

"Nothing to See Here ... All is Well!"

the schizophrenic left and the current syrian migrant crisis

— Tony Wirebach, Berks County Patriots

Why is it that the Left is in chronic crisis mode over fleeting, intangible and largely overblown "threats" to humanity, but downright oblivious to REAL threats to the republic and its citizens?

If given a choice, between creating threats out of thin air, and responding to REAL threats in a reasonable fashion, the left, it seems, is always against what is in the best interest of the Republic.

When they do act, it's in order to raid the public coffers, and create expensive and ineffective government redundancies.

When they don't act, they stand in the way of punishing our enemies -- protecting the universal rights of oppressors, and largely ignoring the universal rights of their victims.

If America is morally obligated to take in Middle Eastern Refugees, so is every other nation between us and Syria along the way. Moral standards are common to all people, not just the U.S. and the West. But if you, dear liberal friend, throw out that old chestnut "*but we're better than that!*" -- then you have just made my argument for me. If moral standards are not universal, and non-Western countries do not share the same values of charity and civility that we do, then it would be in our best interest NOT to allow thousands of these culturally incompatible masses into our country with no strings attached and no safeguards for protecting our fellow citizens. If the shoe were somehow on the other foot, not only would Americans, in a time of domestic crisis, NOT flee to these countries by choice, the other countries would not be expected to welcome us with open arms and a generous social safety net.

Muslim refugees would be much better placed in muslim-majority enclaves, like Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Egypt; Christian refugees would be better placed in the West. With the frequency of Christians abused or murdered in Muslim-majority refugee camps and transport vessels, the evidence would suggest that mixing different groups in common areas usually leads to bloodshed and tragedy. it would also suggest that this violence is NOT a two-way street, but rather disproportionately perpetrated by Muslims against muslims and non-muslim alike.

Of course -- individually, any given asylum-seeker does not pose a definite threat to national security, but thousands of them most certainly do. Anyone who argues that radical Islam is "only" a small percentage of the overall muslim population, ignores the obvious: that, for every one-hundred refugees, 1 to *God-knows-how-many* terrorists will be hidden among them. And with the existence of numerous online videos showing school-age children being trained in Jihad against the West, and women participating in knife attacks on civilians and soldiers alike, the ability to detect the bad apples in the bunch is severely curtailed by the wishful thinking, open-arms, and open-borders policies of the current administration. That means that terrorists can easily be among the women and children that President Obama recently mocked the GOP candidates about.

Once terrorists posing as refugees are inside the system, the ability to track them and prevent

them from another terrorist attack is somewhere between slim and none. Not only that, every potential, lone-wolf terrorist poses a mortal threat to dozens, if not hundreds or even thousands of innocent American lives. The failure of our leaders to acknowledge a state of war that exists between a large portion (if not a majority) of the *Ummah* — the global Islamic community — and the West, means that each and every one of these terrorist attacks will be handled as "local" criminal behavior and, if suspects are taken alive, they will be afforded due process and a fair day in court, at great expense to the Republic on the local, state, and federal level. Not to mention the additional burden on an already overburdened Social Welfare System that will no doubt add great expense and crippling debt to care for the refugees — both the ones who mean us harm as well as those who do not.

There is a limit to the amount of "generosity" our leaders can afford to offer the world in our good name. Most people who have an opinion on what other people OUGHT to do for the refugees of war-torn Syria and Middle East are immune to the repercussions of their views: Their jobs will be protected, despite, as Donald Trump would say, a "yuge!" influx of unskilled labor into the job market ... Their housing values will be protected behind the walls of their lovely gated communities, far away from low-end housing being provided to the new arrivals ... Their children will be protected from rape gangs and violence by their tony uptown zip codes and private schools ... Of course, when the admittedly small percentage of terrorists hidden among them takes out a large section of the power grid, or poisons our water supply, or spreads ebola through a major metropolitan area, I'm sure they HOPE that they and their families and loved ones will escape unharmed, but they will have blood on their hands, just the same.