

Pope Francis has just made his first official papal visit to Mexico.

Pope Francis is the first pontiff from the Jesuit order, and was born Jorge Mario Bergoglio in Argentina to an Italian-immigrant father and a mother whose family is of Italian origin.

Pope Francis continues the tradition recent popes to make papal visits to various countries.

The previous pontiff, Pope Benedict XVI (2005-2013) visited Mexico in 2012.

The pope before Benedict was John Paul II (1978-2005) who traveled so much that he was seen in person by more human

beings than anybody else in history. John Paul II visited Mexico five times and seems to have had a special bond with the Mexican people.

Nevertheless, despite all the hoopla over papal visits, the Mexican Catholic church is in decline. It's declining as a proportion of the population, it's declining in its influence and it can't recruit enough Mexican priests.

Currently, about four out of five Mexicans claim to be Catholic but it's been estimated that only about a quarter of Mexicans are serious practicing Catholics.

Still, it's impossible to understand Mexican history and traditional Mexican culture without understanding Catholicism, and even nominal Catholicism still has a lot of cultural power. A pope can still draw the multitudes in Mexico.

Pope Francis visited Mexico from February 12th to 18th, and spent time in Mexico City, Morelia, Chiapas and Chihuahua, thus traveling from one end of the country to the other.

The last full day in Mexico the pontiff held a mass on the Mexican side of the U.S.-Mexican border, where he decried the humanitarian crisis on the border.

After departing Mexico, Trump was interviewed on the plane and was asked about Donald Trump's candidacy in the United States. In reply, Pope Francis had this to say: "A person who thinks only about building walls, wherever they may be, and not building bridges, is not Christian. This is not the gospel."

Whether we look at this statement from a Christian or political perspective, it's rather problematic.

In the first place, I'm not aware of the Pope speaking in this way of any other public figure. Who else has he called "not Christian"?

The Pope's "walls and bridges" statement is not derived from

the Bible or Catholic catechism. It's a lightweight and incoherent slogan.

Surely the Pope must be aware of the distinction Jesus Christ set forth between human and divine government, expressed in the reply to the question about tribute paid to Caesar. (See Matthew 22:15-22).

Civil governments have the responsibility to protect the inhabitants of their earthly nation-states. Such functions include enforcing criminal law, maintaining military forces and protecting borders.

As for walls and bridges, both are useful and both have their proper functions.

The purpose of the church is not to carry out the responsibilities of earthly governments. The purpose of the church is to advance the Kingdom of God.

Why doesn't Pope Francis put more pressure on Latin American clergy to take care of poor Latin Americans in their own countries? That would be better than encouraging Mexicans and Central Americans to travel illegally to the United States.

U.S. immigration policy is a constant target in Latin America. However, consider this. The U.S. has half the population of Latin America (and less land). Nevertheless, the U.S. has taken in six times the amount of immigrants as all of Latin America (and 24 times the amount as the Pope's native Argentina). Yet they stil complain.

Furthermore, how can the Pope rail against walls when the Vatican itself is surrounded by walls? The Vatican doesn't have an open borders policy, does it? The Vatican is protected by armed guards, as is the Pope himself when he travels.

In an excellent piece published on The American Thinker, Silvio Canto, Jr. points out that on his visit to Cuba, Pope

Francis “...hugged and embraced Raúl Castro, a man who has executed priests, harassed religious leaders, and closed Christian schools years ago. Did he call the Castro brothers un-Christian?” (Click [here](#) for Silvio’s article.)

The day after the Pope’s comments, Vatican spokesman Federico Lombardi said in an interview that the Pope was not attacking Candidate Trump and was not telling people how to vote.

I doubt this is the last time we can expect to hear from the Vatican (a walled city-state) on this topic.

© 2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

## Donald Trump and Mexico

On June 16th, 2015, flamboyant billionaire Donald J. Trump announced his run for the U.S. presidency, and the U.S. political world has not been the same since.

In Mexico, the Trump candidacy unleashed a firestorm of criticism.

Within minutes of Trump’s June 16th announcement speech, Mexico’s paper of record El Universal had an article on its website about it.

Trump was soon lambasted by Mexican politicians, ex-politicians, officials, journalists and celebrities.

Yuriria Sierra of Mexico’s Excelsior called Trump ese hitlercillo del siglo XXI (“that Little Hitler of the 21st century”).

Mexican actor Gael Garcia Bernal proclaimed that Trump’s

discourse is “hate discourse, and what follows next is genocide or civil war. I mean, that’s how it begins.”

Mexican director Alejandro Gonzalez Inarritu also weighed in against Trump.

Former Mexican president Vicente Fox, visiting Los Angeles, took a shot at Trump. That’s ironic. If any Mexican politician is similar to Trump in background and style, it would be Vicente Fox.

Felipe Calderon, another former president, also got in his two cents’ worth of Trump-bashing.

The Trump candidacy inspired the production and sale of Donald Trump pinatas (just a few days after his announcement) and Donald Trump masks were doing a brisk business in mid-October.

The Mexican video game company Karaokulta developed a game called Trumpéalo in which the player throws shoes, beer bottles and nopal cacti at Donald Trump.

Mexican writer Enrique Krauze and Cuban-born Carmelo Mesa-Lago (now at the University of Pittsburgh) organized an anti-Trump Manifesto, subtly entitled Declaración de Intelectuales, Científicos y Académicos Hispanos contra Xenofobia de Trump (“Declaration of Intellectuals, Scientists, and Academic Hispanics Against The Xenophobia of Trump”). The document had 67 signers, from Latin America, Spain and the United States.

In December, Mexico’s Ambassador to the United States, Miguel Basanez, announced on U.S. soil a plan to help 3 million Mexicans resident in the U.S. become U.S. citizens so they can vote. The announced plan was for private sector businesses to loan money to the Mexicans so they can register for naturalization.

Three months earlier, the ambassador had spoken of dual U.S./Mexican citizens voting against Trump, so it seems



obvious this registration plan is a way to combat the Trump candidacy.

And thus it goes on and on....

Having resided in Mexico and being familiar with the Mexican political/media world, I don't find this reaction very surprising. After all, the Mexican elite believes that the U.S. border with Mexico should be wide open and all Mexicans have a right to enter the U.S. with full benefits. Anything less is considered a grave crime against humanity.

Any proposal to tighten the American border with Mexico is going to be met with hysterical shrieks throughout the Mexican chattering class.

Certainly, Trump has offended many with his blunt way of talking. On the other hand, the American political establishment needs some shaking up.

Trump's blunt talk has made it easier to talk about formerly taboo subjects, topics that had previously been swept under the rug by the bipartisan consensus and the media.

Such topics include the link between crime and illegal immigration, birthright citizenship and the relationship between Islamic immigration and terrorism. These are all topics worthy of discussion and Americans have a right to discuss them.

Trump has discussed outsourcing and the national debt. And his foreign policy indicates a willingness to adopt a more conciliatory tone in dealings with Russia.

Despite being a billionaire, Donald Trump has a great ability to connect with ordinary Americans. As a candidate, he's been successful in winning over many potential voters who didn't even vote last time around. One poll even indicated that 20% of Democrats would be willing to vote for Trump.

So yes, Donald Trump could actually win the Republican nomination and after that, the presidency next November.

If the American people choose Trump as their president, Mexico is just going to have to get used to it.

And I really doubt that, in the long run, a Trump presidency would be bad for Mexico.

Let's say a President Trump really did shut down illegal crossings on the U.S.-Mexican border.

That would actually make the border region safer.

And it might even encourage Mexico and other Latin American countries to stop using the emigration as an economic strategy and instead to enact better economic reforms.

The Trump border policy, in other words, might be "tough love" for Mexico.

2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

## **The world's fifty most murderous cities**

The study of homicide statistics is a morbid undertaking, because the analyst is dealing with numbers that represent real people who were homicide victims.

So why pore over such statistics? It's the hope that the discovery of patterns and trends might help in the reduction of homicides.

There are various ways to crunch the numbers. You can compare

and contrast homicide rates by country or by divisions within a country. (See Looking at Mexico's Latest Homicide Stats and those of others in the Americas).

Another way is to list the statistics by city.

A Mexican NGO called the Consejo Ciudadano para la Seguridad Pública y Justicia Penal, A.C. (Citizen Council for Public Security and Penal Justice), whose president is Jose Antonio Ortega Sanchez, released a list of the world's 50 cities with the highest homicide rates in 2015.

In order to be on the list, the city must have at least 300,000 inhabitants. The ranking is based on homicide rates calculated per 100,000 inhabitants. (Cities in war zones are not included in the ranking).

Of the 50 most murderous cities, 41 are in Latin America. (In last year's list, 47 were).

The country with the most cities on the "Top Fifty" list was Brazil, with 21, which is up from 19 last year's.

Venezuela was in second place with 8 cities on the list (double from 4 last year). Mexico was in third place with five of the world's most murderous cities, which is half of last year's Mexican city tally of ten.

The United States and South Africa were tied at four cities each, followed by Colombia with 3, Honduras with 2 and El Salvador, Guatemala and Jamaica with 1 city apiece.

Caracas, Venezuela, was the world's murder capital with a rate of 119.87 homicides per 100,000 inhabitants.

Caracas replaced San Pedro Sula, which had been the world's murder capital for four years straight. In this year's tally, San Pedro Sula is in second place with a homicide rate of 111.03 per 100,000.

The third most murderous city was San Salvador, the capital of El Salvador, with a homicide rate of 108.54 per 100,000. That's not much higher than the murder rate for the whole country of El Salvador, 103 per 100,000.

The fourth most murderous city, and Mexico's highest ranked city, is Acapulco, on the Pacific Coast, with 104.73 homicides per 100,000 inhabitants.

Maturin, Venezuela was #5; followed by Tegucigalpa Distrito Central, Honduras at #6; Valencia, Venezuela at #7; Palmira, Colombia at #8; Cape Town, South Africa at #9 and Cali, Colombia at #10.

Mexico has five cities on the Top 50 list:

1. Just as last year, Acapulco was the Mexican city with the highest homicide rate, #4 on the list, with a murder rate of 104.73 homicides per 100,000 inhabitants.
2. Just as last year, the second most murderous city in Mexico was Culiacan, capital of the western state of Sinaloa. Culiacan was #17 on the world list, with 56.09 homicides per 100,000, an increase from 42 per 100,000 last year.
3. The border city of Tijuana was #3 in Mexico, and #35 on the world list, with a homicide rate of 39.09 per 100,000.
4. In 46th place on the world list was Ciudad Victoria, capital of the northeastern state of Tamaulipas, with a homicide rate of 30.50 per 100,000.
5. The fiftieth most murderous city on the Top Fifty list was Ciudad Obregon, in the northern state of Sonora. It had a homicide rate of 28.29 per 100,000.

Five Mexican cities dropped off the Top Fifty list this year: Chihuahua, Cuernavaca, Juarez, Nuevo Laredo and Tlaxcala.

As for the United States of America, it has four cities on the list: They are:

1. St. Louis, Missouri, #15 worldwide, with a homicide rate of

59.23 per 100,000.

2. Baltimore, Maryland, #19, with a homicide rate of 54.98.
3. Detroit, Michigan, #28, with a rate of 43.89.
4. New Orleans, #32, with a homicide rate of 41.44.

Note that St. Louis has a higher homicide rate than any city in Mexico with the exception of Acapulco.

As for Baltimore, Detroit and New Orleans, each has a higher homicide rate than any city in Mexico except for Acapulco and Culiacan.

To see the list on its original website, [click here](#). To see an English-language report on the list, see Britain's Daily Mail article on it [here](#).

2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

## **Sean Penn gets mixed up in the Chapo Guzman case**

Hollywood actors make lots of money pretending to be other people. But movie star Sean Penn has become part of a news story himself.

In a bizarre truth-is-stranger-than-fiction scenario, Sean Penn involved himself in – and may have inadvertently led to the capture of – Mexican drug lord Chapo Guzman.

In case any of our readers weren't aware of it, Joaquin "Chapo" Guzman Loera, billionaire drug lord of Mexico's Sinaloa Cartel, has been captured for the third time.

To back up a few decades, in 1993 Guzman was captured in

Guatemala, extradited to Mexico and sentenced to prison for a twenty-year term. In 2001, Chapo escaped from the Jalisco state's Puente Grande prison.

In February of 2014, Chapo was captured in Mazatlan, without a shot being fired. (See Mexican Drug Lord 'Chapo' Guzman Captured in Mazatlan, Sinaloa and Mexican Drug Lord 'El Chapo' Guzman remains in the Limelight).

Then, in July of 2015, Chapo escaped from Mexico's Federal Social Readaptation Center No. 1 "Altiplano" the famous prison near Almoloya in the state of Mexico. Chapo escaped through a mile-long tunnel, the construction of which had been going on for quite some time and right under the noses of prison authorities. That of course strongly indicates some heavy-duty collusion with some prison officials.

That escape was especially embarrassing to Mexican president Enrique Pena Nieto, who was out of the country at the time. (See Our 2015 Summer Visit to Mexico and Could Mexico's Escaped Drug Baron Chapo Guzman be Back Home?)

On January 8th, 2016, Chapo was captured by the Mexican Navy in the city of Los Mochis, Sinaloa. This time it was a real shootout, with five of Chapo's henchmen killed and a Mexican marine wounded. Besides Guzman, six other prisoners were taken.

(Click [here](#) for a helmet cam video of part of the operation, in a house from which Chapo escaped before being captured later).

On the evening of the next day, my wife and I were watching a report of the capture on the Univision channel. And they began talking about Sean Penn. Sean Penn?

Yes, that Sean Penn, star of various movies through the year and sometime political activist. That Sean Penn.

It emerged that, back in October, Sean Penn traveled to Mexico along with Kate Castillo, dual citizen Mexican/U.S. actress currently residing in LA. They secretly met with Chapo Guzman.

Sean Penn wanted to interview Chapo for an article in Rolling Stone. They ate together, and agreed to a formal interview later. As it turned out, the formal interview was later done, not in person by Sean Penn, but by means of a BBM device.

Fast forward to January 8th, when Chapo was captured. The very next day, Sean Penn's Rolling Stone article (including the interview) was published with an update about the capture.

That might indicate that either Sean Penn or Rolling Stone either wasn't ready to publish it or was waiting to publish it. I suppose when the news of Chapo's capture came out, they figured they better publish it right away when the story was hot.

If you'd like to see Sean Penn's article and judge it for yourself, [click here](#). Sean Penn describes in detail how the meeting was set up, how he and Kate and a few others went to Mexico, how they were taken to see Chapo, and of course various personal reflections of Sean Penn and the drug war in general. Although entitled "El Chapo Speaks", the article really has more of Sean Penn than Chapo Guzman.

And, if you want you can Watch El Chapo's Exclusive Interview in Its 17-Minute Entirety, just click the hyper-link. It's a video of Chapo Guzman outside, answering Sean Penn's questions. These questions had been sent by BBM device, translated into Spanish, and posed to Chapo by a Spanish-speaker offscreen. English subtitles are provided.

Throughout the video there are distractions: people and a dog walking in the background, the sounds of background conversation, a machine and a frequently-crowing rooster.

Ironically, Sean Penn says in his article that he didn't want

to betray Chapo's whereabouts to authorities. But according to Mexican officials, it was precisely the visit of Sean Penn and Kate del Castillo to Mexico that helped them to locate and later capture the drug lord. Sean Penn denies this, but how can he know for sure?

2016 Allan Wall – All Rights Reserved

---

# Allan Wall Archive 2008 – 2015

- [Musings on the Republican Presidential Race](#), 11-27-15
- [Donald Trump's Immigration Reform Plan](#), 8-19-15
- [Supreme Court Makes Same-Sex Marriage The Law of the Entire Land](#), 7-6-15
- [Mexico's 2015 Mid-Term Elections Are Held](#), 6-17-15
- [Will the Supreme Court Make Same-Sex Marriage Law of the Land?](#), 4-30-15
- [Mexico's Mid-Terms Scheduled For June](#), 3-28-15
- [Ten Mexican Cities 'and 4 American Cities' Make the Top 50 Most Murderous Cities List](#), 2-15-15
- [U.S. Cuba Policy and My Recent Visit to the Island](#), 1-10-15
- [Obama Prepares Unilateral Amnesty of Illegal Aliens](#), 11-19-14
- [Mexican Open-Borders Billionaire Carlos Slim, Again World's Richest Man](#), 10-23-14
- [Chick-Fil-A Chickens out](#), 9-19-14
- [2014 World Cup Now History, Germany Wins](#), 7-22-14
- [The 2014 Soccer World Cup is About to Begin](#), 6-11-14
- [Mexico's Carlos Slim no Longer World's Wealthiest Man](#), 5-9-14



- [The Schumer Proposal, the Spanish-Language Media and the Republican Party](#), 2-18-14
- [How Will the 2014 Winter Olympics Turn Out?](#), 2-1-14
- [Our Christmastime Visit to Mexico and the Hobbit](#), 1-13-14
- [Mexican Congress Approves Revolutionary Energy and Election Reforms](#), 12-20-13
- [Mexican Fiscal Reform Goes to the Dogs](#), 11-7-13
- [Why Mexican Governors are Gung-Ho for Open Borders](#), 10-8-13
- [Doma and the Regularization of Same-Sex Marriage](#), 8-30-13
- [Mexico's Elite Root for Amnesty and Rave About a Border Fence](#), 7-9-13
- [Amnesty Must be Defeated – How You Can Help](#), 6-18-13
- [Obama Takes Pro-Amnesty Road Show South of the Border](#), 5-18-13
- [What Can be Accomplished in the 2016 Election?](#), 4-10-13
- [The Mexican Drug War](#), 3-23-13
- [Obama's Amnesty Plan and What it Means](#), 1-19-13
- [Maya Calendar End-of-the-World Hysteria](#), 12-19-12
- [Enrique Pena Nieto Now the President of Mexico](#), 12-7-12
- [Why Romney Lost](#), 11-17-12
- [Voting For Mitt Romney](#), 11-6-12
- [Focus on the Family Betrays Families and Its Own Principles](#), 9-19-12
- [Chick-Fil-A Versus the Radical Gay Agenda](#), 8-3-12
- [Mexican Election is Over, the PRI's Pena Nieto Wins it](#), 7-10-12
- [Mexican Presidential Candidates and Their Promises](#), 6-15-12
- [The Mexican Election of 2012](#), 5-28-12
- [Titanic and its Centennial](#), 4-20-12
- [Travel Warnings and Visiting Mexico](#), 3-16-12
- [2012 Also an Election Year South of the Border](#)Â 2-15-12
- [The King James Version and its 400th Anniversary](#)Â 12-24-11

- [Remembering Reagan](#)Â 12-11-11
- [Strife in Syria: Let's not get Involved](#)Â 12-2-11
- [Illegal Alien Driver's License in the Land of Enchantment](#)Â 11-24-11
- [Sinaloa Cartel and Zetas Now Mexico's Biggest Drug Gangs](#)Â 10-30-11
- [Drug Threat Assessment Paints Pessimistic Future](#)Â 10-18-11
- [Social Media Meets the Mexican Drug War](#)Â 10-4-11
- [What is Alabama's Immigration Law?](#)Â 9-7-11
- [Scores Die in Monterrey, Mexico's Casino Royale](#)Â 8-30-11
- [Numbers USA Rates the Candidates on Immigration](#)Â 8-7-11
- [Our Family's Summer 2011 Trip to Mexico](#)Â 7-22-11
- [US – Mexico Soccer Game Illustrates a big Assimilation Problem](#)Â 7-8-11
- [Mexican Drug Gangs Increase Power in Central America](#)Â 6-10-11
- [Officially-sponsored gun smuggling harmful to Mexico – and hypocritical](#)Â 5-31-11
- [Is it Safe for Americans to Visit Mexico?](#)Â 5-17-11
- [Osama Dead – Mission Accomplished](#)Â 5-3-11
- [Will Koran-Burning be Banned in the United States?](#)Â 4-5-11
- [Rebellion in Libya – How About We Sit This One Out?](#)Â 3-8-11
- [Many Mexicans Also Watched Super Bowl XLV](#)Â 2-15-11
- [The Year 2010 in Mexico](#)Â 2-1-11
- [What we can learn from the left's reaction to Arizona shooting](#)Â 1-21-11
- [Visiting Mexico at Christmastime](#)Â 1-11-11
- [Shocking News – Diplomacy Being Practiced Here](#)Â 12-7-10
- [GOP Does Well in 2010 Midterms](#)Â 11-11-10
- [Could Tom Tancredo be the Next Governor of Colorado?](#)Â 10-26-10
- [Mexico Celebrates Its Centennial And Bicentennial](#)Â 9-17-10
- [Mexican Supreme Court Advances Gay Marriage](#)

## AgendaÂ 8-17-10

- Mexican Prison Doubles as Hotel For Cartel HitmenÂ 8-10-10
- U.S. Pastor Council Strives to Lead the Flock AstrayÂ 7-24-10
- Obama's Immigration SpeechÂ 7-6-10
- Arizona, May Day and the Failure of the FedsÂ 5-5-10
- Eastertime in MexicoÂ 3-21-10
- And the Violence Continues in MexicoÂ 2-9-10
- World's Biggest Christmas TreeÂ 12-20-09
- Senator Kennedy and His LegacyÂ 12-3-09
- Mexico Revolution Day 2009Â 11-17-09
- Mexico, Norman Borlaug and the Green RevolutionÂ 10-21-09
- Outrage and hope in today's EnglandÂ 9-23-09
- Another Mexican Independence Day Rolls AroundÂ 9-13-09
- Mexican Politicians Seek the Lost Island of BermejaÂ 8-25-09
- Gatesgate – Much Ado About Nothing?Â 7-30-09
- Mexico's Midterm ElectionsÂ 7-16-09
- Sonia Sotomayor and the Supreme CourtÂ 6-16-09
- The H1N1 Virus – A Challenge for Mexico and the WorldÂ 5-25-09
- Is US at fault that Mexico is awash in weapons?Â 4-17-09
- The Easter Season in MexicoÂ 4-7-09
- Eight Reasons Why Amnesty is a Bad IdeaÂ 3-24-09
- Illegitimacy and the GOP – From Dan Quayle to Sarah PalinÂ 2-25-09
- President Obama Hits the Ground RunningÂ 1-30-09
- How Historic Will an Obama Presidency Be?Â 1-18-09
- Christmas in MexicoÂ 12-17-08
- Could an Obama Presidency have a silver lining for Republicans?Â 12-7-08
- The Mexican Revolution and Its LegacyÂ 11-20-08
- Why Obama WonÂ 11-9-08
- The 2008 Presidential Election – What a Choice!Â 11-2-08
- Will Calderon and La Maestra Reform Mexican

[Education?](#) 6-29-08

- [Is Mexico's Drug War A Civil War?](#) 6-22-08
- [Mexican Matters: Toxicology, Archaeology and a Jailed Burro](#) 6-8-08
- [In Mexico, The Body Count Continues to Mount](#) 5-27-08