

Refugee Resettlement Is a Racket

...and Somalis Prove It

BY BRENDA WALKER

Back when the economy was booming a decade or so ago, the business lobby could complain to Congress that companies couldn't find workers cheaply enough, and the obedient legislators would quickly arrange visas for thousands more of whatever category was said to be needed. But now, when 20 million citizens can't find jobs, there seems to be no corresponding OFF switch in Washington for legal immigrants (over a million annually) or for refugees who are often less hire-worthy than the average foreign newcomer. So thousands of refugees keep coming because the President and Congress want them, even though the country is not prepared to receive them.

In the midst of a brutal, ongoing recession, the federal government nevertheless welcomed 74,654 refugees in 2009. The White House announced in October of 2010 that refugee admissions for fiscal year (FY) 2011 would be 80,000, the same as for the current year. There are now five to six unemployed people competing for each available job, but elite humanitarians don't care how difficult it is for today's refugees to get a foothold through employment. Local papers continue to publish sad stories of refugees who are running out of benefits as they hopelessly try to find employment in a tough jobs depression. Some are so desperate that they consider returning to their home country (which apparently cannot be so bad as originally characterized).

Immigration was touted in earlier times as a benefit for America and Americans. Now the unspoken belief of elite liberals is that this country is too rich, and we therefore must welcome the poorest, most culturally inappropriate foreigners possible as part of our penance for economic success. Policies have followed that ideology, exemplified by the family-reunification emphasis in immigration that has admitted impoverished millions

and a refugee program that sails along on auto-pilot. Do-gooder leaders (like the members of Congress' Refugee Caucus) get plaudits for helping the least fortunate, while local communities bear the brunt of crime, unemployment, and extreme diversity (such as polygamy, female genital mutilation and honor killing).

The ugly truth is there is a lot of money to be had through the Refugee Industrial Complex. Catholic Charities has a big collection plate permanently stationed in Washington for its supposed good works, which might raise eyebrows about the separation of church and state. The Conference of Catholic Bishops 2009 Migration and Refugee Services report shows \$58,025,605 in government grants and contracts going to that organization. Other religious groups stand foursquare at the taxpayer trough also, like the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services, which got \$29,907,000 in 2009. Interestingly, until the 1990s, refugee resettlement was handled by private charities, but then the government got involved with big money, to the detriment of the American people.



The refugee business is built on cultural dysfunction. Primitive peoples need a lot of help to settle in a modern society; specifically, the new folks need directions about basic things, like electric lights, kitchen stoves, escalators, indoor plumbing, banks, bus passes, etc. If refugees could adjust easily to life in the first world, then they wouldn't require well-paid experts to hold their hands throughout the process. Washington's continued admittance of thousands yearly who can be categorized as pre-pencil guarantees job security to professional do-gooders.

In fact, the more dysfunctional the refugees, the

Brenda Walker is publisher of the websites LimitsToGrowth.org and ImmigrationsHumanCost.org. A resident of the San Francisco Bay area, she is a frequent contributor to The Social Contract.

more expensive professional help they need. And that fact may at least partially explain why there are so many Somalis among us, despite how inappropriate they are for America. Somalis are a primitive, nomadic people who normally practice polygamy, wife-beating, and female genital mutilation (at a rate of 98 percent prevalence, according to the World Health Organization). They are Muslims and keep their females covered up in the Islamic style. Plus, they are known for jihadist hostility to Western values, except money (supplied by the unwilling taxpayer) of course.

One might think that national security would be a line in the sand where unsuitable refugees would be rejected, but that's not the case at all. Somalis were shooting Americans in Mogadishu in 1993 (and vice versa, as told in the book *Black Hawk Down*), so it is curious that Somali anger about the American incursion is not much considered by Washington when refugee and immigration policy is decided. In addition to the presence of standard infidel-hating Islam, there is an active jihadist group in Somalia known as al-Shebaab. In October, that gang shot a couple of teenaged girls for spying (a charge which seems unlikely) in a demonstration of brutality to terrorize local people. Al-Shebaab has also stoned accused adulterers to death in front of public gatherings for the same effect. This is how the perfect totalitarian sharia state is created, according to Islamic doctrine.

From 2007 to 2009, a couple dozen young Somali men from Minneapolis-St. Paul returned to their homeland to pursue jihad. Shirwa Ahmed, a Minneapolis high school graduate who had appeared well adjusted, blew up himself and 30 others in Mogadishu in the service of Allah. Al-Shebaab helpfully offers weapons training and jihadist doctrine to clansmen with American citizenship. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) officials admit to concern that the Somalis with U.S. passports bring their new knowledge back to America. A new security worry is "home-grown terror," which is a blurry category including adult Muslim immigrants, converts, and American-born young people who are seduced by radical Islam. Curiously, the Senators who have investigated the home-grown threat have not suggested ending immigration even from countries known for sponsoring

terrorism.

Besides violent jihad, Somalis have also established ethnic strongholds in American towns which are unhappy with the unpleasant transformation. Lewiston, Maine, was one of the first to complain, after Somalis began arriving in 2001, because of the financial cost on its schools and social welfare system. Shelbyville, Tennessee, has not been happy with its new diversity, and traditional residents have noted how demanding Somalis are in normal interactions where a measure of politeness is expected. In meatpacking plants in Nebraska, Colorado, and elsewhere, Somali workers insisted on scheduling friendly to their Islamic prayers. (Muslims seem particularly mixed up on the topic of assimilation, that as newcomers, they are expected to shape their behavior to our customs, not the other way round.) Down the road from Shelbyville, Murfreesboro citizens have been fighting against the construction of a multi-million-dollar mega-mosque, which seems inappropriate given the

small number of actual Muslims living in the area. Wealthy backers of sharia law in America obviously are planning for growth.

In addition to Somali youth's fondness for Islamist murder and mayhem, ordinary crime is appealing as well. Areas of large Somali population are stuck with worsening

gang problems. In Minneapolis-St. Paul, violent street gangs have grown into vast criminal enterprises, as shown by the arrests of dozens of Somalis in three states in November 2010 for child prostitution, safe cracking, and car theft. Other evidence points to an international reach of crime that includes credit card fraud, burglary, and witness tampering.

Somalis have brought nothing but trouble, yet they continue to be admitted in large numbers. The excellent blog Refugee Resettlement Watch has counted up the admissions year by year and concluded that America has accepted more than 100,000 Somalis. The whole situation of Somali refugees and immigrants is so counter to reason and America's well-being that too much consideration is headache producing. Would it be too much to hope that welcoming likely enemies and criminals might be looked upon with skepticism by Washington's new reformers? ■

