

Organized Crime Controls The Votes In NH

President Trump and I have forced the election fraudsters to show their teeth. Me in 2008, 2009 and 2010. (See my website) Because of my success at exposing voter fraud I was told to shut up or get shot. The left ALWAYS resorts to violence when they can't win in the courts. In court, under oath, I am undefeated.

Congress Passes Psychological Manipulation in an Education Bill: Schools Become Mental Health Clinics

Child Abuse in the Classroom, A Legal Challenge to ESSA

This is an invitation to join our national revolt called, *"Child Abuse in the Classroom, A Legal Challenge to ESSA."* *ESSA is the federal legislation called Every Student Achieves Act. This revolt to stop this legislation is a tribute to Phyllis Schlafly and her book that exposed the original "Child Abuse In The Classroom" that detailed hearings that brought about regulations to stop the psychological and psychiatric testing and treatment in the classrooms of America finalized in the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment, PPRA.* I was the parent who filed a federal complaint using the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment, PPRA. Phyllis had worked very hard to pass regulations in the 80's. In fact, her

book, ***Child Abuse in the Classroom***, was the impetus for me to file my complaint. My story is well known. My historical journey exposed the corruption, the illegal data collection, and psychological abuse disguised as education in Pennsylvania, as well as other states as I fought ***outcome based education*** in the '90's.

It appears what I had fought to rid our schools in the 1990's is back with a passion. December of 2015, Speaker Paul Ryan pushed the passage of Every Student Achieves Act legislation through Congress along with Senator Lamar Alexander, Chairman of the HELP Committee. Senator Alexander had purposely eliminated any reference in his summary report that would disclose the illegal and dangerous psychological techniques codified in his ESSA education legislation. Citizens contacted Senator Alexander and had informed him of the abusive mental health interventions that he permitted to be incorporated into his legislation. We are asking that he publicly recant the language in his bill that opened the door to these abuses and to act forthrightly to remedy this critical situation.

A Parent and Citizen Revolt


Citizens across the United States are prepared to wage an aggressive grassroots effort to stop *The Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) because it promotes Child Abuse in the Classroom. We are asking you to join us to request President Trump and Congress to repeal ESSA.

Parents and citizens across the United States are requesting an immediate injunction to stop the implementation of social, emotional, and behavioral standards and interventions that have been codified in the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA). Although the implementation and collection of these non-academic standards and interventions have been previously approved and funded by former President Obama through the Executive Order 12866 and the illegal ESEA Flexibility Waivers, Congress has not stopped the progressive execution of

these experimental, psychological manipulations in the classrooms of America. Because our children are at-risk of abuse, we are calling for an investigation.

President Trump has written and released an Executive Order that directs Secretary of Education DeVos to *Enforce Statutory Prohibitions on Federal Control of Education*. The *Every Student Succeeds Act* legislation violates the protection and safety of our children. This Act requires the use of abusive psychological techniques on children. These techniques are actually codified into this law. We are requesting Secretary DeVos to immediately take steps to prohibit teachers from carrying out the intrusive psychological and behavioral techniques named in the legislation to be used on America's children in American classrooms. The intervention techniques specifically named in the legislation include: Applied Behavior Analysis posing as positive behavior intervention and supports; multi-tiered system of supports (response to intervention); schoolwide tiered system of supports; specialized instructional support services; early intervening services for at-risk children or becoming at-risk for mental health disabilities; and universal design for learning.

On September 20, our campaign released a Press Release that explained the violations that we allege are happening in the classrooms of America. We have 20 state coordinators and aligned two major Press Conferences, one in Austin, Texas, and another in Indianapolis, Indiana, the home state of Vice-President Pence. Please go to [our website and join the campaign to help stop this psychological manipulation](#).



Parents, the social, emotional, and behavioral aspects of your children are being monitored, evaluated, and CODED. Behavioral interventions are being performed without your written

permission or consent. Sometimes the names for this are changed to such flowery phrases as mindsets, character development, citizenship, “grit”, or even civics. This tactic effectually catches some parents off guard. Why? Because it sounds so good. Do we really know what is being tested and taught in America’s classrooms? Do you know what data is being collected on your child? Education has moved away from academics. There is now a full focus on personality with teaching and testing in non-Academic areas. The goal is changing the social, emotional, and behavioral personality traits of your child.

What Does the “Whole Child” Mean?

The “whole child” (head, heart, and hand) becomes the focus of the federal government when their job was to educate, not indoctrinate. The recently passed federal ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) is the latest draconian effort to test, teach, and remediate values, attitudes, beliefs, and dispositions. The education establishment calls testing and changing attitudes and values these new buzzwords...social, emotional, and behavioral interventions. This transformation of our educational system removed academics as the main thrust of American education. It is mental health. It is psychological conditioning. It is changing your child’s personality. ESSA becomes the church of today and everyday in the classroom. The spirit of the child is the focus of changing behavior, values,

and beliefs. Churches, wake up! You've been replaced, but so has the family.

We have officially become the nanny state when ESSA was codified into law December 2015.

Penetrating the Human Psyche

The ultimate goal is to squash all individualism in America. Parents beware! This falls under mental health. It is psychological conditioning. It also happens to be illegal the way they are doing this on children in the United States. Specific psychological interventions have been codified into law that teachers are using daily in our classrooms. Phone apps are being used to monitor behavior like the BOSS app, Behavioral Observation of Students in School. Other behavioral assessments include: Systemic Screening for Behavioral Disorders; Behavioral and Emotional Screening System; Student Risk Screening Scale; Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire; Screening Social Skills Improvement System. Imagine replacing academics for these conditioning, behavioral systems used on our kids? It's not conduct anymore. It's BF Skinner conditioning. You do not have to imagine anymore, they are being implemented daily.

What Are We Going To Do About It?

Parents, challenge the federal legislation! We must!!

Professionals in the medical field are identifying these psychological techniques being used in the classroom by teachers, proving that if a doctor would perform these tests in their office, they would need informed written parental consent. *Have You Seen Johnny's Mental Health Profile* written by Dr. Aida Cerundolo, Greenland, NH, brings home the reality of today's classrooms in America. (Source: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/have-you-seen-juniors-psych-profile-1494286467>)

We are asking parents to become involved. Join our effort to roll back this legislation and demand a Back to Basics Curriculum founded on academic subjects. Let's get rid of the psychobabble, the datamining, and the unjust platform that disguises the true intent of the federal goals...globalism and total control of the individual.

These are our American children.

Parents + children = family ... not the nanny state.

Join Child Abuse in the Classroom, A Legal Challenge To ESSA.

Join here: childabuseintheclassroom.com

© 2017 Anita Hoge – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Anita Hoge: hogieshack@comcast.net

Repeal But Not Replace

The Republican leadership in the Senate agonizes over how best to “replace” Obamacare. They thus start with a flawed premise which is bound to fail. Based on the paternalistic and freedom depriving notion that it is for the government to compel the individual to obtain insurance and it is for the government to dictate the kind of insurance available to all, Obamacare invariably leads to market distortions that increase cost, to government influenced or mandated allocation of medical resources which rations care, to a government centric rather than patient centric system, and to near universal disappointment and inadequate care. The business of insurance is one of careful measurements of risk dependent upon a myriad of factors which nonetheless leaves ultimate care decisions to patients willing to pay and doctors willing to perform. An

effort to impose a one size fits all standard on health insurance thus alters not only the make-up and cost of insurance (limiting options and increasing costs) but it also delimits medical practice, which must bend to accommodate insurance demands regardless of medical realities and professional preferences.

So, when the Republican leadership presumes to keep Obamacare in place in part and tweak it, or diminish its scope but infuse it with funding to keep it on life support, the Republican leadership begins with a failed premise, thus dooming itself and the nation to defeat. The Republican leadership is thereby conceding the anti-market, government paternalistic premise (the corrupt heart and soul) of Obamacare, the very evil that Republican voters demanded their officials end in the 2016 elections.

There is a principled alternative to Obamacare appeasement, one that removes top down, government dictation of health insurance and health markets and replaces that state paternalism with a patient centric system replete with freedom of choice. As in most all things, the central question is who exercises ultimate freedom to determine whether and to whom dollars enter the health care system: Is it the government by insurance company proxy or is it the patient in each individual case? All who value freedom should prefer a patient centric health care system where patients determine whether and who to pay, where doctors are attentive to the needs and demands of patients first and foremost and to insurance companies only secondarily.

There is no way to retain any element of Obamacare and revivify a patient centric system where market forces prevail over government mandates. Consequently, the first order of business must be complete repeal of Obamacare, leaving none of it.

The sequence of overall legislative events germane to this

issue is backward. Tax reform should have preceded Obamacare repeal and replace. That is because the ultimate patient centric alternative to Obamacare is best triggered through amendments to the tax code, not government control of health insurance markets.

In my book, *Restore the Republic*, I advocate a simple, yet profound free market alternative to Obamacare, one that removes government control and replaces it with individual preferences. That alternative creates a true incentive to finance the care of those in need who cannot afford to pay for insurance or care but leaves the ultimate freedom to follow that incentive with the individual. It is simple alternative, and yet, its effects would be revolutionary in empowering patients and ensuring no federal government limits on the nature, degree, quality, or quantity of health care offered.

Here is the overall plan. Congress would repeal Obamacare immediately but not replace it. Congress would then move forward with President Trump's tax reform measures, lowering corporate and individual rates to trigger an economic boom. In addition to the Administration's slated reductions in taxation would come the tax reform measure I recommend to encourage private action to care for those who cannot afford health insurance or the care they need. This tax reform would be the free market replacement called for by the electorate.

It works this way. For every dollar an individual or entity spends to cover the health insurance or health care costs of an individual who cannot afford to pay for same, the donating individual or entity would receive a \$1.50 federal tax deduction. Under this simple measure, companies of all sizes would have a major incentive to provide health insurance for employees who cannot afford it and also to pay directly either for health insurance for, or part or all of the medical expenses of, identified others in need because doing so would result in a significant tax deduction. Individuals would

likewise have a great financial incentive to pay for relatives in need or identified others in their communities who have needs. Finally, hospitals, medical groups, and individual physicians would also have a huge incentive to pay directly for the costs of caring for the indigent, because doing so would result in a substantial tax deduction.

Most importantly, money would be restored to private hands and individual patients would be empowered by the tax plan. That would be the free market antithesis of Obamacare.

In short, rather than accept as given the offensive premise at root in Obamacare that government knows better than an individual what how that individual should spend his health care dollars, we should reject that premise, reject Obamacare in totality, and “replace” it not with additional government but with no government at all, using instead the power to relieve tax burdens as a way to encourage the provision of patient-centric care.

© 2017 Jonathan Emord – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jonathan Emord: jemord@emord.com

Marriage Is No Business Of The State

In the battle for God’s Holy Institution of Marriage as of late there has not been a lot of encouraging news. The problem confronting us however has roots going back more than 100 years. The nose of the camel came into the tent with miscegenation laws which largely began after the War between the States. What this meant is that civil government claimed

it had a rightful jurisdiction over what marriages would be legitimate and what would not.

[Video of the Sermon](#)

By the way the standard they established is not given in the Word of God where interracial marriage was never forbidden; just consider Moses and Zipporah and Boaz and Ruth and so on. So civil government was not only usurping jurisdiction over a realm of life that had not been given to it by God who ordained human civil government, they were also establishing a standard that was a contradiction against as well as a violation of God's Law. Tragically the other two God ordained governments, family government and church government did nothing to oppose this usurpation and nothing to rebuke this law breaking act of civil government.

But there were individuals who desired to break this civil government invented law, or to use our founders verbiage, pretended legislation. When they desired to enter into a marriage with someone of a race that was forbidden the law, they would appeal to the government for a waiver of that law in the case of their upcoming marriage. And the civil magistrate often times would comply by offering them a marriage license. That is the origin of the marriage license in our land. Blacks Law dictionary defines a license as "A permission, accorded by a [competent authority](#), conferring the right to do some act which without such [authorization](#) would be illegal," In other words the marriage would be illegal unless a license was granted because the law claimed such a marriage was illegal to begin with. How did such a standard come then to apply to all marriages not just interracial marriages? It is a frog in the kettle story. Slowly turning up the heat bit by bit until the frog is boiled. More and more marriages were coerced into applying for marriage licenses until at this point we are led to believe that all marriages, to be legitimate, must receive a marriage license from the State.

Because the family government and church government have surrendered the ground of marriage, civil government claimed that it owned marriage entirely. Now we see the disaster that belief has led to. When government claims it owns marriage, then it claims it can redefine marriage any way it chooses. You want to marry your dog, just wait a few years, they could make that part of so-called marriage law.

What is the solution to this mess? Family government and church governments end the charade. God never gave jurisdiction over marriage to civil government. It must be taken back by family and church government. Marriage is no business of the State and therefore no marriage license is required. Family governments need to determine they will not be part of the civil government marriage charade. Don't get a license to marry. Church government needs to do the same. As a pastor today, I will not conduct a marriage ceremony for anyone who is marrying utilizing a State issued marriage license. Family and church must take back the ground unrighteously surrendered in the past 100 years.

Along those lines there is one positive development. An Alabama Senate Committee Passed Bill last month to Eliminate Marriage Licenses in order to Nullify Federal Control over marriage.

"MONTGOMERY, Ala.(Feb. 27, 2017) – An Alabama bill that would abolish marriage licenses in the state, and effectively nullify in practice both major sides of the contentious national debate over government-sanctioned marriage, unanimously passed an important Senate committee last week.

Sen. Greg Albritton (R-Bay Minette) filed Senate Bill 20 ([SB20](#)) earlier this month. The legislation would abolish all requirements to obtain a marriage license in Alabama. Instead, probate judges would simply record civil contracts of marriage between two individuals based on signed affidavits.

'All requirements to obtain a marriage license by the State of Alabama are hereby abolished and repealed. The requirement of a ceremony of marriage to solemnized the marriage is abolished.'"

The Alabama Senate passed a similar bill during the 2016 session, and a House committee [approved it as well](#), but the full House did not take final action before the legislative session ended.^[1]

So there is a realistic probability that Alabama will pass this law and lead the way for other States to do likewise and turn marriage back to the family government and church government where it truly belongs.

But stepping back from the details and examining the history of this problem in America one asks, what happened in our land, how did we go so far off track? The answer I believe is what happened in the pulpits of America. Because God's Law Word was not taught, the people never rose up to resist a civil government going out of its God ordained boundaries. The people in our land were not taught from the Word of God the separate jurisdictions of the three institutions God ordained; family government, church government and civil government. They were not instructed in what the Bible establishes as the limits of the boundaries for each of the three institutions. They were not trained to recognized violations of these God ordained boundaries nor were they instructed about how Christians in our land should respond when such violations took place.

Furthermore the pastors in our land were not only failing to instruct their own congregations, they themselves ignored the clear teaching of God's Word about what they should do when such violations occurred, they themselves failed to resist the tyranny as the Word of God commands them to do. They actually became part of the system.

Before I repented of doing weddings with State issued marriage licenses, I recall the language on the license forms I was required to fill out as the officiant at the wedding. It made me an officer of the State, with fines and penalties if I didn't do as the State commanded me in the time frame it commanded. For me it began with being troubled by the language used at the end of the State ceremony – “by the power vested in me by the State of Maryland I now pronounce you man and wife.” What power does the State of Maryland or any other State for that matter have to make such a pronouncement? None whatsoever. The Word of God tells us that it is God Himself that takes the two and makes them “one flesh” not the State. So my first step was to drop that language.

The more I studied the more I was disturbed by all aspects of the State ceremony. I finally repented of participating in all those State ceremonies and committed to doing them no more. I realized that I had not been properly taught, I had accepted what others told me was the right way to act in this realm. It was the Word of God that led me to repentance. Paul brings this same point home in Titus 2:1.

Learn more about your Constitution with Pastor David Whitney and the “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your [free gift](#).


[\[1\] Alabama Committee Passes Bill To Eliminate Marriage Licenses Nullify Federal Control In Practice](#)

Emerging Truth: Obama and AG Lynch authorized spying on President Trump

As this week's spy drama continues to unfold, a former military intelligence officer and police detective told *NewsWithViews.com* that last year President Barack Obama's Attorney General, Loretta Lynch, signed off on – and expedited – two FISA ([Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act](#)) Court requests to wiretap the Trump campaign.

Former homicide detective Barry Thomas Neallon, a retired intelligence operative with the U.S. Marines (*Force Recon), claims, "If Attorney General Lynch was processing applications for electronic eavesdropping warrants, then both her boss, Barack Obama, and her FBI chief, James Comey, had to know about the spying and the justification to invade the privacy of a presidential candidate from the opposition party."

Besides Neallon's statement to *NewsWithViews.com*, [ABC News](#) reported on Thursday that all of the applications to the FISA Court were authorized by Lynch.



"[Which] means that she chose not to investigate the Clinton Foundation for illegal activities but rather signed an application to wiretap President Trump," stated Jim Hoft, the editor-in-chief for the [Gateway Pundit](#) website.

Just about every news story on the subject of the Trump wiretaps mentions that the FISA Court turned down the first request to wiretap Trump even though it was requested by Lynch

herself. The fact the FISA judge nixed the warrant is evidence that the Justice Department did not even come close to satisfying the usually minimal standards for obtaining such warrants.

Out of close to 11,000 warrant applications during the Obama administration only two were rejected by the FISA Court. "It's almost like getting an indictment from a grand jury. A decent prosecutor could get a ham sandwich indicted. Likewise, judges aren't tough on warrants unless they believe the requester is on a 'fishing expedition' or the request is totally without merit," said former police officer and corporate security director Iris Aquino.

When on Saturday morning President Trump's tweeted that President Barack Obama had wiretapped Trump Tower in October 2016, the usual cabal of Democrats and news media outlets began their routine of casting doubts on Trump's accusation. "It was as if they were saying 'how dare you make outrageous allegations against Saint Barack,'" Aquino noted in a tongue-in-cheek quip.

Meanwhile, Ben Rhodes, the deputy national security adviser for Obama, told the news media over and over again that presidents can't order a wiretap. He also cast doubts on the honesty of the new president.

Lynch made statements this week on a video and she's heard encouraging protests and marches, blood in the streets and even death in order to stop and topple the Trump administration.

During the last presidential election cycle, a man named [Julian Assange](#) single-handedly alerted a large number of American voters about the secretive, devious and hypocritical goings-on at the



Democratic National Committee headquarters and their connections to the Hillary Clinton for President campaign and members of the so-called mainstream news media. The damage done to the Democratic Party as a result of the leaked information may never be fully gauged.

Instead of looking at cyber security considerations at the DNC – a political party that’s not part of the U.S. government – Democrats in both houses of Congress prefer to make wildly absurd accusations about President Donald Trump, Russian President Vladimir Putin, and anyone else they can dredge up in order to portray themselves as victims. Also, instead of asking the appropriate committees in the House and Senate to probe the nation’s vulnerability to foreign espionage – especially cyber espionage – the Democrats wish to create an ad hoc or select committee to investigate the alleged cyber crimes perpetrated against their opposition.

**Force Recon is one of the United States Marine Corps’ special operations capable forces (SOC) that provide essential elements of military intelligence to the command element of the Marine Air-Ground Task Force (MAGTF), by supporting their task force commanders.*

President Trump On “Law Enforcement”

One of the major concerns I have had with Donald Trump as a candidate, and continue to have with President Trump in the White House, is the all-too-often ambiguous, even amorphous, character of his pronouncements on important policies. To be sure, this defect might be only apparent—the unfortunate result of combining Mr. Trump’s penchant for truncated statements with my own inability to extrapolate from the few

words he does provide a deeper meaning which he may intend for them to convey. (I readily admit that I must be counted among the ever-diminishing set of Americans who consider twitterite and fakebookish discourse truly deplorable means for attempting to communicate ideas with depth any greater than that of a cookie sheet.) On the other hand, perhaps Mr. Trump and his advisors are at fault for not offering more specificity in what they cause to be published below the White House's by-line.

For a prime example of the latter demerit, most recently my attention was piqued when I came across the White House's internet post entitled "Standing Up For Our Law Enforcement Community". See [[Link](#)]. Unfortunately, this is an essay without a compelling theme reflective of Mr. Trump's promise to "make America great again". Rather than locating itself in a recognizably American historical and legal context, providing a critical overview of contemporary problems, and proposing a long-term political strategy consistent with fundamental constitutional principles, it offers little more than slogans—the main one being that "[t]he Trump Administration will be a law and order administration". Inasmuch as the first and foremost duty of every President under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution is to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed", this glittering generality imparts to the reader precious little of actual substance. For the question remains: "What body of 'law' and what kind of 'order' will the Trump Administration enforce?" Oh, I realize (perhaps "hope" is the more accurate verb) that somewhere over the political rainbow there must be more in the minds of the author(s) of this post than the few paragraphs it contains. My concern, though, is: "What more?"

1. Although its title refers to "our law enforcement community", the White House's post nowhere even suggests that the latter "community" includes in any way, shape, or form "the Militia of the several States", the one and

only "community" to which the Constitution explicitly assigns the authority and responsibility "to execute the Laws of the Union" (and of their own States as well). See U.S. Const. art. II, § 2, cl. 1; art. I, § 8, cl. 15; and amends. II and X. One must wonder, therefore, what extra-constitutional, non-constitutional, or even (Heaven forefend) anti-constitutional notion of "standing up for our law enforcement community" the White House has in mind, when it leaves out of consideration any rôle for the Militia.

This oversight is especially ominous in light of the neo-Bolshevist "color revolution" which "leftists" have launched throughout this country in order not simply to demoralize, demonize, and delegitimize, but ultimately to destroy entirely the Trump Administration—in service, not of "the working class", but of predatory globalist multi-billionaires for whom "the working class" no longer counts for anything, any more than does any other conglomeration of "useful idiots" and "transmission belts" who and which can be aggregated and energized under the divisive banners of contemporary "identity politics". Mr. Trump and his advisors will prove to be extraordinarily naïve, amateurish, and even feckless if they fail to realize that, absent timely revitalization of the Militia, not just the present Administration but also America as a whole will all too soon be submerged in very hot and deep political waters from which their extrication will be exceedingly difficult. And no, I am not referring to the National Guard—which is no "militia" at all (in the constitutional sense), but instead consists of the "Troops, or Ships of War" which the States may "keep * * * in time of Peace" "with[] the Consent of Congress" under Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 of the Constitution (that is, a component of "the standing army"). Rather, "the Militia of the several States" consist of all of WE THE PEOPLE—or at least that part of them which the Declaration of Independence styled "the good People"—who today constitute "the Whites" versus "the Reds"

(in line with the dichotomy in the original Bolshevik “color revolution”). In keeping with the Declaration of Independence’s excoriation of King George III for “ha[ving] affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power”, “the good People” of the present time must impress upon the Trump Administration the imprudence of deploying the National Guard or any other component of the regular Armed Forces to deal with this matter under some variety of “martial law” (in the sense most Americans give to that term). Rather, reliance must be had on the Militia, as the true constitutional recourse against the domestic lawlessness of any contemporary “color revolution”. See Parts 6 and 7, below.

2. The White House’s post asserts that “[o]ne of the fundamental rights of every American is to live in a safe community * * * free of crime and violence”. It does not, however, answer (or even ask) the question: “‘Safe’ at what cost?” The Constitution does. One of the goals it sets out in its Preamble is to “ensure domestic Tranquility”, which obviously describes the situation which obtains in “a safe community * * * free of crime and violence”. Another goal identified in that same place is to “secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity”. And the Preamble links these two goals with the unqualified conjunction “and”, thereby demanding that both of them are to be achieved simultaneously, not one to be sacrificed for the supposed benefit of the other. For self-evident to the Founders (just as it should be to contemporary Americans) is that this country can never secure the full measure of “domestic Tranquility” without maximizing “the Blessings of Liberty”, and vice versa.
3. So it is troubling that the White House’s post takes the one-sided position that “[t]he dangerous anti-police atmosphere in America is wrong. The Trump Administration will end it.” For this fails to recognize that two quite

different types of “anti-police” activism exist in this country today. One of them intends to undermine “domestic Tranquility” by sabotaging the legitimate work of law-enforcement agencies in every way possible, and therefore should be exposed and eradicated; whereas the other desires to protect “the Blessings of Liberty” against threats emanating from rogue law-enforcement personnel, and therefore should be praised and promoted.

The “anti-police atmosphere” antagonistic to “domestic Tranquility” is being propagated by groups intent upon engendering divisions and mutual antagonisms within society, and especially turning as many Americans as possible against their own governments at every level of the federal system, so as to create the chaotic conditions propitious for waging a successful neo-Bolshevist “color revolution”. The strategy at work is quite simple: Because, of all governmental agencies, police forces interact with the citizenry on the closest day-to-day basis, most common Americans tend to treat them, rightly or wrongly, as particularly representative of “the government” as a whole. If ordinary people can be inveigled to turn against the police in particular, they will naturally turn as well against the government in general. If they do so in large enough numbers, society will become effectively ungovernable, and thus ripe for all sorts of political upheavals. So the White House’s post is correct to emphasize that “[o]ur job is not to make life more comfortable for the rioter, the looter, or the violent disrupter”—because, although most of these street criminals are little more than “useful idiots”, they (along with the other “disrupters” who know precisely what they are about) constitute the first wave of cannon fodder in the initial offensive in the neo-Bolsheviks’ “color revolution”. If they cannot be checked at the outset, their aggression will only increase in its scope and intensify in its destructive effects.

On the other hand, the contemporary “anti-police atmosphere”

favorable to “the Blessings of Liberty” is the result of many Americans’ fully justifiable complaints about intolerable levels of patently lawless, yet all-too-often unpunished, behavior by rogue law-enforcement personnel occurring across the length and breadth of this country. Of course, in a free society operating under “the rule of law” (and especially the constraints of “the rule of constitutional law”), any misconduct by law-enforcement agencies should be denounced as excessive, and every malefactor in their ranks should be held maximally accountable for his misconduct. After all, when an officer of the law breaks some law, he violates not only that particular law which he has a general duty to obey in his capacity as an ordinary citizen, but also the very principle of law-enforcement itself which he (unlike an ordinary citizen) is specially sworn to uphold. So, when a representative of the law breaks the law and gets away with his misbehavior under color of the law, his actions inevitably generate disrespect for all law among everyone else. Today, though, the level of police misconduct throughout America is, not simply excessive, but even extremely so, primarily because of the manner in which it tends to be mishandled. All too typically, such misconduct as comes to public attention is explained away by spokesmen for “police unions”, then excused by departmental “internal affairs” investigators and accommodating prosecutors who “find” that the perpetrators’ actions were in accord with various “policies” and “guidelines” (as if those magic words could set at naught constitutional commands). And later on, civil lawsuits brought by the victims are dismissed or otherwise frustrated on the grounds that the perpetrators are privileged to avoid personal liability perforce of fantastic “immunity” defenses of one sort or another concocted by the kangaroo courts under color of “judicial supremacy”.

In light of these circumstances, how can the Trump Administration fulfill the promise that it “will end [the anti-police atmosphere in America]”—but as to both aspects of

that “atmosphere”? The White House’s post is not wrong to point out that “[o]ur country needs more law enforcement, more community engagement, and more effective policing”. The proper manner in which to meet these needs, though, remains the question. Not surprisingly, the Constitution supplies the answer.

The Constitution of the United States provides no explicit mandate or permission for the professional police or like law-enforcement agencies found throughout this country today. The only institutions within the federal system to which the Constitution assigns the authority and responsibility “to execute the Laws of the Union” are “the Militia of the several States”; and the only individual officeholder to which the Constitution assigns the authority and responsibility to “take Care that the Law be faithfully executed” is the President, to whom it also entrusts the status of “Commander in Chief * * * of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States”. See U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cls. 15 and 16; art. II, § 3; and art. II, § 2, cl. 1. Self-evidently, “execut[ing] the Laws of the Union” and “tak[ing] Care that the Laws be faithfully executed” involve quintessential “law-enforcement” and “police” functions. Similarly, because “the Militia of the several States” are the States’ own governmental institutions, with permanent place in the federal system, and because the Constitution, through the Second Amendment, declares that only “[a] well regulated Militia” is “necessary to the security of a free State”, “law-enforcement” or “police” functions which relate to the provision of “security” under State and Local law must devolve upon “the Militia of the several States” in each of the States, and upon each of the Governors of “the several States” in their capacities as commanders in chief of their own States’ Militia. Moreover, inasmuch as each of “the Militia of the several States” must be “[a] well regulated Militia” and “[a] well regulated Militia” must be composed of the body of the people, in the final analysis the American people

themselves, properly organized in "well regulated Militia", should assume primary responsibility for the performance of all "law-enforcement" and "police" functions. This, of course, is no constitutional accident. For in a constitutional republic in which the people themselves exercise sovereignty (as described below), who but the people themselves can be entrusted with the task of policing the people themselves?

So if, as the White House's post opines, "[o]ur country needs more law enforcement", the true constitutional source of the additional manpower should be the Militia. Being composed of every able-bodied adult from sixteen years of age upwards (until justly exempted on the basis of superannuation), the Militia could supply far more individuals already qualified, or capable of being trained, to perform any and every "law-enforcement" and "police" function which both the Union and the several States might require. (Actually, if the job were to be done with scrupulous attention to the Constitution, all present-day police forces and other law-enforcement agencies at the State and Local levels should be integrated within the Militia largely in their present forms, augmented by such other specially trained units and reserve formations as the circumstances in various States and Localities might warrant.) If "[o]ur country needs * * * more community engagement [in 'law enforcement']", in what more efficacious and safe manner could this goal be met than by enlisting the whole community in each community in the effort? No "anti-police atmosphere" could ever arise were the people themselves the police and the police the people. And if "[o]ur country needs * * * more effective policing", how could this be better guaranteed than by drawing participants in "police" functions from the most extensive pool of talent extant in any community: namely, essentially the entire adult community itself? Not only that: When in the form and with the authority of "well regulated Militia" the people in Local communities will police themselves, law enforcement will necessarily become more effective than it is or ever could be now, because then the

people with the greatest personal incentives to maintain proper “law and order” will be directly in charge. No longer will the people in any Locality be subject to a police force of élitist professionals who (as is all too often the case today) envision themselves as aloof from, superior to, and even the antagonists of the very community which they are supposed to protect and serve.

4. The White House’s post assures its readers that “[s]upporting law enforcement means supporting our citizens’ ability to protect themselves”. On the one hand, this statement is a mere truism—because, as America’s Founders well knew, “[s]elf-defence * * * , as it is justly called the primary law of nature, so it is not, neither can it be in fact, taken away by the law of society”. William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Robert Bell, American Edition, 4 Volumes & Appendix, 1771-1773), Volume 3, at 4. Whether performed by the individual or by the community, self-defense is the most important, being in the final analysis the indispensable, form of “law enforcement”. On the other hand, unfortunately, the post’s statement sets legal and political priorities in reverse, even perverse, order—because actually enabling citizens to protect themselves individually and collectively must always come before “[s]upporting law enforcement” in the form of modern-day professional police forces. After all, self-defense presupposes the absence of timely and effective assistance from even honest and competent law-enforcement agencies; whereas, in all too many instances today, through their execution of constitutionally questionable “gun-control” laws rogue law-enforcement personnel across this country hinder or entirely frustrate ordinary citizens’ ability to execute “the primary law of nature” for their own individual and societal protection.

Self-evidently, “the security of a free State” depends upon the ability of its constituent citizens to defend both themselves as individuals and their “free State” as a collective—and the Second Amendment declares that, for these purposes, “[a] well regulated Militia” is “necessary”, not subordinate to various law-enforcement establishments not only less inclusive than such a Militia but also lacking a Militia’s constitutional credentials. Thus, the only way in which the statement “[s]upporting law enforcement means supporting our citizens’ ability to protect themselves” can be read in a fully constitutional manner is for the Militia to become the primary institutions of “law enforcement” at every level of the federal system. This is plainly possible even at the level of the General Government, because the Constitution empowers Congress “[t]o provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union”, without exception. U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 15. And because “the Militia of the several States” are the States’ own governmental institutions, the States can assign to them whatever “law-enforcement” responsibilities may be “necessary to the security of a free State” in those jurisdictions, when the Militia are not “called into the actual Service of the United States”. Compare U.S. Const. art. II, § 2, cl. 1 and art. I, § 8, cl. 16 with amends. II and X.

To be sure, the White House’s post goes on to promise that “[w]e [i.e., the Trump Administration] will uphold Americans’ Second Amendment rights at every level of our judicial system”. The apparent exclusive concern with “our judicial system” is perplexing, however. Does President Trump believe that “our judicial system” wields exclusive authority under the false doctrine of “judicial supremacy” to determine with finality what “Americans’ Second Amendment rights” are? Or is that the province of the Constitution, which the Legislative and Executive Branches of the General Government, the States, and ultimately WE THE PEOPLE must interpret and apply for themselves when “our judicial system” neglects, fails, or

refuses to protect those rights?

Even those Americans who are satisfied with the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Heller and McDonald cases, and who assume that President Trump will succeed in appointing to the Court new Justices who will scrupulously adhere to those precedents, must realize that, because of the practical vicissitudes of litigation, many if not most rulings of consequence to be rendered by the inferior courts of the United States and the States' courts with respect to the Second Amendment will never be reviewed by the Supreme Court. Inasmuch as these lower courts are now overpopulated with opponents of the Second Amendment, reliance on "our judicial system" will result in numerous judicial screeds as much at odds with "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms" as Circuit Judge James A. Wynn, Jr.'s grotesquely unconstitutional concurring opinion in *United States v. Robinson*, No. 14-4902 (4th Cir., 23 January 2017). Under these circumstances, can President Trump—or the American people—trust "our judicial system" to guarantee "the security of a free State" as the Second Amendment understands it? Or should President Trump work to empower Americans to exercise "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms" in "well regulated Militia", impervious to modern-day "gun control"? These questions answer themselves, the first in the negative, the second in the affirmative.

5. The White House's post describes President Trump as "dedicated to enforcing our border laws, ending sanctuary cities, and stemming the tide of lawlessness associated with illegal immigration". These ends are admirable; but the means by which the President and his advisors believe that he can actually accomplish them remain as opaque as they are conjectural. I need not repeat here what I have written about these matters in my NewsWithViews commentaries "How the President Can Secure the Borders" (18 August 2015), "A Trumped-up

Controversy” (20 February 2016), and “No Sanctuaries in ‘Sanctuary Cities’” (3 December 2016). What does deserve renewed emphasis, though, is the indispensable constitutional rôle which the Militia can and must play in the fulfillment of these tasks, under President Trump’s assertion of leadership as “Commander in Chief * * * of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States”, in order to fulfill his duty to “take Care that the Laws [pertaining to immigration] be faithfully executed”. See U.S. Const. art. II, § 2, cl. 1 and art. II, § 3.

Not just the present tidal wave of patently illegal immigration, but also since the late 1960s the excessive extent of ostensibly legal immigration by aliens unwilling or unable to assimilate themselves within an uniquely American culture, amount to actual hostile invasions of this country. I do not employ the term “invasions” in a loosely metaphorical sense, either. For these incursions are not simply historical accidents, akin to the serial “barbarian invasions” that first splintered, then helped to shatter entirely, the Roman Empire. Rather, they are part and parcel of modern neo-Bolshevism’s long-operative strategy to deny Americans the right vouchsafed to them by the Declaration of Independence to retain “among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal status to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them”; to demolish the United States as a functioning polity; and to drag “the good People” of this country into a “new world order” administered by supra-national mega-banks and -corporations serving the selfish interests of a globalist kleptocracy composed of multi-billionaires. This amounts to a new twist on Leninism/Trotskyism—because “the revolution’s” contemporary financiers are so sure of themselves that they no longer feel the need to operate largely behind the scenes (in the manner of, say, Alexander Helphand), but instead brazenly flaunt their rôles as “the revolution’s” mentors and even directors out in the open, in the person of such as George

Soros.

The neo-Bolsheviks' tactics emphasize enlarging the fissures already in existence throughout American society, and engendering as many new ones as possible, so as to be able to employ "identify politics" in service of a divide-and-conquer approach of multifaceted "class warfare". The old Leninist/Trotskyist dichotomy of "classes" has been expanded from the original purely economic Marxist categories of "the proletariat" and "the bourgeoisie" to embrace divisions delineated by race, religion, sex (or even worse, "gender"), economic status, political allegiances to such deceptive conceptions as "left" and "right", rural versus urban attitudes and lifestyles, and so on—until American society now finds itself on the verge of being permanently Balkanized into a chaotic jumble of squabbling sects unified only by their joint participation in an orgy of mutual antagonisms and recriminations. Already, "mainstream" political discourse accepts without demur this country's bifurcation into "blue States" and "red States" (although, to conform to the relevant historical antecedent, the colors should be reversed; and, better yet, "white" substituted for "blue"). Plainly enough, this situation by itself is incompatible—indeed, at war—with attainment of the Preamble's goals "to form a more perfect Union" and "insure domestic Tranquility".

The contemporary agitation from various quarters for "open borders" attempts to hornswoggle gullible Americans into condemning as "xenophobic", "racist", or otherwise contemptibly "discriminatory" the laws of the Union which control immigration, so as to make it politically impossible for this country to repel the invasions of aliens now assaulting it. "Hornswoggle" is the properly descriptive verb, too, because no such thing as "open borders" can exist under the Declaration of Independence. For if other nations can systematically dump their unwanted populations into the United States, or if individual foreigners in unlimited numbers can

impose themselves on this country, then Americans will no longer “assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them”. Neither can “open borders” exist under the Constitution. For, as the Preamble attests, WE THE PEOPLE “ordain[ed] and establish[ed] th[e] Constitution” in order to “secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity”—not to aliens whom THE PEOPLE refuse to accept into their community in the first place, or to some future posterity of those undesired aliens who succeed in insinuating themselves into the United States.

More than a century ago, the Supreme Court rejected the argument for “open borders” pressed upon it by radical attorney Clarence Darrow, that “[n]o power is delegated by the Constitution to the general government over alien friends with reference to their admission into the United States”, with the rejoinder that “[r]epeated decisions of this court have determined that Congress has the power to exclude aliens from the United States; to prescribe the terms and conditions on which they may come in; to establish regulations for sending out of the country such aliens as have entered in violation of law, and to commit the enforcement of such conditions and regulations to executive officers; that the deportation of an alien who is found to be here in violation of law is not a deprivation of liberty without due process of law, and that the provisions of the Constitution securing the right of trial by jury have no application.” *United States ex rel. Turner v. Williams*, 194 U.S. 279, 287 (argument of counsel), 289-290 (opinion of the Court) (1904). And inasmuch as the Constitution recognizes no alleged “right” of “alien friends” to immigrate into the United States, it surely denies any such “right” to “alien enemies”, whether openly declared as such, or clandestine in their purposes, or merely potentially dangerous because of their beliefs or associations.

The Bill of Rights provides no exceptions to this rule. At

issue in *Kleindienst v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753 (1972), was a statute which declared ineligible to obtain admission into the United States aliens who advocated the “doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship”. Mandel, a self-described “revolutionary Marxist” who openly espoused “the economic, governmental, and international doctrines of world communism”, was denied a visa to participate in lectures and conferences sponsored by various American universities and think-tanks. Joined by several American “university professors * * * who [had] invited [him] to speak”, Mandel brought suit on the grounds that denial of his visa violated the complainants’ rights under the First Amendment, denied them the equal protection of the laws, and deprived them of procedural due process. *Id.* at 754-760. The Supreme Court overruled these contentions:

It is clear that Mandel personally, as an unadmitted and nonresident alien, had no constitutional right of entry to this country as a nonimmigrant or otherwise. *United States ex rel. Turner v. Williams*, 194 U.S. 279, 292 (1904). * * *

* * * * *

This case, therefore, comes down to the narrow issue whether the First Amendment confers upon the * * * professors, because they wish to hear, speak, and debate with Mandel in person, the ability to determine that Mandel should be permitted to enter the country, or, in other words, to compel * * * Mandel’s admission.

* * * * *

Recognition that First Amendment rights are implicated, however, is not dispositive of our inquiry here. * * * The Court without exception has sustained Congress’ “plenary power to make rules for the admission of aliens and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has

forbidden." * * * "[O]ver no conceivable subject is the legislative power of Congress more complete than it is over" the admission of aliens.

* * * * *

We are not inclined in the present context to reconsider this line of cases. Indeed, the [complainants] * * * recognize the force of these many precedents. * * * [T]hey concede that Congress could enact a blanket prohibition against all aliens falling into the class defined by [the statute], and that First Amendment rights could not override that decision. * * * But they contend that by providing a waiver procedure, Congress clearly intended that persons ineligible under the broad provision of the [statute] would be temporarily admitted * * * . They argue that the Executive's implementation of this congressional mandate * * * must be limited by the First Amendment rights of persons like [the complainants]. * * *

[The complainants'] First Amendment argument would prove too much. In almost every instance of an alien excludable under [the statute], there are probably those who would wish to meet and speak with him. * * * Were we to endorse the proposition that governmental power to withhold a waiver must yield whenever a bona fide claim is made that American citizens wish to meet and talk with an alien excludable under [the statute], one of two unsatisfactory results would necessarily ensue. Either every claim would prevail, in which case the plenary discretionary authority Congress granted to the Executive becomes a nullity, or courts in each case would be required to weigh the strength of the audience's interest against that of the Government in refusing a waiver * * * , according to some as yet undetermined standard. * * * Indeed, it is precisely for this reason that the waiver decision has, properly, been placed in the hands of the Executive.

* * * * *

In summary, plenary congressional power to make policies and rules for exclusion of aliens has long been firmly established. In the case of an alien excludable under [the statute], Congress has delegated conditional exercise of this power to the Executive. We hold that when the Executive exercises this power negatively on the basis of a facially legitimate and bona fide reason, the courts will neither look behind the exercise of that discretion, nor test it by balancing its justification against the First Amendment interests of those who seek personal communication with the applicant.

Id. at 762, 765-766, and 767-770.

It should be obvious that, if this reasoning is valid with respect to “the freedom of speech” guaranteed by the First Amendment, then it applies with equal force to all of the other rights that Amendment covers—such that exclusion of aliens on the basis of their religion, or of the predominant religion of their countries of origin, or of the observation that many of them misbehave under color of their religion in countries which incautiously admit them as immigrants, is no less valid. As the Court observed in *United States ex rel. Turner v. Williams*, 194 U.S. 279, 292 (1904),

[i]t is, of course, true that if an alien is not permitted to enter this country, or, having entered contrary to law, is expelled, he is in fact cut off from worshiping or speaking or publishing or petitioning in the country, but that is merely because of his exclusion therefrom. He does not become one of the people to whom these things are secured by our Constitution by an attempt to enter forbidden by law. To appeal to the Constitution is to concede that this is a land governed by that supreme law, and as under it the power to exclude has been determined to exist, those who are excluded cannot assert the rights in general obtaining in a land to which they do not belong as citizens or otherwise.

Therefore, “[t]he Bill of Rights is a futile authority for the alien seeking admission for the first time to these shores”. *Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding*, 344 U.S. 590, 596 note 5 (1953). As the Court explained in *United States v. Verdugo-Urquidez*, 494 U.S. 259, 265 (1990),

[t]he Preamble [to the Constitution] declares that the Constitution is ordained and established by “the people of the United States.” The Second Amendment protects “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms,” and the Ninth and Tenth Amendments provide that certain rights and powers are retained and reserved to “the people.” * * * While this textual exegesis is by no means conclusive, it suggests that “the people” * * * refers to a class of persons who are part of a national community or who have otherwise developed sufficient connection with this country to be considered part of the community.

Pace the Court, however, “this textual exegesis” is certainly far more than merely “suggest[ive]”. For no one could possibly believe that aliens may demand entry into this country while exercising a purported “right” under color of the Second Amendment “to keep and bear Arms” in their hands, or (more specifically) that armed Moslem jihadists intent upon imposing Sharia by means of the “[p]olitical power [which] grows out of the barrel of a gun” may demand entry under color of the Second and Tenth Amendments combined. Compare Mao Tse-tung, *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung* (Peking, China: Foreign Languages Press, 1966) at 61, with Arthur L. Corbin, “Legal Analysis and Terminology”, 29 *Yale Law Journal* 163 (1919), at 168-169 (definition of a legal “power”).

Going further, the Court in *Verdugo-Urquidez* pointed out that previous cases which have applied principles of equal protection and due process to aliens “establish only that aliens receive constitutional protections when they have come within the territory of the United States and developed substantial connections with this country.” 494 U.S. at 271.

“In the exercise of its broad power over naturalization and immigration, Congress regularly makes rules which would be unacceptable if applied to citizens’”. *Id.* at 273, quoting *Mathews v. Diaz*, 426 U.S. 67, 79-80 (1976).

In the light of these precedents, the recent decision in *Washington v. Trump*, No. 17-35105 (9th Cir., 9 February 2017), purporting to uphold a temporary stay of President Trump’s recent Executive Order on immigration, is (to borrow Bentham’s deprecatory phrase) “nonsense on stilts”. Yet in the latter decision this country witnesses what the White House’s post calls “our judicial system” being intentionally misused by “useful idiots” within the political hierarchies of the States of Washington and Minnesota in order to frustrate the constitutional authority of Congress and the Executive! How should President Trump respond? Recently, the noted journalist and author Seth Lipsky asked me whether Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution applies to this problem; so I shall take that provision as an example of what President Trump and his legal advisors should consider—

The Constitution commands that “[t]he United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion”. Art. IV, § 4. Which implies, of course, that no State can claim a license either (i) to set aside her own “Republican Form of Government” or expose her own citizens to an “Invasion”, or (ii) to obstruct the United States in their execution of their constitutional power and duty to “guarantee * * * a Republican Form of Government” within that State’s territory and “protect” that State’s citizens “against Invasion” by whatever means may be available to the General Government. And without any necessity for any State subject to an “Invasion” to agree to the United States’ exercise of their constitutional duty to deal with that affliction—for, unlike the second clause of Article IV, Section 4, which requires an “Application of the Legislature [of a State], or of the

Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened)", before the United States may "protect" a State "against domestic Violence", the first clause imposes no such restriction.

Now, even were contemporary neo-Bolsheviks, other subversives of various persuasions, and assorted "useful idiots" not working tirelessly to promote irreconcilable social divisions through "Invasion[s]" of aliens indisposed to assimilate (or, worse yet, predisposed not to assimilate) to traditional American culture, such immigration would inevitably destroy "a Republican Form of Government" in each of the several States. What the Constitution describes as "a Republican Form of Government" is "one constructed on th[e] principle, that the Supreme Power resides in the body of the people". Compare U.S. Const. art. IV, § 4 with *Chisholm v. Georgia*, 2 U.S. (2 Dallas) 419, 457 (1793) (opinion of Wilson, J.). If, however, the United States no longer consist of one "people", substantially united in political understanding and purpose, maintenance of "a Republican Form of Government" in any of the several States is impossible. Inasmuch as, whether by conscious design or merely by its unintended consequence, unlimited immigration precludes such unity, it fatally threatens "a Republican Form of Government" in every State. Which (among other reasons) is why the Constitution provides that "[t]he Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing [i.e., as of 1788] shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight"—thereby recognizing the plenary power of Congress to "prohibit[]" any and all such "Migration or Importation" in those States after that date, and in all other States at any time. U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 1. And that is why (among other reasons) the Constitution delegates to Congress the allied powers "[t]o establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization" (as to "Migration"), "[t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations * * * and with the Indian Tribes" (as to "Importation"), "[t]o provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of

the Union[and] repel Invasions”, and “[t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers”. U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cls. 4, 3, 15, and 18. For through the exercise of these powers by Congress and the execution by the President of the statutes Congress enacts pursuant to them, “[t]he United States” can “guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government” by “protect[ing] each of them against Invasion” by aliens.

Moreover, the Second Amendment refers to “the security of a free State”, as to which it declares that “[a] well regulated Militia” is “necessary”. The term “a free State” is a general conception, to which (in the estimation of the Founders) all of “the several States” conformed at the time (1791) and were expected always to conform thereafter (along with such other States as later entered the Union). The term “free State” is perhaps best understood by consideration of the German noun “Freistaat” (literally, “free state”), the primary meaning of which is “republic”, with the adjectival form, “freistaatlich”, meaning “republican”. Thus, the term “a free State” in the Second Amendment should be equated with the term “a Republican Form of Government” in the original Constitution, such that “a free State” denotes a polity “constructed on th[e] principle, that the Supreme Power resides in the body of the people”. And, plainly enough, no “free State” can enjoy “security” when it is exposed to incessant “Invasion[s]” by aliens. So, just as “[a] well regulated Militia” is “necessary to the security of a free State”, such a Militia is necessary to the security of a “Republican Form of Government” free from the fear, let alone the actuality, of “Invasion”. This should be obvious, because the essence of both “a free State” and “a Republican Form of Government” is that “the Supreme Power resides in the body of the people”, and “a well regulated militia[is] composed of the body of the people”. See Virginia Declaration of Rights (1776) art. 13 (emphases supplied). In particular, then, by

executing “the Laws of the Union” so as to “repel Invasions” of illegal aliens when other components of the Constitution’s federal system prove themselves inadequate or even inimical to that task, the Militia can guarantee (as can no other institutions) that “the Supreme Power [always] resides in the body of the [American] people” who themselves make up the Militia, rather than being gradually usurped by foreign interlopers with no conceivable claim to any portion of that “Power”. See U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 15.

Inasmuch as issues arising under Article IV, Section 4 typically involve “political questions” as to which the Judiciary is constitutionally incompetent to afford relief to parties challenging the actions of Congress and the Executive, President Trump can—and should—simply disregard aberrant decisions such as *Washington v. Trump* (while, of course, providing the public with a complete explanation for his actions). See, e.g., *Luther v. Borden*, 48 U.S. (7 Howard) 1 (1849). And both he and Congress enjoy other, even more potent means to deal with rogue judges. See, e.g., my book *How To Dethrone the Imperial Judiciary* (San Antonio, Texas: Vision Forum Ministries, 2004). Whether the President’s legal advisors will properly instruct him—and steady his nerves—on these matters remains uncertain, though.

6. The White House’s post concludes with the truism that “[i]t is the first duty of government to keep the innocent safe”, and emphasizes the application of this duty to “especially those Americans who have not known safe neighborhoods for a very long time”. This is all well and good, as far as it goes. Yet it does not go nearly far enough. For the most serious threat to the safety of “the good People” throughout this country is not simply everyday “street crime” (as bad as that may be), but instead the crescent neo-Bolshevist “color revolution” for which the streets constitute merely one theater of operations.

The architects of America's emergent "color revolution" have honed their theory of "régime change" to a razor's edge, and tested it in various places around the world with some notable success. Throughout this country its practitioners in the Rotenfrontkämpferbund are numerous, well organized, adequately funded, and fanatic (if not lunatic) in their willingness to apply whatever measures of rhetorical and even physical violence they deem expedient to smash all opposition to their demands. The big "mainstream media", choruses of puffed-up political pundits, and gaggles of goofy "celebrities" apologize for, encourage, and even glamorize these tactics. And rogue public officials at every level of the federal system openly lend their support to the revolutionaries. The goal of this "color revolution" is to render America effectively ungovernable during President Trump's tenure, by impugning the legitimacy of any and every law, governmental policy, and action of his Administration that contradicts a single jot or tittle of the neo-Bolsheviks' agenda—enforcing these incessant complaints with massive orchestrated disruptions of the political, legal, and social order, thereby creating a new order based upon chaos, on the strength of which the neo-Bolsheviks hope to usurp the power of "a state within the state", with President Trump reduced to an impotent, ridiculous "bubblehead".

At first glance, "the color revolution's" reliance on strong-arm tactics appears to impale this country on the horns of a dilemma (which, no doubt, is the neo-Bolsheviks' intention). On the one hand, "the good People" cannot be left to the mercy of neo-Bolshevist thugs, unable to protect themselves unless they turn to the kind of ad hoc self-help that smacks of vigilantism—for that will reduce this country to an ungovernable condition, inasmuch as "order" imposed without "law" (other than "the law of the jungle") is not "government" at all. Yet, on the other hand, true constitutionalists must stand firm against the all-too-natural inclination of ordinary citizens assaulted by massive social unrest to "tighten the

screws” by employing police-state tactics up to and including “martial law”—for that will render this country ungovernable, too, inasmuch as “martial law” is not a form of government permissible under the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The only sure and certain way to avoid both of these mutually undesirable alternatives is to revitalize the Militia, thereby returning to “the good People” the ability, together with the absolute legal authority, to protect themselves. See my book *By Tyranny Out of Necessity: The Bastardy of “Martial Law”* (Ashland, Ohio: Bookmasters, Inc., Revised & Expanded Second Edition, 2014, 2016), especially at 531-676.

After all, as America’s sovereigns WE THE PEOPLE are “the government”—both as its source and as its ultimate executors, as well as its beneficiaries. Public officials can do nothing—at least legitimately—without THE PEOPLE’S approval and coöperation, both passive and active. So if (as the White House’s post opines) “keep[ing] the innocent safe” is “the first duty of government”, then it is the first duty of THE PEOPLE themselves—who, having the greatest incentive to remain safe, will surely be most assiduous in fulfilling it. And because “keep[ing] the innocent safe” is obviously a defining characteristic of what the Second Amendment calls “the security of a free State”, then the revitalization of “well regulated Militia”—composed of THE PEOPLE themselves—is “necessary” to that end.

7. President Trump must also take into account that the open neo-Bolshevist “color revolution” is not the only, or even the most dangerous, subversive force deployed against his Administration, as well as against himself personally. He must also reckon with what students of these matters denote as “the Deep State”—namely, the clandestine rogue apparatus lodged within the bowels of the “military-industrial” and especially the “national-security” complexes, which considers itself the real

“state within the state”, ruling over this country as a law unto itself alone. See, e.g., Paul Craig Roberts, “The Trump Presidency: RIP”, Paul Craig Roberts Institute for Political Economy (16 February 2017); and my commentary “An Ominous Start” (1 January 2017) at <edwinvieira.com>, pages 6-7.

In the long run, it does not much matter whether the Deep State is proceeding independently along the same lines as the neo-Bolsheviks, or whether it is loosely allied with them, or whether it is a full partner in their operations, or even whether it is actually in control of the whole shebang—for the immediate goal of both the Deep State and the neo-Bolsheviks is the same: to wit, the utter destruction both of the Trump Administration and of Mr. Trump himself, with their ultimate purpose being the defeat of WE THE PEOPLE’S reassertion of constitutional authority over this country. (Although, as Mark Twain quipped, history does not repeat itself, it often rhymes, the closest historical couplet in this case being, of course, the tacit alliance between the “left-fascist” Stalin and the “right-fascist” Hitler, through which the German Communist Rotenfrontkämpferbund effectively colluded with its supposed opponent, the Nazi Sturmabteilung, to overthrow the social-democratic Weimar Republic and set the stage for the Second World War. See, e.g., Viktor Suvorov, *The Chief Culprit: Stalin’s Grand Design to Start World War II* [Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press, 2013]).

Whatever the relationship between the fascistic “right” of the Deep State and the equally fascistic “left” of American neo-Bolshevism may be, the Deep State has already revealed its own hand, in spades, in the recent “Flynn-flammery” it has apparently imposed on President Trump. See, e.g., Richard Pollock, “EXCLUSIVE: How The Nation’s Spooks Played The Game ‘Kill Mike Flynn’”, *The Daily Caller* (15 February 2017); Jay Symopoulos, “Open Warfare Declared In DC As Deep State ‘Goes Nuclear’—Trump ‘Will Die In Jail’”, *The Freethoughtproject* (15

February 2017); Pepe Escobar, "The Swamp Strikes Back", Offguardian (16 February 2017); and Joachim Hagopian, "Reasons Why Michael Flynn Was Fatality #1 in the Trump Presidency", LewRockwell.com (17 February 2017).¹ The only adequate response to this dire threat is for President Trump to bring to bear against the Deep State the full power of constitutional "law enforcement", and sweep all of the renegades out of the "military-industrial" and "national-security" complexes with an iron broom. Compare 18 U.S.C. §§ 2383 through 2385 (the emergent problem) with 10 U.S.C. §§ 332 and 333 (a necessary part of the solution).

8. In the final analysis, if the Trump Administration intends to "stand[] up for our law enforcement community" in the fullest constitutional sense of that promise, it must first recognize of whom "our law enforcement community" actually consists—namely, WE THE PEOPLE themselves—and then realize that "standing up" for that "community" demands the revitalization of those constitutional institutions in which WE THE PEOPLE personally participate, to the point of exercising actual day-to-day decision and direction. If President Trump does nothing else during his tenure in office, he must leave America with the permanent legacy of "well regulated Militia" in every one of the several States, able to "execute the Laws of the Union" in "the actual Service of the United States" against all enemies, whether foreign interlopers or (especially) domestic subversives. And he must begin to do so immediately. For his—and America's—enemies will not afford him the luxury of being able to "play for time". Today is his time. Tomorrow will be too late. Procrastination was apparently President Kennedy's undoing. See, e.g., JFK and the Unspeakable. Why He Died and Why It Matters (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2008; reprinted, New York, New York: Touchstone, 2010). President Trump would be well advised to take that lesson to heart.

[1]. Some supporters of President Trump have floated the alternative explanation that Flynn's resignation was actually part of the normal course of events within the Administration. See "Dr. Steve Pieczenik Says Michael Flynn Was Purposefully Removed, The Left Are Intellectual Frustrated Children", *iBankCoin* (16 February 2017). This thesis is exceedingly difficult to credit, however. For it would have been both unnecessary and highly counterproductive for the Administration to subscribe to a narrative based on Flynn's telephonic indiscretion and later dishonesty in describing his behavior, together with allegations of "leaks" by person or persons unknown inside but hostile to the Administration, when a simple press-release stating that Flynn had resigned to make way for a better-qualified replacement would have sufficed—without providing the big "mainstream media" with additional ammunition for their on-going barrage that President Trump is a crony, a stooge, a dupe, or otherwise an "asset" of Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Expanding the Role of States

The Trump Administration is evaluating how best to transfer back to the states powers that have been usurped by the federal government since the New Deal, including an ever greater role planned for the states in public education, health care, public safety, land management, and pollution control. There is in the President's intended devolution of power to the states an opportunity for reduction in federal spending and in state burdens. There is also an opportunity for the Trump Administration to evaluate every unfunded federal mandate imposed on the states and eliminate all which are redundant of state functions or interfere with state-tailored means to address the underlying issues, which means

are likely to be less costly and more effective. This devolution of power signals a return to dual federalism, including less federal paternalism and more state-centric solutions to the peculiar problems of each state's citizens.

During the Reagan Administration, President Reagan issued Executive Order 12291 and Congress passed the State and Local Cost Estimate Act of 1981. Those measures were designed to quantify the cost to the states of unfunded federal mandates. Hundreds of pieces of federal legislation contain unfunded mandates, including prominently the No Child Left Behind Act, Medicaid, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Safe Drinking Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Endangered Species Act. No one knows for sure the total cost to the states of the mandates now imposed nationwide but they are likely in the tens of billions of dollars.

The order of federal business since the New Deal has been to remove discretion from the states by imposing federal fiats of one kind or another, frequently without funding support. Those legislative commands either compel the states to undertake initiatives at state expense to receive other federal benefits or compel the states to act without any financial help. Over the last thirty years traditional state functions in education, health and welfare, and criminal justice have been usurped by the federal government, leaving much of the cost of compliance on the states.

As was apparent at the recent National Governors' Conference, a majority of Governors view the mandates as overwhelming, rendering the states increasingly mere functionaries of the federal government, and denying the states discretionary funds sufficient to implement their own tailored plans at less cost.

The great deregulation initiative commenced on February 24 with President Trump's Executive Order on Enforcing the Regulatory Reform Agenda should be followed by an additional

Executive Order to require a review with the aid of the states' Attorneys General of all unfunded federal mandates. That order should anticipate a move by the Administration to alleviate the states of the mandates.

First, all unfunded mandates which are redundant of state functions should be identified as appropriate for repeal. Second, all anachronistic unfunded mandates and those which impose costs that exceed benefits should also be up for termination. Third, all mandates in areas that could more appropriately be addressed by state and local officials should likewise be slated for elimination.

Then, with the mandates identified that are in need of elimination and the support of a majority of the nation's Governors, the Trump Administration's allies in Congress should introduce legislation to eliminate the unfunded mandates. The reduction in cost burdens pm the states combined with the greater freedom the states will acquire to address issues of education, health care, public safety, land management, and pollution will lead to less costly and more efficient government overall, as well as to a revitalization of the dual federalist constitutional system intended by the Founding Fathers.

Donald Trump: greatest US President in modern era

President Donald Trump has accomplished more in the first few weeks of his presidency than any other president in the modern era. He is making good on each of his campaign promises, transforming America into a nation that has secure borders,

that reduces regulatory impediments that block market entry and retard free enterprise, that permits free markets to arise in health care, and that wages a relentless campaign of destruction against radical Islamic terrorists worldwide. His actions are so swift and so consequential that his opposition has difficulty capturing the news cycle. By the time they coalesce opposition against a measure, President Trump is on to the next initiative.

He is unintimidated by his opposition and dedicated with laser like precision to achieve the objectives of his Administration. To this point in history, each modern President has been preoccupied with media perception of each action. That preoccupation has rendered actions anemic and results unimpressive in case after case. By contrast, President Trump leads and lets the consequences follow. He means to make a huge difference for the benefit of his country and has no tolerance for mindless drivel and opposition based on sympathies for America's enemies.

The politics of Washington have been the politics of indecision, inaction, and inertia. President Trump has filled Washington's vacuum of power with bold and directed leadership. Republicans thought to be likely antagonists of the President have largely fallen into rank behind him, recognizing that President Trump proceeds like a steamroller at full throttle without regard to whether his opposition comes in the form of a Red or a Blue state representative.

For those who have long yearned for change to revitalize the American economy, defend America's borders, and dismantle the regulatory state, President Trump comes as an answer. There is no one in Washington more dedicated to the welfare of the United States than President Trump.

He is increasingly winning over the hearts and minds of the American people. They are coming to realize that bureaucratic mountains thought to be impenetrable and permanent are the

very ones he intends to bring down. The dams those mountains formed, blocking the flow of free market activity are rapidly giving way, ushering in new streams of commerce for the benefit of all Americans.

Just one month ago, the market heaved forward carrying the weight of regulation with no apparent end in sight. Many doubted that President Trump, even were they to credit his promise to deregulate, could alter decades old regulatory regimes that exercised an authoritarian strangle hold on the throat of business.

Business leaders have learned that regardless of how illogical or extreme the regulations imposed upon them, they would have to adjust because the regulators were not going to disappear and possess numerous tools to fine or destroy those who resist compulsion. Trump's executive order on deregulation changes the direction. Now the regulatory state faces a President who means to reduce the size and scope of the regulatory state by a promised 75%. They face a President with the fortitude necessary to stand firm in the face of bureaucratic wailing and gnashing of teeth.

President Donald Trump is proving by action, not rhetoric, that he means to resurrect the American empire. The contrast with his predecessor could not be greater. The world is fast coming to realize that Donald Trump will fight tenaciously and unrelentingly to rebuild American military and economic dominance. The apology tour is over. America is back. Thank you, Mr. President.

© 2017 Jonathan W. Emord – All Rights Reserved

Obama thumbs his nose at Trump's immigration agenda

President Barack Obama is thumbing his nose at his successor, President-elect Donald Trump by bringing as many Islamic refugees as he can in his remaining weeks in office. Fact, Obama entered into a secret deal with Australia to take as many refugees as possible who were turned down for asylum by Australia, according to a number of sources.

In fact on Thursday, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley wrote a letter of complaint to both Secretary of State John Kerry and Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson. In his letter he reportedly condemned reports that President Obama was going to admit thousands of Muslims into America including "asylum seekers" the Australian government believed were a danger to their citizens.

"Apparently, Australian officials are more concerned with national security and the safety and security of their people than our own President," claims former police official David Renaaldi. "This is an example of how little the Democrats care about the American people. Their hearts are with illegal aliens, Muslim terrorists and other anti-American groups they consider 'constituents,'" retired Capt. Renaaldi said.

The refugees involved are nationals from global hotspots including Iran, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia and Sudan. Grassley called these nations places where it's almost impossible to vet people.

One of the most pressing issues Trump faces is the enormous problem of illegal immigration and the implementation of his plans to secure U.S. borders and apprehend and deport criminal aliens. Coupled with that is the American left's obsession with importing thousands of refugees from countries that

harbor or are run by terrorists, with no viable means to conduct background checks.

As far as his ideas on immigration reform, Trump's rhetoric and his plans appear to coincide with the opinions of a majority of Republicans and so-called Independents despite Republicans and Democrats in the news media who claim the majority of Americans want Obama-style amnesty for the millions of illegal aliens already living in the United States. And as far as voters are concerned – and not just Republicans – Donald Trump has a winning formula for fighting immigration-related violence and crimes.

While Democrats and some Republicans warned Trump about pushing his immigration agenda during his campaign against open-borders advocate Hillary Clinton, a Rasmussen Reports national survey appeared to show that many Americans agreed – and continue to agree – with Trump's views on border security and criminal aliens.

Donald Trump had released a policy paper that calls for getting tough on illegal immigration. He even used a Rasmussen poll to show that contrary to what the news media say – that his immigration policy is outside of the mainstream – his proposal to end automatic citizenship for children born to illegal immigrants in this country is far from being outside the mainstream of Americans' political thought.

Rasmussen pollsters found that 70 percent of likely GOP voters agree with the GOP presidential hopeful that the United States should build a wall along the Mexican border to help stop illegal immigration. Seventeen percent (17%) of GOP voters disagree, while 13% are undecided.

Ninety-two percent (92%) of Republicans agree that the United States should deport all illegal immigrants who have been convicted of a felony in this country. Only four percent (4%) disagree.

Among all likely voters – Republicans, Democrats and Independents – 51 percent favor building a wall on the U.S.-Mexican border; 37 percent disagree, and 12% are not sure. A whopping 80 percent said that they support the deportation of all illegal immigrants convicted of a felony; while only 11 percent are opposed and nine percent aren't sure.

Cops urge Trump to restore equipment confiscated by Obama

President-elect Donald Trump's victory over Democrat Hillary Clinton was the result of a number of actions that the news media chose to ignore, but the American people still discovered. For example, an overwhelming number of law enforcement fraternal and labor organizations broke ranks from the rest of the unions to endorse candidate Trump. That included the federal officers with the U.S. Border Patrol, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, and the nation's largest police union representing local and state police, the Fraternal Order of Police with more than 300,000 members and affiliates.

Now many cops are urging President Trump and his Attorney General to rescind Executive Order 13688 which was meant to decrease the protection of police officers by reducing their self-defense capabilities. The goal was to appease rioters, activists and certain politicians who felt threatened by police officers based on "how they looked."

Last year, President Barack Obama pushed his administration to implement his executive order to take away certain weapons and equipment away from local police and sheriff departments throughout the nation in reaction to police anti-riot tactics in which they utilized military-style vehicles and weapons.

According to 13688, high-tech weapons, equipment and vehicles are to be confiscated from law enforcement agencies across the country by the Obama administration despite the country's sheriffs and lawmakers complaining that the equipment is more

than ever necessary to protect communities from violence including incidents perpetrated by jihadists who are expected to attempt a repeat of attacks occurring in France, Belgium and other countries.

Sheriffs such as Arizona's Joe Arpaio and Wisconsin's David Clarke have complained that losing armored vehicles and other equipment that are defensive not offensive will place police officers and sheriffs' deputies, in addition to their communities, at risk from violent crime, riots and terrorism.

"These things are useful tools and the president taking them away will put more officers in jeopardy and at risk of harm or even death. I don't know how he can sleep at night knowing his actions will have those repercussions," argues Rep. Mike Rogers, R-Alabama.

Rogers explained that President Obama had issued Executive Order 13688 after the anti-police riots in Ferguson, Missouri, Baltimore, Maryland, and other riots. Amid the violence, there was outcry by liberal-left activists and Democrat lawmakers about the alleged "militarization" of the police while there was practically silence about the rioters looting and torching businesses.

"The do-gooders were more concerned about the [safety of] rioters and looters than about the officers who had to face them and worry about how they used their weapons and equipment," said former police officer and attorney Joseph Fitzgerald. "In fact, Obama and his Attorney General at the time [Eric Holder] took action even before the investigation that followed the shooting of a black man by a white officer was completed. By the way, the verdict in that case was that the officer was correct in his use of deadly force against a 6'8? 300 lbs. assailant," explained Fitzgerald.

Satanic temple gets ok for after-school club for elementary kids

If this isn't proof positive of the demise of America, then what is?

The Portland chapter of the Satanic Temple – a reference that's significant in itself, as it shows a plurality and therefore, growth of organized Satanism in America – has just won an accommodation from school officials to offer an after-school club for children.

It's called the "After School Satan Club."□ How nice. It's aimed at attracting the elementary-age crowd.

Beginning Oct. 19, Sacramento Elementary School will open doors to the satanic activity, which is being billed as lessons "on science and rational thinking,"□ according to one of the temple's local chapter heads, Finn Rezz.

Rezz kindly explained to the Oregonian it's not that the members of the Satanic Temple are truly Satanists, worshiping some sort of spiritual or supernatural entity of the dark side. Rather, he went on, most are simply atheists who view Satan "as an allegory for free thought,"□ the newspaper said.

The club is solely to foster in its participants a sense of "benevolence and empathy for everybody,"□ Rezz said.

He also said the After School Satan Club is intended to provide students an option to the "Good News Club,"□ a get-together arranged by the Child Evangelism Fellowship – a Bible-based group – that's allowed to meet at the school once a month.

As if the two groups are morally equivalent.

This is the Child Evangelism group's stated mission, on its

webpage: "Child Evangelism Fellowship is a Bible-centered, worldwide organization composed of born-again believers whose purpose is to evangelize boys and girls with the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, disciple them in the Word of God and establish them in a Bible believing church for Christian living. We are committed to helping local churches and individuals evangelize children."

By comparison, the Satanic Temple touts its mission, on its own website, as "facilitate[ing] the communication and mobilization of politically aware Satanists, secularists, and advocates for individual liberty." The Satanic Temple also promises to "undertake noble pursuits guided by the individual will." Really?

Note to Satanic Temple: Have you considered a Marketing 101 class?

But here's a free thought observance – the Satanic Temple's name is what it is because it aptly describes all that flows from its members and missions.

Wake up, America. This battle for the soul of our nation – which used to be clearly stated, taught and believed as a country where individual rights come from God, not government – is growing more intense. And the enemy is not only disguising its true intent, cloaking its wickedness in a guise of free thought and with a cloak of kindness – it's setting sights on the youngest, most malleable minds of all: the children.

And it's doing it in a way that Satan himself would be proud: by taking a truth and twisting it just enough to cause chaos and confusion – by citing the First Amendment's religious freedom clause and demanding an equal access to the Christian groups. The end result is predictable: Local governing authorities, afraid of lawsuits, cave to the Satanic Temple's demands.

Local citizens, even those of faith, ultimately bite their tongues and shake their heads, unsure how to fight off such

logical, law-based demands. And atheists, progressives and others with similar mindsets who want nothing more than to tear down the Judeo-Christian fabric of America's founding and usher in a secular society that breeds contempt for all-things-traditional, moral and virtuous, rub hands with glee, fueled by yet another chink in the nation's faith-based armor. Well, here's a message to mull: Two roads diverged in a yellow wood – one leading down a path of acceptance, conciliation, regret and loss and the other, down a path of bold and righteous indignation, brutal fights to the finish, glory for God, and honor to both individual and nation. Which to choose? That, dear Christian and fellow patriot, will make all the difference.

© 2016 Cheryl Chumley – All Rights Reserved

Obama, Hillary and media display bigotry against Middle Eastern Christians

President Barack Obama and his hopeful successor Hillary Clinton are continuing their open-door policy to Muslim refugees fleeing the turmoil in Syria, Iraq and other regions, but a number of American Christian organizations claim the two Democrat leaders have shown less sympathy for Syrian and Iraqi Christians.

In fact, of the 10,801 brought into the United States by the end of September, only 56 of them are listed as Christians (see numerical breakdown below). The vast majority of the Muslims are part of the Sunni sect, which is the one represented by the likes of al-Qaida, Islamic State of Iraq

and Syria (ISIS), Al-Shabaab (Somalia) and others.

Religious Denomination Number of Refugees

Catholic	12
Christian	29
Greek Orthodox	1
Jehovah Witness	4
Muslim (unspecified)	90
Muslim (Shiite)	20
Muslim (Suni)	10,612
No Religion	1
Orthodox	6
Other	5
Protestant	4
Yazidi	17

Religious denominations of the 10,801 Syrian refugees who have been admitted into the United States since the Obama Administration's announced plan to admit 10,000 Syrian refugees for FY2016 on September 10, 2015. Source: -Refugee Processing Center

"For a political party that loves to label their opponents as bigots, it's remarkable how bigoted the current administration is and how bigoted the Clinton administration will continue to be against Christians," said former counter-terrorism training officer and American police detective George Tobiaso.

According to several news reports from outlets in the United States and Europe, more than 70 mass graves were discovered in Iraq and Syria containing thousands of decaying bodies killed by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and other Islamic terrorist groups who buried the victims of their atrocities.

As many as 15,000 victims – men, women and children – slaughtered during the occupation of towns and villages by ISIS, a group known for executing Christians, may be buried in

the sites across territory that was occupied by ISIS, Al Nusra Front or other radical Muslims.

According to the Homeland Security News Wire, "The [Associated Press] used satellite imagery, photos, and interviews, to find the location of seventeen mass graves in Syria and sixteen mass graves in Iraq – although the latter are in areas still too dangerous to excavate. AP says from 5,200 to more than 15,000 ISIS victims are buried in the graves it knows about."

Few if any are being held accountable for the heinous crimes. Besides the killings, much of Iraq's Christian community have been ripped from their ancestral homes in Nineveh. The jihadists are also responsible for the destruction of Christians' cultural heritage. However, while Obama frets over Islamophobia, hardly anything is said about the horrors being faced by followers of Jesus Christ.

Many more mass graves may be found once Isis retreats after losing ground outside of Iraqi cities of Mosul and Raqqa which remain under jihadists' control.

According to the watchdog group that's known for its accuracy and diligence: Earlier this year Judicial Watch uncovered State Department records confirming that "Arab extremists" are entering the U.S. through Mexico with the assistance of smuggling network "cells." Among them is a top Al Qaeda operative wanted by the FBI.

The government documents also reveal that some Mexican smuggling networks actually specialize in providing logistical support for Arab individuals attempting to enter the United States. The top Al Qaeda leader in Mexico was identified in the State Department records, via a September 2004 cable from the American consulate in Ciudad Juárez, as Adnan G. El Shurkrjumah. In December, 2014 Shukrijumah was killed by the Pakistan Army in an intelligence-borne operation in South Waziristan.

But before he died Shukrijumah helped plan several U.S. attacks, including plots to bomb Oprah Winfrey's studio and detonate nuclear devices in multiple American cities. For years Shukrijumah appeared on the FBI's most wanted list and, despite being sought by the agency, he crossed back and forth into the U.S. from Mexico to meet fellow militant Islamists in Texas. Back in 2014 Judicial Watch reported that, as one of the world's most wanted terrorists, Shukrijumah piloted an aircraft into the Cielo Dorado airfield in Anthony, New Mexico.

Michael Scheuer, former Chief of the CIA's [Osama] bin Laden unit, offered a recent perspective on presidential candidate Hillary Clinton: He called her, "A likely felon/traitor who is utterly dependent on her sexual-predator husband, has accomplished nothing in her life except a superb talent for deceit, and the gains made by her family's graft, influence peddling, and corruption. This is a person so devoid of integrity, honesty, and character that her two major concerns seem to be to pocket more lucre for herself, and to ensure that human babies always can be profitably murdered, dismembered, and sold for parts right up to their due date."

Speaking about President Barack Obama, Scheuer said, "Barack Obama, the pride of the Ivy League, the darling of the media, and a man who can only be described as ignorant, stupid, or a liar. In his oh-so-superior speech to the convention, Obama said that Hillary Clinton was the most prepared/experienced candidate for the presidency in U.S. history, adding 'better than you or me Bill.' Well, Obama was right on one count, he is certainly the least-prepared person ever to be president."

© 2016 Jim Kouri- All Rights Reserved