

Name:

Period:

REFUGEES IN AMERICA

Honors Research Packet



Research Question

- How does/has the United States treated refugees in the past?
- What are some examples of countries that cause people to become refugees?
- Why do some people think it is good to accept refugees into our country?
- Why do some people think we shouldn't accept refugees into our country?
- What is your opinion on the issue?

ARTICLE 1

MILITANTS MAY SNEAK IN WITH THE REFUGEES

By Merrill Matthews, resident scholar with the Institute for Policy Innovation in
metropolitan Dallas | 2016

President Barack Obama is once again faced with a problem of his own making. He has no one to blame but himself if some people no longer trust his assurances.

For seven years, the president has dismissed, demeaned and denounced those who have raised reasonable concerns about his policies.

When those concerns have turned out to be correct, as they often have, he ignores the evidence, insults his critics and asserts that everything is going well. Remember, for example, his assertion that Islamic State was being "contained." The attacks that followed that claim certainly proved that those who questioned him were right to be worried. Recall his promise of a post-partisan America in which Democrats and Republicans would be able to work together. Today, the country remains as divided as ever.

So when 31 governors turned their thumbs down on Obama's decision to accept 10,000 Syrian refugees and distribute them among the states, they were sending a message: "We do not trust you and your administration to tell the truth or do the due diligence necessary to vet refugees."

Benefit Of The Doubt? No!

Let us be clear: Every governor knows this is a country of immigrants with a long and cherished tradition of helping refugees.

They also know that the vast majority of the Syrian refugees would be honest and law-abiding. Most are simply fleeing a violent civil war they had nothing to do with starting. Many are fleeing the Islamic State, which had taken over parts of their war-torn country. They would be thrilled to get a chance at a new start in America.

Even a vast majority is not 100 percent, however, and that presents a safety concern which is worth taking seriously. If even a few Islamic State fighters slipped in with the refugees, that could be a huge problem.

However, Obama, true to form, dismissed the concerns and ridiculed the critics. "Apparently they (the Republicans) are scared of widows and orphans coming into the United States of America," the president said. He then claimed that the screening process would be the most careful and thorough process "conceivable."

Is that so? Remember when Obama administration officials boasted about how well the HealthCare.gov website would work right before its problem-plagued rollout? So what about refugee screening technology? Why should we assume that would work any better?

Under normal conditions, elected officials and most of the public would take the president's word. However, this president has misled the public so often that he has not earned the benefit of the doubt — and he is not getting it.

Refugees Won't Be Properly Screened

The governors resisting the refugee resettlement simply do not trust Obama's claim that all of the refugees will be checked out extremely carefully. Neither does the public. A Rasmussen poll showed some 60 percent of likely voters "oppose the settling of Syrian refugees in the state where they live." Even many elected Democrats have their doubts.

This same president keeps trying to move prisoners from Guantanamo in Cuba to the United States. He has repeatedly assured governors that the prisoners, who are all suspected militants, are not a threat. The president continues to make that claim even though more than 100 of those who have been released have rejoined militant groups.

To make matters worse, the administration has resorted to making ridiculous statements about the Syrian refugees.

For example, the State Department says that only 2 percent of Syrian refugees admitted to this country since 2011 are "military-age males." So what? Anyone watching the news can see that young and middle-age adult males make up a good portion of those currently fleeing Syria. Even if the State Department restricted the 10,000 refugees to "widows and orphans," widows have brothers and orphans have uncles. Wouldn't there be a need to let other family members in, if not now, then soon, in order to help provide for the resettled women and children? And, of course, some suicide bombers have been women.

Here is the point: Those who are frustrated with the refugee stalemate need to focus their wrath on the president, not the governors. Obama entered the White House determined to prove that big government can do big things well. Instead, he has increased Americans' long-held skepticism of big government.

I, for one, hope the administration, Congress and governors can find a solution that upholds the country's long tradition as a shelter for refugees. The lack of trust in this case is not targeted so much at the Syrian refugees, but at the White House.

ARTICLE 2

DON'T PLAY INTO FEARS ABOUT MILITANT ATTACKS

By Don Kusler, the executive director of Americans for Democratic Action, a national liberal advocacy organization | 2016

The U.S. governors refusing to accept Syrian refugees are not just morally wrong. They are also helping Islamic State.

Islamic State, also known as ISIS, is a militant group. Its members are trying to spread their own brand of Islam throughout the Middle East. They have conquered territory in Syria and Iraq, where they are now battling both Western and Arab forces.

The group's dream is to establish an Islamic state shaped after their own beliefs. They are using violence and fear to advance those ends. They see themselves as being at war not only with Arab governments, but with the West.

The first thing we need to understand is that Islamic State is actually weak. It claims responsibility for any act of violence carried out by Muslims on Western soil so that it can appear stronger than it actually is.

Most attacks have actually been the acts of do-it-yourself militants unconnected to any group. But Islamic State does not want us to know that. The group's fighters want us to believe they are everywhere. They want us to be afraid.

Setting Muslims Against The West

Islamic State fighters also want us to get angry and condemn Muslims everywhere. They want to make Muslims the enemy of the West. They believe if that happens, millions of peaceful Muslims living around the world will join them.

Their goal is quite simple. They aim to divide us. They would like nothing more than to have the Western world accept Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump's idea for a Muslim database or ID patch. They want us to see the world in terms of us against them.

Islamic State also wants us to turn away Syrian and other Muslim refugees.

Since 2011 when civil war broke out in Syria, 11 million Syrians have fled their homes for safety. Many are fleeing Islamic State's reign of terror. More than 250,000 people have died in that war. The fighting in Syria began as an attempt to remove Syria's president, Bashar al-Assad, who many see as undemocratic and oppressive. Over time, Islamic State fighters have become increasingly involved in the war.

While Islamic State also would like to see Assad gone, its goal is not greater democracy. Instead, its fighters hope to seize power themselves, in order to impose their own brand of Islam. Many Syrians have fled territories now controlled by the group's fighters, who have introduced extremely harsh laws.

The current refugee crisis is the biggest since World War II, with Syrians now making up the world's largest refugee population. Most are struggling to find new homes in Europe, and the United States needs to help.

Don't Make It "Us Against Them"

The Obama administration has pledged to take in 10,000 new Syrian refugees. They are supposed to be distributed among the states.

The government's plan has met with resistance, however. So far, 31 governors have protested the admission of Syrian refugees. They have gone as far as to say that their states will refuse to take them in.

Their fear, that Islamic State fighters will sneak in among the refugees, is not justified. The U.S. refugee-screening process is extremely difficult to get through. Most refugees stay in camps for months to years while their personal stories are evaluated and checked.

About half of these refugees are children, while another quarter are elderly. Almost all of the adults are either mothers or couples coming with children.

By refusing to take in these war-torn refugees, these U.S. governors are not only going against our ideals as a nation. They are also helping Islamic State by dividing us even further. They are helping Islamic State by showing that our leaders want to turn away these desperate families, because it is "us against them."

The 31 irresponsible governors are also sending a message to the U.S. public that fear, prejudice and even outright hate are acceptable. This ill-informed policy is not reflective of what is at the core of our national history. Every time U.S. leaders have followed similar paths in the past, their fears have been proven to be irrational. Every time similar things have happened, we as a nation have had to correct course.

Let us not forget what is inscribed on the Statue of Liberty, quite possibly America's most widely recognized symbol:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

Can you honestly read that and feel we should reject these victims of Islamic State? Let us not accept this fear only to be proven wrong by history yet again. Instead, let us reject leaders, whether governors or members of Congress, who want to fan baseless fear. Let us educate ourselves about the horrors these refugees are fleeing, and the significant hurdles they must clear to be admitted. More than anything, let us light the way for a safer world by leading with an example of humanity.

ARTICLE 3

WHERE AMERICA'S TERRORISTS ACTUALLY COME FROM

By Uri Friedman, *The Atlantic* | January 30, 2017

This weekend, Rudy Giuliani went on *Fox News* to explain why Donald Trump's [decision](#) to bar Syrian refugees from U.S. shores and suspend visas for citizens of seven Muslim-majority countries did not amount to a [Muslim ban](#). "What we did was, we focused on, instead of religion, *danger*," the former New York City mayor [said](#), in reference to the targeted nations: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. "Which is a *factual* basis, not a religious basis. ... It's based on places where there are substantial evidence that people are sending terrorists into our country."

But Trump's policy does not have the factual basis that Giuliani claims. The data on terrorism in the United States consistently indicates that the threat largely lies elsewhere.

ISIS [does control](#) territory in Syria, Iraq, and Libya, while al-Qaeda has a major presence in Yemen and the terrorist group al-Shabab is based in Somalia. The U.S. State Department [alleges](#) that the governments of Iran, Sudan, and Syria support international terrorism. The Trump administration also selected these countries because the Obama administration and Congress had [previously](#)

designated them as places people couldn't visit if they planned to participate in the U.S. visa-waiver program.

In addition, people from the countries in Trump's crosshairs **have certainly committed** acts of terrorism in the United States; a Somali refugee **injured** several people in an attack at Ohio State University just this fall. Asylum-seekers have also recently **been implicated** in terrorist plots in Europe.

But after **sifting through** databases, media reports, court documents, and other sources, Alex Nowrasteh, an immigration expert at the libertarian Cato Institute, has **arrived** at a striking finding: Nationals of the seven countries singled out by Trump have killed zero people in terrorist attacks on U.S. soil between 1975 and 2015.

Zero.

Six Iranians, six Sudanese, two Somalis, two Iraqis, and one Yemeni have been convicted of attempting or executing terrorist attacks on U.S. soil during that time period, according to Nowrasteh's research. (Nowrasteh focused on plots against the U.S. homeland, which presumably Trump cares most about, rather than other terrorism-related offenses, like supporting a foreign terrorist group or trying to join a jihadist organization overseas.) Zero Libyans and zero Syrians have been convicted of doing the same. "Foreign-born terrorism is a hazard," Nowrasteh argues, "but it is manageable given the huge economic benefits of immigration and the small costs of terrorism." As for refugees, Nowrasteh **writes**, Trump's action "is a response to a phantom menace." Over the last four decades, 20 out of 3.25 million refugees welcomed to the United States have been convicted of attempting or committing terrorism on U.S. soil, and only three Americans have been killed in attacks committed by refugees—all by Cuban refugees in the 1970s.

Zero Americans have been killed by Syrian refugees in a terrorist attack in the United States.

Between 1975 and 2015, the "annual chance of being murdered by somebody other than a foreign-born terrorist was 252.9 times greater than the chance of dying in a terrorist attack committed by a foreign-born terrorist," according to Nowrasteh.

Nowrasteh **has listed** foreign-born individuals who committed or were convicted of attempting to commit a terrorist attack on U.S. soil by their country of origin and the number of people they killed. As in any exercise like this, the statistics are rough and directional rather than precise. For example, the San Bernardino attacker Tashfeen Malik, who was born in Pakistan but lived in Saudi Arabia most of her life, is counted as originating from Saudi Arabia. In the case of attacks perpetrated by multiple terrorists, like 9/11, each terrorist is assigned an equal number of victims.

Still, it's worth noting that the countries at the top of the list, including Saudi Arabia and Egypt, are not included in Trump's ban.

The 9/11 attacks were carried out by **19 men**—from Saudi Arabia (15), the United Arab Emirates (2), Egypt (1), and Lebanon (1). The incident remains influential in how Americans think about the nature of terrorism; Trump's executive order cites 9/11 as a prime example of the U.S. visa process catastrophically breaking down. But it's misleading as a guide to where today's terrorists come from. Nowrasteh **found** that foreign-born terrorists who entered the country, either as immigrants or tourists, were involved in 3,024 of the 3,432 murders caused by terrorists on U.S. soil from 1975 through 2015. But 2,983 of those murders came on 9/11 alone.

The stereotype of the foreign terrorist infiltrator is outdated, according to the New America think tank. The organization has compiled its own data on patterns of terrorism in the United States, which unlike Cato’s focuses on jihadist terrorism in the country following 9/11. The dataset includes people charged with terrorism-related crimes, not just those convicted, as well as U.S. citizens and residents rather than solely foreigners.

“[E]very jihadist who conducted a lethal attack inside the United States since 9/11 was a citizen or legal resident,” [New America](#) reports. During that time period, more than 80 percent of individuals who were charged with or died engaging

Foreign-Born Terrorists and Murders in Pre- and Post-9/11 United States

	Number of Successful Terrorists	Murders in Terrorist Attacks	Average Murders per Successful Terrorist	Years Covered
Pre-9/11	16	17	1.06	26
9/11	19	2,983	157	1
Post-9/11	5	24	4.8	14

in jihadist terrorism or related activities inside the United States have been U.S. citizens or permanent residents (the tally also includes Americans accused of engaging in such activity abroad). Many have been second-generation immigrants: The Orlando nightclub attacker, for instance, [was](#) a U.S. citizen and son of Afghan immigrants. One of the [San Bernardino](#) shooters was a U.S. citizen and son of Pakistani immigrants; the other, Tashfeen Malik, [was](#) a Pakistani national and conditional U.S. permanent resident who came to the United States on a fiancée visa.

Citizens and Permanent Residents

82%



- 190 U.S. Born Citizen
- 82 Naturalized Citizen
- 11 Citizen of Unknown Status
- 43 Permanent Resident
- 11 Nonimmigrant Visa
- 8 Illegal Immigrant
- 12 Refugee
- 39 Unknown

Non-residents and Unknown

18%



As Jane Holl Lute, the former deputy secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, [said](#) at the Aspen Ideas Festival last year, “What’s been our theory of the case for 12 or 15 years following 9/11? Our theory of the case is the bad guys are out there, trying to come here. ... What if [the bad guys are]

already here?”

The 9/11 attackers [entered](#) the United States using various types of visas. But between then and 2015, “among attackers claiming or appearing to be motivated by extremist Islam, only one would have needed a visa to enter the United States at the time of the attack,” according to yet another tally, by [The New York Times](#). Half of the prominent jihadist attacks analyzed by the *Times* were carried out by men born in the United States. “Security experts argue that the risks of routine travel—including the U.S. visa waiver program, which allows citizens of Britain, France, Belgium and 35 other countries to enter the United States without a visa for stays of up to 90 days—are greater than the threat of foreign terrorists coming through the refugee program,” the paper added.

Trump is understandably focused on the threat from ISIS. But here, too, the statistics don’t align with Trump policy. Since 2014, the majority of individuals charged in the United States with ISIS-

related offenses have been U.S. citizens (58 percent) or permanent residents (6 percent), according to George Washington University's [Program on Extremism](#). Additionally, more ISIS fighters in Iraq and Syria appear to [come from](#) Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Morocco, Turkey, Russia, Egypt, and China than any countries included in Trump's ban.

One could argue that America hasn't experienced high levels of terrorism by foreign-born individuals precisely because, well before Trump, the U.S. government was limiting immigration from countries afflicted by terrorism, and subjecting the modest number of refugees it accepted to [more rigorous vetting](#) than any other type of traveler to the United States. As my colleague Graeme Wood [has written](#), "If the Islamic State intends to kill Americans by sending an Iraqi or Syrian to get a visa, they are doing it the hard way. Most of the attackers will blow themselves up out of frustration with the American immigration bureaucracy before they can ever reach American shores to blow themselves up near their intended targets."

But even if that's the case, it still doesn't explain why the Trump administration would suddenly block all refugees and citizens of entire countries, as if it were confronting Syrian refugees and Iraqi immigrants pouring across America's borders to commit terrorism. Like his border wall, which will be erected to stop a mass Mexican migration that [no longer exists](#), Trump's immigration ban is a solution that misdiagnoses the actual problem.

As Nowrasteh [notes](#), future terrorists could very well come from different countries than terrorists have in the past. Judged by the evidence to date, however, Trump's ban "will likely stop few terrorists, prevent zero deaths, and slightly reduce immigration and tourism. All minor economic pain, no gain."

ARTICLE 4

EXECUTIVE ORDER BARRING REFUGEES WILL NOT PREVENT TERRORISM

By Max Boot, Council of Foreign Relations | January, 2017

"This is better than a more comprehensive ban on all [Muslims](#) or all visitors from a longer list of Muslim-majority countries, but it is hard to see how this actually advances American security."

During the campaign, Donald Trump morphed from advocating a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States" to a more amorphous pledge to impose "extreme vetting from certain areas of the world." Now, with a draft executive order apparently set to be issued on Thursday, the administration is defining what that means.

Here, in a nutshell, is what the White House appears to be doing in addition to building his famous border wall: Blocking all Syrian [refugees](#) from entering the United States indefinitely and barring other [refugees](#) for at least 120 days in order to improve vetting. When [refugee](#) ascensions resume, the total number admitted annually will fall from 110,000 to 50,000.

In the meantime, all visas will be blocked for at least 30 days from seven suspect countries—Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. The Departments of State and Defense are also

directed to come up with plans for “safe zones in Syria and in the surrounding region,” so as to offer Syrian **refugees** a way to stay home.

This is better than a more comprehensive ban on all Muslims or all visitors from a longer list of Muslim-majority countries, but it is hard to see how this actually advances American security.

Vetting Challenges

In the first place, “extreme vetting” already exists. As Donald Kerwin of the Center for Migration Studies and my colleague, Edward Alden of the Council on Foreign Relations, noted (https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/trumps-vetting-plan-would-weaken-us-security/2017/01/25/33798514-d830-11e6-9a36-1d296534b31e_story.html?postshare=1801485430542138&tid=ss_tw&utm_term=.0ad3b83c1148):

Scrutiny of visa applicants is far better than it was before 9/11. Overseas visitors are now fingerprinted and photographed, in order to check their identities against terrorist databases. The government further ensures identity through secure travel documents, runs robust checks against immigration, criminal and [terrorism](#) databases, and targets people with suspicious travel or other patterns. And, the multiyear U.S. vetting and screening process for **refugees**, many of them fleeing terrorism, is more thorough and exhaustive than any other admissions process to the United States.

It is hard to imagine what procedures will be devised in the next 30 or 120 days that will be vastly superior to those that have evolved in the 16-plus years since the 9/11 attacks. The likelihood is that the Department of Homeland Security would feel compelled to revive some version of the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System (NSEERS), which was implemented after 9/11 and then discarded because it was found to be too time-consuming and ineffective. As Kerwin and Alden note, NSEERS involved subjecting nearly all travelers from two dozen Muslim-majority nations to hours of “secondary screening” and “intrusive questioning by border officials.”

The Trump executive order would also force immigration agents to question potential entrants to determine whether they “support the U.S. Constitution” and whether they would place “violent religious edicts over American law” or whether they would “oppress members of one race, one gender, or sexual orientation.” Good luck getting that information. At best, this will lead to a hopeless snarl at ports of entry that will discourage visitors from coming.

Missed Targets

It will, of course, all be worth it if the Trump order actually prevents terrorist attacks. But will it? It is striking how little overlap there is between the seven countries singled out for a temporary visa ban—Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen—and the actual sources of terrorism in the United States since 9/11.

By the count of my research associate, Sherry Cho, there have been 56 actual or attempted terrorist attacks in the United States since 2001 involving 89 identified perpetrators. By far, the largest number of suspects (47) were American citizens, most of them American-born, including those who carried out the massacres in Orlando, San Bernardino, and Fort Hood, which together killed 76 people.

Almost all of the foreigners or naturalized Americans involved in terrorist attacks in the U.S. are from countries not on the list. Shoe bomber Richard Reid was from Britain. The 9/11 hijackers were from Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, and Lebanon. One of the San Bernardino

shooters, Tashfeen Malik, was a native of Pakistan who had come to the U.S. from Saudi Arabia. Faisal Shahzad, who attempted to set off a car bomb in Times Square, was a naturalized citizen who was Pakistan-born. The Boston Marathon bombers, Tamerlan and Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, were born in the former Soviet Union. The New York-New Jersey bomber, Ahmad Khan Rahami, was a U.S. citizen born in Afghanistan. Underwear bomber Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab was Nigerian. Just about the only attacks carried out by anyone from Trump's verboten countries were three Somali-Americans.

Why isn't this list more comprehensive, to include countries such as Pakistan, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia? One suspects for the same reason that it doesn't include Britain: Banning travel from those nations would spark a crisis with important American allies. But by limiting his visa-ban to a small number of countries, Trump is doing little to stop potential [terrorists](#).

Indeed, as the abundance of American citizens among the ranks of terrorists attests—groups such as [al-Qaeda](#) in the Arabian Peninsula and Islamic State have taken to radicalizing Muslims who are already here—something that Trump's immigration restrictions cannot possibly affect. Indeed, to the extent that his new rules convey the message that the U.S. is hostile to Muslims, they only make it more likely that the terrorists will find fresh recruits here in the future

ARTICLE 5

TRUMP'S EXECUTIVE ORDER TO BAN REFUGEES IS CONSTITUTIONAL

By Mitchell C Shaw | 2017

“[C]onsidering that the legal framework on which the order rests has never been considered either unreasonable or unconstitutional, it seems more than a little ludicrous to assign the execution of those laws either of those titles.”

President Trump's executive order to suspend the highly controversial (and highly dangerous) [refugee](#) program has been stymied by the courts. It has been called an unreasonable and unconstitutional “Muslim ban” by its opponents, who celebrate the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' decision to leave a lower court's restraining order in place. But is it unreasonable or unconstitutional? Is it even a “Muslim ban”?

Seven Countries

First, considering that the legal framework on which the order rests has never been considered either unreasonable or unconstitutional, it seems more than a little ludicrous to assign the execution of those laws either of those titles. Second, the order does not use the word “Muslim” even once. It is a “ban” on traveling to this country from seven countries known for being hotbeds of terrorism. Much of that terrorism is state-sponsored or at least state-approved.

The seven nations listed in President Trump's order have Muslim majorities, but Trump's detractors have been the ones to make this an issue, while ignoring the fact that many other countries with Muslim majorities (Indonesia, Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Egypt, etc.) were not part of the travel ban.

Given the lengths to which Trump’s detractors have gone to pretend that the Muslim world is all peace and harmony, it is clear that they protest too much. In fact, a report released last week shows that “72 individuals from the seven countries covered in President Trump’s vetting executive order have been convicted in terror cases since the 9/11 attacks.”

The report—published by the Center for Immigration Studies—states:

A review of information compiled by a Senate committee in 2016 reveals that 72 individuals from the seven countries covered in President Trump’s vetting executive order have been convicted in terror cases since the 9/11 attacks. These facts stand in stark contrast to the assertions by the Ninth Circuit judges who have blocked the president’s order on the basis that there is no evidence showing a risk to the United States in allowing aliens from these seven terror-associated countries to come in. In June 2016 the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest, then chaired by new Attorney General Jeff Sessions, released a report on individuals convicted in terror cases since 9/11. Using open sources (because the Obama administration refused to provide government records), the report found that 380 out of 580 people convicted in terror cases since 9/11 were foreign-born. The report is no longer available on the Senate website, but a summary published by Fox News is available here. (<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2016/06/22/anatomy-terror-threat-files-show-hundreds-us-plots-refugee-connection.html?intcmp=hplnws>)

So, the Ninth Circuit Court’s protestations duly noted, the fact remains that—as the report states —“The United States has admitted [terrorists](#) from all of the seven dangerous countries.” The report lists the breakdown of those convicted of terrorism as follows:

Somalia: 20
Yemen: 19
[Iraq](#): 19
Syria: seven
Iran: four
Libya: 2
Sudan: one

At least 17 of those convicted terrorists were here as [refugees](#), three were here on student visas, and one was here on a diplomatic visa. At least 25 became U.S. citizens, another 10 were here as lawful permanent residents, and four were here illegally.

Denying Refugees

And those are just the ones convicted. Since a 100-percent conviction (not to mention a 100-percent apprehension rate) is unimaginable, it is reasonable to conclude that many others are here as terrorists from those same countries and are still at large, flying under the radar, planning their next attack. As *The New American* reported (<https://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/immigration/item/25358-trump-travel-ban-unconstitutional-but-carter-bush-obama-travel-bans-constitutional>) last week:

Obama’s State Department quietly halted all [refugees](#) from Iraq for a period of six months after it was discovered (to the surprise of no one paying attention) that terrorists who had actually fought against U.S. soldiers in Iraq had gained entry in the United States as “[refugees](#)” and were planning attacks here.

Those terrorists—from Iraq—were undoubtedly among the 19 Iraqis listed in the report who were convicted of terrorism.

And as President Trump is prepared to appeal both the restraining order instigated by Washington and Minnesota and the Ninth Circuit Court's decision to leave that order in place as this case winds its way through the courts, it is important to note that the Ninth Circuit Court is the most overturned court in the nation. For instance, in 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned a whopping 86 percent of the cases it reviewed from the Ninth Circuit Court. That could mean that if this case makes it to the Supreme Court, it would stand a great chance of being decided in the Trump administration's favor.

The extreme liberal bias of the Ninth Circuit Court is a long-standing tradition, leading many to derisively refer to it as the Ninth Circus Court of Appeals. This case is par for the course and has lent itself to a firm condemnation from Judge Andrew Napolitano who is now a Fox News senior judicial analyst. Judge Napolitano said recently that the court's decision to allow the restraining order to stand was “precisely the wrong thing” for it to have done. He also said that it was “profoundly wrong” because “it essentially consists of substituting the judgment of three judges for the [President of the United States](#), when the Constitution unambiguously gives this area of jurisdiction — foreign policy — exclusively to the president.”

Given that “the Constitution unambiguously gives this area of jurisdiction — foreign policy — exclusively to the president” as Judge Napolitano said, President Trump does not have to wait—with America in peril—to win this battle in the courts. He has, as *World Net Daily* pointed out, the authority to “simply lower the ceiling on **refugee** resettlement for fiscal 2017, which began four months ago on Oct. 1.” As that article goes on to say:

Trump has already partially exercised this option in his first executive order when he lowered the annual ceiling from 110,000 **refugees** set by Obama to 50,000. Interestingly, this was the one part of his executive order that was not struck down by the lawsuits filed in Washington state and Minnesota.

Given that President Trump is a man who is willing to explore all options, and has said he will do so in this case, another plan which is not open to the idiotic review of the courts may be well in place by the time the Supreme Court gets its chance to—once again—reverse another decision of the Ninth Circuit Court. Since the very safety of the nation is at stake, it is a good thing that the president has other legal options.

Boot, Max. "Executive Order Barring Refugees Will Not Prevent Terrorism." *Council on Foreign Relations*. January. 2017.

Frieman, Uri. "Where America's Terrorists Acutally Come From." *The Atlantic*. 30 January, 2017.

Kusler, Don. "Don't Play Into Fears About Military Attacks." *Tribune News Service*. 27 December 2015.

Mathews, Merrill. "Millitants May Sneak in with the Refugees" *Tribune News Service*. 27 December 2015.

Shaw, C. Mitchell. "Trump's Executive Order to Ban Refugees Is Constitutional." *The New American* 15 Feb. 2017.