

Board of Directors
Norman Olney
San Diego, California
Floyd Brown
Phoenix, Arizona
Randy Goodwin
Santa Ana, California

Executive Director
Michael Connelly

Of Counsel
James F. Altham, Jr.
New Haven, Connecticut
G. Darlene Anderson
San Diego, California
Russell A. Austin, Jr.
Seattle, Washington
Roy L. Brun
Shreveport, Louisiana
Kenneth G. Burke
Memphis, Tennessee
James L. Byrnes
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
William M. Crosby
Orange, California
Scott E. Darling
Riverside, California
Richmond T.P. Davis
Silver Spring, Maryland
William G. Davis
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Frank Donatelli
Alexandria, Virginia
James E. Edwards
Coral Springs, Florida
William E. Evans
Annandale, Virginia
Fred Friedman, P.C.
Akron, New York
Malcolm N. Fleming
Manlius, New York
Richard G. Handler
Bellerose, New York
John J. Jawor
Chicago, Illinois
J. Kent Jarrell
Washington, D.C.
Karl Keating
San Diego, California
James V. Lacy
Laguna Niguel, California
Robert M. Levy
Woodland Hills, California
W. Andrew McCullough
Orem, Utah
John C. Meyer
Washington, D.C.
David B. Nolan
Alexandria, Virginia
Taylor O'Hearn
Shreveport, Louisiana
Alfred S. Regnery
Washington, D.C.
John L. Roche
San Diego, California
Duane Root, P.C.
Akron, New York
Richard B. Sanders
Seattle, Washington
Leonard J. Snow
Ithaca, New York
David J. Strachman
Providence, Rhode Island
Elroy Strickland
Murrysville, Pennsylvania
Roscoe Stovall, Jr.
Indianapolis, Indiana
John P. Taylor
Cupertino, California
John H. Tovey
Allendale, New Jersey
Neil T. Wallace
Ithaca, New York
(Partial Listing)



May 19, 2016
PRM-Comments@state.gov

Hon. Simon Henshaw
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary
Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20006

Re: United States Justice Foundation Comments to the
United States Department of State Responding to its
Notice of Public Comments on the
FY 2017 U.S. Refugee Admissions Program
Federal Register, Vol. 81, No. 77 (April 21, 2016)

Dear Secretary Henshaw:

These Comments of the United States Justice Foundation are filed in response to the U.S. Department of State's above-referenced Notice relating to the FY 2017 U.S. Refugee Admissions Program.

Background on Commenter United States Justice Foundation

These comments are filed by the United States Justice Foundation, 932 D Street, Suite 2, Ramona, California 92065. The United States Justice Foundation ("USJF") is a legal defense and educational organization, founded in 1979. More information about USJF can be found at www.usjf.net.

USJF has been involved in analyzing and reporting to the public on the federal government's immigration programs in the past. *See e.g.*, United States Justice Foundation Legal Policy Paper: "A Legal Analysis of New Proposals to Limit Immigration from Muslim Countries into the United States" (Feb. 12, 2016).¹

¹ <https://www.usjf.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/USJF-Paper-on-Trump-Immigration-Proposal-Feb-12.pdf>.

Purpose of the Solicitation of Comments

Sections 207(d)(1) and (e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) require that the Department of State submit to Congress a report before the beginning of each fiscal year. The next fiscal year, FY 2017, begins on October 1, 2016. These comments are requested from the public as part of the Department of State’s process to obtain information for that report.

(d)(1) **Before the start of each fiscal year** the President shall report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate regarding the **foreseeable number of refugees** who will be in need of resettlement during the fiscal year and the anticipated allocation of refugee admissions during the fiscal year. The President shall provide for periodic discussions between designated representatives of the President and members of such committees regarding changes in the worldwide refugee situation, the progress of refugee admissions, and the possible need for adjustments in the allocation of admissions among refugees.....

(e) For purposes of this section, the term “appropriate consultation” means, with respect to the admission of refugees and allocation of refugee admissions, discussions in person by designated Cabinet-level representatives of the President with members of the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the refugee situation or emergency refugee situation, to project the extent of possible participation of the United States therein, to discuss the reasons for believing that the proposed admission of refugees is justified by humanitarian concerns or grave humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest, and to provide such members with the following information:

- (1) A description of the nature of the refugee situation.
- (2) A description of the number and allocation of the refugees to be admitted and an analysis of conditions within the countries from which they came.
- (3) A **description of the proposed plans for their movement and resettlement** and the estimated cost of their movement and resettlement.
- (4) An analysis of the anticipated **social, economic, and demographic impact** of their admission to the United States.
- (5) A description of the extent to which other countries will admit and assist in the resettlement of such refugees.
- (6) An analysis of the impact of the participation of the United States in the resettlement of such refugees on the foreign policy interests of the United States.
- (7) Such additional information as may be appropriate or requested by such members.

To the extent possible, information described in this subsection shall be provided at least **two weeks in advance of discussions** in person by designated representatives of the President with such members. [Emphasis added.]

These comments are particularly focused on giving the Department of State information to incorporate into its report to Congress which addresses the “social, economic, and demographic impact” of admitting large numbers of refugees into the nation. Further, USJF requests that the Department of State report the truth about the risks of such refugees to the safety of Americans, and the preservation of our Constitutional Republic.

The State Department’s Notice Is Doubly Flawed

USJF notes that the Department of State’s Notice published on April 21, 2016 in the [Federal Register, Vol. 81. No. 77, at 23544](#), is flawed, in that it provides that persons “wishing to submit written comments on the appropriate size and scope of the **FY 2016** U.S. Refugee Admissions Program should submit them by 5 p.m. on Thursday, May 19, **2015**.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, this notice is flawed in two respects. First, it seeks comments as to the appropriate size and scope of the 2016 program — when it should be seeking comments as to the appropriate size and scope of the 2017 program — 2016 being nearly half over by the time these comments are filed. Second, the deadline for comments was May 19, 2015, which was one year ago. The deadline for comments should have been stated to May 19, 2016. Although these comments are filed on the assumption that the notice was in error, many persons may have been confused so as not to file any comments at all. For these reasons, it would appear that the State Department has not made an adequate request for public input, and the notice should be reposted and a new deadline for comments be set as to the 2017 program.² Based on the statutory requirement, set out above, there is still time for the Department of State to seek additional input from the public, and still meet the statutory deadline for its report.

The United States Government Has Provoked the Middle East Refugee Crisis

U.S. Army General Wesley Clark served as the Supreme Allied Commander for Europe — no doubt the most important military position outside of the Pentagon. Shortly after the events of 9-11, in 2001, General Clark visited the Pentagon where he learned that the United States was planning to begin wars to topple seven Middle Eastern governments in five years.³ Those seven countries were Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, and Iran.

² Although it is possible that a superceding notice with correct information was published, it is the erroneous April 21, 2016 notice that was posted to the Department of State’s website as of the date of the filing of these comments.

³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9RC1Mepk Sw>.

We know that the United States government implemented these plans based on a leaked cable, as discussed in an article by Robert Naiman entitled “WikiLeaks Reveals How the US Aggressively Pursued Regime Change in Syria, Igniting a Bloodbath” (Oct. 9, 2015):⁴

A December 13, 2006 cable, “Influencing the SARG [Syrian government] in the End of 2006,” indicates that, as far back as 2006 - five years before “Arab Spring” protests in Syria - destabilizing the Syrian government was a central motivation of US policy. The author of the cable was William Roebuck, at the time chargé d'affaires at the US embassy in Damascus. The cable outlines strategies for destabilizing the Syrian government. In his summary of the cable, Roebuck wrote:

We believe Bashar's weaknesses are in how he chooses to react to looming issues, both perceived and real, such as the conflict between economic reform steps (however limited) and entrenched, corrupt forces, the Kurdish question, and the potential threat to the regime from the increasing presence of transiting Islamist extremists. **This cable summarizes our assessment of these vulnerabilities and suggests that there may be actions, statements, and signals that the USG⁵ can send that will improve the likelihood of such opportunities arising.**

This cable suggests that the US goal in December 2006 was to undermine the Syrian government by any available means, and that what mattered was whether US action would help destabilize the government, not what other impacts the action might have. In public the US was in favor of economic reform, but in private the US saw conflict between economic reform and "entrenched, corrupt forces" as an “opportunity.” In public, the US was opposed to “Islamist extremists” everywhere; but in private it saw the “potential threat to the regime from the increasing presence of transiting Islamist extremists” as an “opportunity” that the US should take action to try to increase. [Emphasis added.]

In other words, the U.S. Government, having worked covertly for the past 15 years to destabilize the Syrian government, it is utter disinformation for the Government now to tell the American people that there is a refugee crisis of unparalleled proportions because of flaws in the Syrian government. The U.S. Government created this crisis and cannot now demand that the American people accept massive immigration from the Middle East, under the cover of a humanitarian program to address a “refugee” crisis.

⁴ <http://www.truth-out.org/progressivepicks/item/33180-wikileaks-reveals-how-the-us-aggressively-pursued-regime-change-in-syria-igniting-a-bloodbath>.

⁵ United States Government.

While refugees are usually described by the Obama Administration as “women and children,” the long lines of refugees shown in television news broadcasts are overwhelmingly males in their twenties and thirties without any women and children. It would be a disaster for the countries from which these young men come to allow them into this country, as they should stay with their families, and we should not encourage them to abandon their families.

Indeed, the American people can have no confidence that persons who claim to be Syrian refugees are, in fact, even from Syria.⁶ There is no reason to believe that the Obama Administration will be vigilant in vetting refugees into the country to prevent violent criminals or even terrorists from settling in the United States.

Today, most Americans do not trust President Obama to protect the borders of the nation. Rather, he appears to be pursuing, with vigor, the use of immigration and refugee policy to fulfill his pre-election pledge to “fundamentally transform the United States of America.”⁷

The Policies of Our Government Will either Serve the American People, or Serve the Interests of an Internationalist Elite which Threatens America

For generations, America’s immigration and asylum policy admitted persons and people groups whose religious beliefs and cultures were harmonious with the foundational principles of the American experiment. *See generally* “Opportunity and Exclusion: A Brief History of U.S. Immigration Policy”¹. There was a critically important reason for that policy, which has been rejected out of hand by modern politicians and government bureaucrats who prefer to view themselves as internationalists, rather than American nationalists. These modern politicians and bureaucrats have a visceral hostility to the nation state conceptually, as they believe they have found a better way. But the way of internationalism is as old as the Tower of Babel, where the world’s peoples rebelled against our Creator God:

1 And the **whole earth was of one language**, and of one speech. 2 And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there. 3 And they said one to another, Go to, let us make brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar. 4 And they said, Go to, **let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven**; and let us make us a name, lest we be

⁶ The United Nations acknowledges that refugees crossing the Mediterranean are from Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Iran, Nigeria, Gambia, Somalia, Cote d’Ivoire, and Guinea, and reports the number of men at 45 percent — well over the 2 percent estimated by President Obama.

⁷ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KrefKCaV8m4>.

⁸ <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/special-reports/opportunity-and-exclusion-brief-history-us-immigration-policy>.

scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. [Genesis 11 (emphasis added).]

This represented the first, and last, effort to physically assault the Heavens, as God responded:

5 And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. 6 And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. 7 Go to, let us go down, and there **confound their language**, that they may not understand one another's speech. 8 So the Lord **scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth**: and they left off to build the city. 9 Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did there **confound the language** of all the earth: and from thence did the Lord **scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth**. [*Id.* (emphasis added).]

As a result of their rebellion, God, in his mercy, gave different people groups the ability to speak different languages, and those that spoke the same language then were sent in different directions to settle different parts of the earth. The result of this scattering into groups of persons speaking the same language was the creation of the nation state.

24 **God that made the world and all things therein**, seeing that he is **Lord of heaven and earth**, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; 25 neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; 26 and **hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth**, and hath **determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation**; 27 **that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him**, though he be not far from every one of us: 28 for in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring. [Acts 17 (emphasis added).]

God's purpose in creating the nation state was that people would find Him, and reconcile with Him. Therefore, the secularists/internationalists who wish to wipe away national borders are engaged in an act of rebellion against our Creator God who gave us life.

The battle continues to this day. Earlier this month, Secretary of State John Kerry gave a commencement address at Northeastern University, where he demonstrated his unfitness to serve as this nation's representative to other nations, when he rejoiced that:

You're about to graduate into a complex and borderless world.⁸

⁹ P. Kasperowicz, "Kerry slams Trump's wall, tells grads to prepare for 'borderless world,'" Washington Examiner (May 6, 2016). <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/kerry-slams-trumps-wall-tells-grads-to-prepare-for-borderless-world/article/2590596>.

Secretary Kerry continued, lecturing that: “For some people, that is all they need simply to climb under the sheets, close their eyes and push the world away....” However, it is Secretary Kerry who fails to understand the consequences of a borderless world, for by his wealth and power he is immunized from the consequences of his actions. A government official who lives in a guarded community and rides to and from his barricaded government office in a motorcade of black Suburbans with armed security is unlikely to ever suffer the threat posed by immigrants, whose culture and religion do not value human life as the United States does — or at least once did.

Indeed, the truth is the opposite of what Kerry envisions. One statement variously attributed to President Ronald Reagan, and others, sums up the opposing view:

A nation without borders is not a nation.⁹

It appears that in November 2016 the American people will be faced with a choice between these two competing views of the world — one nationalist, and one internationalist. If those who believe in the preservation of the United States as a nation prevail in that election, it can be expected that large numbers of internationalists soon will be leaving “government service.”

The very same internationalist threat is present worldwide, as the people of various Western nations are rejecting the rule of their political elites. On June 23, 2016, the United Kingdom will hold a referendum to decide if it will stay in or leave the European Union. Polling as of now indicates that the government’s campaign to infuse fear into the people of that nation should they choose to reject rule by the EU to re-establish their own sovereignty, is slightly ahead, but the gap appears to be closing.¹⁰ One of the most powerful arguments for leaving the EU is that decisions that affect the lives of those in the UK would be made in London, not Brussels. The Brexit vote may be the last chance for a generation or more for the people of the UK to throw off a powerful central government run by internationalists who have no meaningful accountability to the people.¹¹

The Internationalist Elites completely understand that government which is closest to the people can be best controlled by the people. When a town council governs badly, the

¹⁰ See Phyllis Schaffley, “Amnesty Isn’t Reform — It’s Open Borders, Eagle Forum (Jan. 2004). <https://www.eagleforum.org/psr/2004/jan04/psrjan04.html>.

¹¹ See Brexit poll tracker, *Financial Times* <https://ig.ft.com/sites/brexit-polling/>.

¹² See “Brexit: The Movie” (“[The EU] is like Heaven for the politician or bureaucrat, because it’s power without accountability. It was devised to make sure that the great mass of the people could not control government, ever again. The EU is turning into a dictatorship, and this is not overstating it.”) <https://youtube.com/UTMxfAkxfQ0>.

people learn of it quickly, and can remedy the situation. It is easier to oust a corrupt governor than a corrupt President. In a country where each member of the House of Representatives represents, on average, over a half-million people, it is already a problem that Representatives are often immune from input from their constituents. Centralization of power always makes it easier for these elites to move in the direction which benefits them personally, having no real interest in preserving the elements of the nation by which free men would resist tyranny.

Our Nation’s Refugee Policy Must Only Admit Persons Willing to Live Peacefully in Our Constitutional Republic

The easiest way for the Internationalist Elites to achieve their objective of a “borderless” world is to change the demographics of our nation. Open borders, and the admission of millions of persons from other nations, cultures, and religions, is their goal. Loose immigration and refugee policy is the current tactic. They care little about the economic well-being of Americans. They certainly do not care about the physical safety of Americans. And least of all do they care if Americans continue to live in a relatively “free” state. Indeed, freedom must be extinguished in order for the Internationalist Elites to have the power to force on the American people what they believe to be best — meaning, best for these elites.

Few countries of the world have a civic culture, a religion, and a common objective of freedom. Fewer and fewer countries allow their citizens to be armed, so they can resist totalitarian government.¹² Our freedom has been preserved because of our Biblically-based form of government. For the United States to remain a constitutional republic, it requires people who have a common belief in those Biblical principles on which the nation was founded, and who exhibit a high degree of self-discipline in their daily lives. As John Adams said in his letter to the Officers of the Militia of Massachusetts:

Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.¹³

There is a reason that most people in the Middle East and other parts of the world seek to emigrate to the United States: they seek a better life. It is the fact that our nation was based on Biblical principles that has allowed our experiment in freedom to continue for over two centuries. While secularist elites in the corporate-controlled media, academia, internationalist

¹³ As just one illustration, the purpose of the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution was to have an armed citizen militia so that the people could resist government that becomes totalitarian to preserve “a free State.” See *Heller v. District of Columbia*, 554 U.S. 570, 640-41 (2008). Internationalist Elites would strip the American people of their “Arms” so as to make resistance futile.

¹⁴ John Adams, Message to the Officers of the First Brigade of the Third Division of the Militia of Massachusetts (Oct. 11, 1798). http://www.beliefnet.com/resourcelib/docs/115/Message_from_John_Adams_to_the_Officers_of_the_First_Brigade_1.html

corporations, and government, and those of currently prominent Eastern and Middle Eastern faiths often deny the significance of that Biblical foundation of our nation, the American people understand that we need to hold these principles in common. Massive immigration by peoples who do not share these values threatens the survival of our American Constitutional Republic.

That same letter by John Adams continued:

we have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion. Avarice, ambition, revenge, or gallantry, would break the strongest cords of our Constitution as a whale goes through a net.

If this country admits persons who cannot or will not govern themselves, people who do not believe that when they die they will face judgment by a righteous God, we will see our police state grow to adopt such powers as necessary to control the people, and our experiment with liberty will end. It is in this area that we have a near complete disconnect between the great swath of the American people who would agree with John Adams, and those Intellectual Elites who would ridicule him and his Christian faith. The vast majority of those holding federal office have no understanding of what has made the American experiment successful, as they employ various tactics to open our borders.

One of our nation's earliest political documents --- the 1620 Mayflower Compact --- begins with an acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God over the affairs of men. The Pilgrims proclaimed that their voyage to a new land was taken for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith. And it was that Christian faith upon which they created a new civil order.

As Andrew C. McLaughlin wrote in his definitive work — The Foundations of American Constitutionalism — the people of what would become the Commonwealth of Massachusetts applied to the affairs of civil government a theology that taught that it was the right of the people to choose their own leaders.¹⁴

Further, America's founders brought with them a conviction that the word of God imposed a higher law — a law that bound not only the people in their civil affairs — but one that governed their political leaders. The purpose of civil government was to secure to the people God-given rights endowed by their Creator and secured by governments instituted by men whose just powers were derived from the consent of the governed.¹⁵

¹⁵ See R. Perry and J. Cooper, eds., Sources of Our Liberties (ABA Foundation: 1976) at 57.

¹⁶ The Declaration of Independence gives homage to our Creator God not once, but multiple times.

These ideas found their way into the nation's charter — the Declaration of Independence — which, in turn, had a universal appeal attracting men and women all over the world to come to the land of the free and the home of the brave.¹⁶

And come they did. At first came Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. Then people of other religious persuasions, including atheists and agnostics — all longing to be free. While these immigrants brought with them their own cultures, they assimilated to become Americans — committed to adapt to a new way of life which was possible because of the nation's first freedoms — of religion, of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of petition.

Few Emigrating from Muslim Nations Share American Values

For years, people who did not share this commitment were not welcomed. Among those not welcome were people from Muslim countries. Indeed, during the early history of the United States, the Barbary pirates and their Muslim protectors were her mortal enemies¹⁷ — not only on the high seas where they plundered a young nation's merchant ships, but on land where Christians and Jews were denied the basic human rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Under the common law¹⁸ basic rights were sacred and belonged not only to believers, but to unbelievers, and were secured by written Bills of Rights in constitutions both national and state, and safeguarded by laws applied by an independent judiciary. In Muslim nations, if one did not live by the sharia law,¹⁹ they either converted or were killed, or if not killed, forced to live as a persecuted minority consigned without basic human rights under dhimmitude rule.²⁰ Unbelievers were taxed, forbidden to build places of worship and ring church bells or blow the shofar.

¹⁷ See, e.g., Lech Walesa, "We the People," an address to Joint Session of U.S. Congress (Nov. 15, 1989). <http://10-25.pl/10-25/we-the-people/>.

¹⁸ See, e.g., Robert McNamara, "The Young U.S. Navy Battled North African Pirates 200 Years ago." (Dec. 14, 2014). <http://history1800s.about.com/od/americanwars/tp/barbarywars.htm>.

¹⁹ As Blackstone explained, "Christianity is part of the laws of England." IV Blackstone *Commentaries*, at 59. See also, James McClellan, *Joseph Story and the American Constitution* (U. Okla Press: 1971); M. Stanton Evans, *The Theme is Freedom: Religion, Politics, and the American Tradition* (Regnery: 1994).

²⁰ Bill Connor, "Muslims Not the Enemy: But Sharia Law is Clear and Present Danger to America," (Dec. 20, 2015). http://thetandd.com/news/opinion/muslims-not-the-enemy-but-sharia-law-is-clear-and/article_3fa5dbd3-d1c1-5153-8550-84074645dadbd.html.

²¹ See "The Status of non-Muslim minorities Under Islamic Rule." <http://www.dhimmitude.org/>.

Even those born Muslim or who converted to Islam are not free under sharia law. It is illegal to change one's religion, punishable by death. Blasphemy of Allah or Muhammad is also a capital offense. Proselytizing is likewise. Freedom of religion, speech, and the press is totally foreign to sharia law, and to the secular Muslim world. Rather, the Islamic state has total jurisdiction over all of life, earning thereby the sobriquet of the religion of the sword.

Women fare ill in those Islamic countries that abide by sharia.²¹ While women's rights vary across the Middle East, they are nevertheless second class citizens. In marriage, a Muslim woman may have only one husband, but a Muslim man may marry up to four women. A husband may divorce his wife simply by making a declaration, a wife may not divorce her husband unless he consents. Women may not own property independent of their husbands except for property brought by the woman into the marriage. Women have lesser inheritance rights, and their testimonies in courts of law carry lesser weight than those of men.

Additionally, a man may beat his wife and, under some sharia legal systems "honor killings" of women are permitted, if a wife or daughter goes astray. Indeed, there are "modesty" rules governing Muslim women dress in public, ranging from an abaya — a scarf covering head and neck, to a "burqa" — a full-body and head cloak which includes a netted rectangle over the eyes. Women are not permitted to be outside the home unless accompanied by a man, and in Saudi Arabia women are not allowed to drive.

All of these rules are enforceable in an Islamic court composed of Muslim clergy, making the family a client of the State, rather than an independent unit of society. The church and the state are also merged into one unit, there being no duty that is outside the jurisdiction of the clergy/state which rules by threat of force or by force.

It is true that some Muslims do not adhere to all the tenets of this faith. Various rationales for disbelieving those tenets which embrace violence and are hostile to women are presented. However, overall, Islam is a worldwide political movement, as much as it is a religious movement. It is dedicated to the mission of converting every person and every nation to Islam.

While the Islamic clergy/states are currently divided over means by which this goal is reached, they are united in reaching that goal — a goal shared by Islamic extremists like ISIS and Muslim moderates like Egypt. Chief among the means employed in today's world is jihad. A flexible term, jihad is downplayed by political leaders, both Muslim and non-Muslim, liberal and conservative, as a personal lifetime religious struggle of a good Muslim's striving against sin. In fact, however, it is a holy war designed to convert the entire world population

²² Elliot Friedland, "Women's Rights Under Sharia," The Clarion Project, (Feb. 19, 2014). <http://www.clarionproject.org/understanding-islamism/womens-rights-under-sharia>.

to Islam, as confirmed by the Koran itself and propagated by Imams preaching in mosques around the world.²²

Muslim Extremism Presents a Real and Present Threat to the United States

Chief among the targets of jihad are Europe and America. And one of the most prominent means to achieve the jihadist goal is emigration from Muslim nations in north Africa and the Middle East to Europe and North America, including the United States. In Dearborn, Michigan, we have seen the stoning of Christians holding up signs promoting their Christian beliefs at a city-sponsored Arab Festival. The police did nothing to protect the Christians or to arrest those throwing rocks.²³

Since then, we have seen the violence caused by Muslim immigration on other Western nations. The Swedish Government, like the United States, has embraced multi-culturalism, which has resulted in the near-destruction of the nation.²⁴ Only an Internationalist Elitist would not react in horror to the stories of rapes, and gang rapes, of Swedish women by Muslims in Sweden.²⁵ The story is similar in Germany.²⁶

The Internationalist Elitists in the governments of these countries were complicit in the coverup of these crimes. “Stockholm police were warned not to give descriptions of the perpetrators lest they be accused of being racist.”²⁷

²³ See Dave Gaubatz, “Radical Islam or Mainstream Islam” *American Thinker* (Feb. 2, 2011). http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2011/02/radical_islam_or_mainstream_is.html.

²⁴ “American Muslims Stone Christians in Dearborn, Michigan,” (June 27, 2012) <http://www.clarionproject.org/news/american-muslims-stone-christians-dearborn-michigan/>.

²⁵ See interview of Swedish public policy analysis Ingrid Carlqvist (May 6, 2016) (The Swedish people did not even know that they took this position [open borders]. The Swedish people are finally waking up. No one can escape the consequences.... People are scared of getting raped, scared of getting mugged.” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=25VVmCviVao&feature=youtu.be>

²⁶ “Sweden: Muslim rapes woman lying on broken glass,” 10 News.dk (Dec. 31, 2014). <http://10news.dk/?p=588>

²⁷ “Germany shocked by Cologne New Year gang assaults on women,” BBC News (Jan 5, 2016). <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35231046>.

²⁸ Ivar Arpi, “It’s not only Germany that covers up mass sex attacks by migrant men... Sweden’s record is shameful,” *The Spectator* (Jan. 16, 2016). <http://www.spectator.co.uk/2016/01/its-not-only-germany-that-covers-up-mass-sex-attacks-by-migrant-men-swedens-record-is-shameful/>

Conclusion

For these reasons, the United States Justice Foundation urges the Obama Administration and Secretary John Kerry to cease and desist in allowing any immigration or refugees from Muslim countries. A study by the United States Justice Foundation demonstrates the constitutionality and legality of this step, as well as precedents for this action.²⁸ If the Obama Administration will not protect the nation, those in that Administration will have the blood of innocent Americans on their hands.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ William J. Olson

William J. Olson

WJO:gw

²⁹ United States Justice Foundation Legal Policy Paper: “A Legal Analysis of New Proposals to Limit Immigration from Muslim Countries into the United States” (Feb. 12, 2016). <https://www.usjf.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/USJF-Paper-on-Trump-Immigration-Proposal-Feb-12.pdf>.