

Today, whole nations are being destroyed by those who are called 'refugees' and 'asylum seekers'. Just as an entire housing estate can be reduced to misery by just one problem family, so countries can be ruined by just a few alien nationals. This is not racism, but acknowledgement of stark facts.

At its most rudimentary level, a 'refugee' who escapes an abysmal situation in their own country, escapes to find refuge in another, safer country. In that new country, if they apply for such, they receive 'asylum seeker' status. My problem with this today, in that once a 'refugee' passes from one country to another, he should really be termed an 'economic migrant'. And, the majority of these 'refugees' are illegal. That is why we need a firm understanding of what a 'refugee' and 'asylum seeker' is. Those who look on must get into the habit of calling 'refugees' what they are – migrants. Unless they can prove their status that is what they are.

Geneva Convention on Refugees

The rules on refugees were not meant for today's situation. The original purpose was to help people displaced by Hitler, after WW2. These were all Europeans moved about by necessity, not foreign nationals who had nothing to do with Europe. The idea was to assist those forced to leave their homes in Europe, to re-establish themselves, hopefully by going back to their former homes, and to find their families. Thus, the refugee system was for 'home-grown' refugees. Not for people of any nationality who have nothing to do with the West and who insist on staying in a country not their own.

The original refugees were white, with a Christian or Christianised background, so they were not at odds with each other, or with the West. This is very different to the way hostile foreigners are accepted as 'refugees' even though they are antagonistic towards the West! This makes application of the refugee rules to Muslims so very alien and impossible. (The principles in O-281, 'Ceteris Paribus', can be used in this connection).

"... owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence ... is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it."

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

(1951 Geneva Convention relating to the status of refugees, amended by the 1967 protocol to the convention).

These are the salient points:

1.

The person must have a 'well-founded' fear of persecution. For obvious reasons, this originally specifically applied to Jews.

2.

The persecution must be personal and not national (being in a war zone is not enough, nor is being poor).

3.

Reasons are almost anything devised by socialists.

4.

The person thus afraid can go to any country other than his own, for protection.

5.

He may, also, be unwilling to stay in his own country or, cannot return.

What constitutes 'well founded'? Homosexuals can apply as asylum seekers because their own country persecutes their 'particular social group'. But, is their claim just personal, or is it an acknowledged fact, that their 'social group' is *actually* being persecuted; or, are they just disliked. In this situation I can think of a number of problems:

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

1.

They are lying and thus abuse asylum rules to gain entry to a more liberal, immoral country.

2.

What is this 'persecution'? Is it just a national dislike for their sexual perversion? Or, is it actual bodily harm? As a Christian I am persecuted by homosexuals in my own country, but I do not thereby think this is enough reason to seek asylum elsewhere.

3.

The status of homosexuals in the UK is false, because their situation has been forced upon the people by statute and not by general acceptance of sexual impropriety.

4.

More homosexuals means more disease, paid for by taxes, and more use of health services and, perhaps a short while later, more use of many other state benefits and housing.

5.

This means that homosexual application for asylum is founded on a false premise, probably unable to be proved.

6.

And, unlike someone whose skin colour can give them away, or their language, all homosexuals need do to avoid persecution is to stop being homosexual. Simple, because it is only a sexual choice, and not an inherent condition.

What of people seeking asylum from a variety of countries for a variety of reasons? These countries range widely, from the Middle East to Africa, and Afghanistan, Pakistan, etc. A few leave these countries because people of their *own religion* want to harm them. This is why the Puritans left England to sail to America. Is there an affinity? I do not think so.

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

The majority who leave their country leave for non-persecution reasons, which is why they can be termed 'economic migrants'. Article 33 of the Convention states that no refugee may be removed (refoulement) back to their own countries if they are at risk. However, the EU prevents the UK deporting Islamic terrorists back to their countries, even though their own countries are Islamic and support terrorists. To me, this prevention is beyond the terms of the Convention, and they should be deported.

Frankly, why should the UK maintain and support terrorists who wish us harm? If we go back to the original purpose of the rules – would Britain accept Nazis as 'refugees' after WW2? No – they would have been put in prison, put to death, or cast out of the country! No-one has the courage to do this today.

Special Papers – a Cover for Illegality

Those deemed to be refugees (escaping a dire threat of violence or death go each one *persona lly*) must be given 'special' travel documents, which replace their passports! In other words, someone claims refugee status, throws away their papers, and is given a special document that conveniently replaces their actual means of identification. Yet, the authorities have no idea who they are. It comes back to emotional deception and socialistic policies, with little or no regard for national security or the safety of citizens.

This suggests strongly that there is a criminal motive in the activity, and the owner of papers does not wish to be identified as a non-refugee. By giving him special papers, we encourage him to continue his illegality. It has been discovered that the vast majority of 'refugees' are NOT escaping war and are NOT persecuted. Yet, the EU insists on treating them as such, thus muddying the waters of the Convention, and ignoring its basic requirements. (See an excellent appraisal by Frederick Forsyth, [Daily Express, 11th March 2016](#) , which properly identifies 'refugees' as 'migrants' who have no justification for being 'refugees').

Note that the current application of post-WW2 rules is wrong and conveniently 'loose', enabling a few million Muslims to literally invade Europe without qualifying as 'refugees'. Also note that Germany is the main culprit.

A country may send the 'refugee' on to a third country if it is deemed to be safer, where their

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier

Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

claim to asylum can be investigated. The problem with this is that most 'refugees' have destroyed their papers, to avoid identification. This means that people who may be a danger to our own citizens must be accepted as genuine, even though their identity cannot be verified. And, they deliberately travel through many 'safe' countries until they reach the one they think will give them higher benefits*! This is not genuine refugee activity, but a cynical abuse of the system. (*Some try to deny this basic money-grabbing philosophy. But, as Forsyth correctly says, Britain is well-known worldwide as a country giving faster and better payments overall, plus every imaginable social benefit, from health to education and housing, which lowers what a natural-born citizen can obtain).

Can you imagine going into a bank and asking for ten thousand pounds; the manager asks for your identification; you say you haven't got any. Will the bank give you the money? Of course not. Yet, Europe is being pushed hard to accept a vast number of 'refugees' who cannot prove their status as refugees. In which way, then, are they 'refugees' who come under the Convention? They cannot be refugees at all. Try another illustration: watch police programmes and hear criminals deny they are guilty, and say "Honestly, I didn't do anything"! The police officer turns to the camera and says this is what he hears every time he arrests someone. He adds how stupid an officer would be if he accepted the plea.

In fact, the officer will take the person to a police station and search records from near and far to find out who the person is and what he has done previously. But 'refugees'? All they need do is say they ARE 'refugees' and need asylum! And they are given the status even though they have no identification! This is not just wrong – it is official insanity and gross negligence, in the light of Islamic violence and murders.

First Country of Asylum

That a refugee must register with the first safe country they reach, is NOT a part of the Convention. However, it has been a long-standing *international law* principle that a neighbouring country takes in refugees. Thus, if a refugee does not claim asylum in that first country, he is returned to it as a matter of course. But, today, this is not happening and Europe is literally deluged by so-called 'refugees' who refuse to register in the first safe country. It is logical to say that if they refuse to register in the first safe country, that their true motive is economic migration.

EU moguls are saying that anywhere in the EU is counted to be as one country, so 'refugees' can move freely between states. This is a reckless absurdity, turning borders into sponges soaking up all and any persons, whether good or evil.

Germany is the biggest sticking point in this, and is responsible for the massive influx of 'refugees', even though data show that the majority are NOT 'refugees' at all, but are illegally trying to enter Europe for economic reasons, or, in some cases, to inflict terror upon the people.

In Europe, domestic law is found in the Asylum and Immigration (treatment of Claimants, etc) Act, 2004, and in various immigration rules. Schedule 3 of the Act gives a list of countries deemed to be 'safe'. However, it is bizarre that terrorists are not sent back to their own countries because their countries are not 'safe'... that is, their own countries are just as bad as the terrorists.

Let us be honest – why should we sympathise with terrorists whose aim is to kill us? They must be deported back to their own countries and receive their just rewards. Unfortunately, this is where the European convention on human rights meddles with the reality of the situation, twisting the rules to suit their own agendas! This is why convicted terrorists must be retained in the UK, on full state benefits... a slap in the face for countries already damaged by terrorism and wicked actions.

The secretary of state may return a person to his own country, or to a 'safe' country if that country will indeed take him in. This is obvious, otherwise the person might be like a shuttlecock moving from UK to the country and back again indefinitely. Even so, every effort should be taken to deport the person. To be blunt, I believe a terrorist has lost all rights once he tries to kill us, or conspires to do so, so I do not care if he returns to a hostile own country. (See my article on 'Compassion').

Illegal Leads to Illegal

We also have a weird rule that if a person is smuggled into Europe or the UK (e.g. by lorry), he cannot have an opportunity to register for asylum in the first country he travels through. I fail to see what difference this makes – his entry or attempted entry is illegal to begin with, so his attempt to gain asylum status in a later country should be ignored, and the person sent back home.

It is a very reasonable assumption that if someone tries to enter the country illegally, then he will continue in illegality once he gains entry. It is also a very worrying fact that many who enter are bent on our destruction or treat us as objects of hatred. And, few will work, either by choice or

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

by being unemployable. The subsequent costs to the UK are therefore enormous, and the country slides into a deficit because taxes are less than benefit costs. Our pension-age people are already victims of this insanity, having to work much longer than expected.

Anyone claiming asylum must do so within 12 months of arriving. In that case the country the person is in must deal with the claim. If outside the 12 months, the claim must be made in the previous country the person was in. But, in the EU, all these provisions are being blurred by 'do-gooder' politicians, and the 'rules' are being bent or ignored widely. The real reasons, ultimately, are socialist hypotheses.

Red Cross Musings

(It is interesting that Muslims coming into Europe, on being given Red Cross water or food, throw them away, because they have a cross on them. This is a sure sign of their hatred for Christianity and the West).

The Red Cross says there is no such thing as an 'illegal' asylum seeker. Frankly, this is just their absurd opinion. They recognise the difference between asylum seekers and economic migrants, though. (Source: British Red Cross, 27th March, 2015). They say we should not "jump to conclusions" over who is a genuine asylum seeker and who is not. However, their web site also blurs the edges and I believe a legal case can be drawn up against it. For example, the web page says this under the heading, "Who's Hiding in Lorries to Get Here, Then?":

"It's impossible to say without knowing more. They could be asylum seekers, economic migrants, or a mix of the two. (A person's home country might shed some clues, but we shouldn't jump to conclusions.)"

If an economic migrant hides from authorities or overstays their visa, they break UK law.

But an asylum seeker has the right to stay in the UK while we process their claim."

Firstly, if these people throw away their papers, who is to know what country they came from? It is easily possible that someone claims to be leaving a war area such as Syria, but has actually

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier

Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

come from a non-war zone, or even a place like an African state. Or, that the person himself is not in personal danger, even in a war zone. Also, being Syrian by birth does not mean he is a Syrian resident. Without genuine papers we cannot trust *any* claim. Yes, an economic migrant breaks the law by sneaking into the country. This is followed by "But an asylum seeker..."

By the same token HOW can anyone be called an 'asylum seeker' if he has no papers to prove it? Here, the Red Cross is making assumptions! For me, the illegal entry attempt is enough to dismiss any claim to asylum. Indeed, without papers no claim should be accepted and the person sent straight back to his previous country. It is possible he might be genuine. It is also possible he is not. I tend to believe the latter, for most throw away their papers in Europe – they are not just 'lost'. His decision to throw away his papers should elicit a solid response of 'no entry'. If this was adopted, suddenly there would be a ready supply of papers (probably criminally printed forgeries)!

The Red Cross says "Asylum seekers flee unimaginable horrors". This may, or may not, be true. Those from Syria, for example, may indeed have seen horrors, especially coming from ISIS. But, there might be other, unspoken reasons, to escape from Syria. And I repeat – without papers the truth cannot be found.

Risk is Nothing When Life is Cheap!

The Red Cross thinks that people must be leaving something awful to risk life and limb getting to Europe. Not necessarily - in this they seem not to understand how devious people can be. In the Middle East and in Africa, etc., under Islam, people are used to lying, cheating, concealing, deceiving, and being violent. If they think they can obtain free state benefits at a rate very much higher than their present income, they *are* willing to risk their lives. This is because life is cheap under Islam. It has nothing to do with seeing awful things... perhaps even things they themselves have been party to.

The Red Cross is also forgetting the axiom found throughout Islamic countries – that whatever happens, even woes, are sent by Allah, so it is accepted as fate. This is why, if a car, even a Rolls Royce, breaks down in the desert, the driver will accept it as a fate sent by Allah and just sit there to die. Not understanding this odd mind-set leads to applying sympathy to people where it should not be given.

Hardened Muslims *will* travel through danger if they can get relatively high financial rewards; death is just a risk they are willing to take, such is their Islamicised idea of life. They will even

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier

Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

put their children in danger to achieve it, because, as many videos and reports prove, Islamists think of children as 'Allah's Little Helpers', sex objects, and disposable bomb-carriers. Frankly, I believe the little child drowned off Turkey, a famed photo, was the victim of his parent's disregard for safety and higher regard for more money (the parents had lived safely in Turkey for some years).

No doubt some Muslims do love their children – but the reverse is shown in many reports. And when it comes to Calais and other European sites, children are just handy objects to gain better benefits.

The biggest problem with the Red Cross ideas, is their belief in the verity of refugee claims, when there are no papers. Papers are being thrown away en-route through countries, and not as a sudden gesture, or because they have to escape suddenly. It is a calculated act, designed to ensure their true identity is hidden.

Without papers people can say whatever they like! And remember that the vast majority of 'refugees' are fit young men, usually with plenty of money, and designer clothes. They fight their way through Europe and when they finally reach their goal. This is not true refugee behaviour nor does it encourage us to allow them asylum status. A few in the media are finally realising this truth.

The Situation

As the Red Cross states, "An asylum seeker can legally stay here while waiting for a decision to be made", And this is a *very* big problem, as a quarter of all 'refugees' have disappeared in Europe! An odd thing to do if one is a genuine refugee? The Red Cross complained that the term 'bogus refugee' is incorrect and should not be used, because anyone with refugee status is legally entitled to stay. This is correct – but without papers how can any country accept people as 'genuine refugees'?

Such 'refugees' know it takes a long time to come to a decision... but, when it comes they have usually disappeared into the country and cannot be traced. If they are genuine, why do they wish to disappear and live illegally? This is another reason not to apply sympathy – we do not know who is genuine, without papers. And, decisions **MUST** be made swiftly, so that genuineness can be established and a leave or stay reply is given. As you can see, this matter of no papers is a vital ingredient.

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

In other words, a person can only have 'refugee' status when the government has agreed they need protection. But, if there are no papers and no way to check stories, there is no way to say applicants genuinely need protection! And, if this status is only given after a decision has been made, there is no real reason to call the millions now invading Europe 'refugees'. In essence they are simply people travelling through Europe without papers or a proven legitimate reason to be here: they are illegals. In which case they ARE 'bogus'.

The rules state that, in itself, coming from a war-torn area or a place that has experienced a natural disaster does not mean one is automatically a 'refugee'. To be called one, the person has to know PERSONAL danger... not national danger. How many of these are found amongst the millions set to travel to Europe? Without papers, there is no true way of telling!

Those who travel from their own countries are *migrants*. Only when they are *proved* to escape from persecution or real threat of death, do they become refugees. And they can then claim asylum. BUT WITHOUT PAPERS – HOW DOES ANYONE KNOW THEY ARE GENUINE? It is a very strong suspicion that they are, instead, illegals who just want everything free. I keep repeating the fact: without papers they cannot prove who they are and cannot be proved to be escaping danger personally, or even nationally. All this is being ignored.

Any Conclusions?

Angela Merkel of Germany encouraged millions of migrants to enter Europe and THEN commanded every member EU state to take them in! The ones who have already reached Europe are wreaking havoc wherever they go, and some EU states are now putting up borders again as a result of the criminality of 'refugees'. The crime rates in every EU country where there are 'refugees' is rising steeply. In some places it is out of control and police are powerless to act.

At the same time citizens of every country are being deceived by false data and false reporting, into thinking all is well, when it is not. At the moment, Britain is safer than most because we live on an island. But, if we do not leave the EU, this will change and we will be forced to take a quota of uncheckable 'refugees', thus opening ourselves up to potential mortal danger, **on top of dangers we are already aware of and have suffered**, as well as economic disaster.

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

While Europhiles and EU officials try to muddy the waters, blur the edges, and deliberately misreport what is happening, many more illegal migrants arrive in Europe daily, and some countries are now finding the situation has spawned vigilante groups (with justification)... something we predicted some time ago.

I hope I have shown that the terms 'refugee' and 'asylum seeker' are being used mainly without warrant, because people without papers are simply 'illegal'. Sympathy is being drawn from those ignorant of the real dangers posed by illegals, especially and *specifically* Muslims. And many Muslims call the West 'weak' because of this sympathy and the reason we can be exploited. That is why so many Muslims pretend to be someone they are not; they pretend to have families; they pretend to be escaping war; they lie; they KNOW westerners will be sympathetic! And the West drinks it all in as truth! ISIS said they would send operatives to us, and the sudden tsunami of migrants began immediately after! Is the EU blind and deaf?

Christians Beware

For Christians this situation can easily reverse itself, because the more Muslims fill our land the more likely they will rise against us. The quicker unchecked unverified 'refugees' are granted asylum the worse this will get and Islam will create its no-go areas. From this will come Islamic demands that bring grief to non-Muslims, especially Jews and Christians. Not to recognise this is to be blinkered. Stop your sympathy!

But, it all starts with calling a spade a spade. Without papers no man can prove who he is. In normal circumstances, such a man cannot get anything from anyone. But, when it comes to possible 'refugees' all sense disappears and dangerous nonsense replaces facts. ***The plain fact is – if a man has no papers he cannot prove a right to being an asylum seeker or a refugee.***

Merely travelling through country after country does not prove anything, except that the man doing it is travelling illegally and acting illegally!

No matter what the Red Cross says (and says it simplistically, if not cynically), no-one is tackling the real issues. Real dangers are covered up by the EU. Europe is being smothered by illegals whose status cannot be proved. And if I cannot claim state benefits without proper identification, reams of paperwork and months of investigation – *why* are people without *any* form of identification being given privileges that tax-paying citizens cannot claim?

Europe is becoming a caliphate, as ISIS warned. Many Muslims given asylum will prove to be

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

sleepers for Islamic terror. They are already planning devastation and havoc. This is why Europe must apply strict rules of entry, and send back the huge majority who cannot be called asylum seekers, let alone refugees.

The UK will soon disappear under medieval sharia laws. The UK will not be a place we can live in quietly and safely. And if the rest of the world is clinging to sharia, there is nowhere else we can go. And this is why I say the time is coming when WE will be forced to leave as refugees... but no country will be willing to accept Christians! Pushed out by illegals who pretend to be refugees, so they can reach the point bluntly told to us by Muslims already here – that when their numbers are sufficient they will take over the country. THEN we can look forward to economic disaster, social destruction, loss of national identity, and real persecution BY LAW. It is an insanity that wicked violent Muslims are preferred to quiet law-abiding Christians!

Refugee? Asylum seeker? The rules MUST be written clearly and amended, otherwise we become like the Third World and natural-born citizens will be ousted from their own country by people who wish us gone or dead! This is not 'doom-saying', it is actual fact gleaned from real data and reports from every EU country. It also comes from what Islamists are saying, time and again. The dangers are already with us.

Further Notes

Some British media try to say that images and acts of violence are being 'faked' (The Independent). No doubt some might be – but they are based on actual violence. This is why some countries are closing their borders and their police are overwhelmed. Sadly, those media who try to say the 'right' are trying to 'demonise' refugees, are themselves of socialist persuasion. Also, the huge majority of reports from a wide diversity of sources are more accurate.

Others in the media are more forthright. For instance, RT News reports *that "one in three 'Syrian' refugees have fake IDs, German authorities admit"*

(RT news, 26

th

September 2015). That is, those who *claim*

to be Syrian, but have no proof. So, we have a mixture – most throw away their papers, but others use fake ones, hoping they will not be noticed! By September, then, one third of the 527,000 migrants proved to be liars and illegals. They do this because if they say they are from Syria, their applications will be fast-tracked. And the faster they are shifted the less likely it is that operatives will be found. The cost for buying a forgery is about \$1000... where do genuine

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

refugees get that kind of money? And a British journalist easily bought a fake Syrian passport for \$2000.

As 90% of all migrants claim to be 'Syrian' this creates massive problems. Bulgaria seized 10,000 fake Syrian passports by September last year, and The Telegraph said: "*which is likely to be only a fraction of those in circulation elsewhere.*"

Thus, listen to the Red Cross and other socialist sources and we will be in dire trouble if we follow their logic. And, as RT states,

many who claim to be from Syria don't even speak Arabic

(German interior Minister, September)! The same source also admitted that the migrant problem was "out of control". He added that even if not from Syria, refugees would still be afforded refugee status! What on earth is this rabid irresponsibility? Why admit someone who may be not just illegal but a terrorist? Why give a blanket acceptance of people who have no identification? In any other sphere of life this would never happen!

And, because so many applications are being literally pushed through fast, when applicants do not have papers, or have false papers, there are bound to be big problems later. It is with a laugh that I repeat what the Minister said – "*migrants (are urged to) be truthful about their identity.*" ! Thus, the whole thing is a farce. Do you think a terrorist will be truthful? Or, an economic migrant? Watch any police programme and what do those they capture always say? "Honest. I'm not lying!" A short while later, we find they lied their heads off!!

Obama and 'Refugees'

Obama's position is plainly pro-Islam and pro-terrorists. His insistence on closing 'Gitmo' and taking the remaining terrorists into the USA, is one huge example (note how many of those released thus far have returned to ISIS and other Islamic terror groups). He is continuing to foist Islamists onto the people:

"Mark Twain once said there are lies, damned lies and statistics. We saw all of these from the Obama administration this week as it desperately tried to defend its foolhardy plan to bring Syrian refugees into the United States without adequately vetting them for ISIS terrorists." (Fox News, 16th Nov, 2015)

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

Is this suicide? Or, all-out treason? Having followed these arguments for months I am convinced Obama is a traitor. In response to complaints from high sources in the USA, Obama issued a set of statistics to 'prove' his critics are wrong. I studied statistics for a year and even with such rudimentary knowledge I know that statistics can indeed be manipulated any way you want them to go. The same statistics can be used to both reject and accept claims! Mark Twain was correct.

It turned out that the 'reassuring' statistics were false (what a big surprise, eh?), but there is no way to check them because unnamed officials did not give details of source documents. (Note: statistics must be checked very carefully against many criteria. Only those that are checked thoroughly can be used sensibly).

Any wonder that few are willing to see any truth in Obama's claims, or in his assurances that the USA is 'safe'... when so far Islamists have conducted terror attacks. Donald Trump is perfectly right to say the problem is not the Muslims who are quiet and law-abiding, but the unknown numbers who are terrorists, or who support terrorism. His attitude is admirable, and common sense. Sadly, because of terrorists, *all* Muslims must be treated as potential terrorists. No-one knows who they are until they commit atrocities, and almost all who join ISIS have been hitherto unknown to police: so-called 'moderates'. (Note that the Turkish president abhors the word 'moderate' – he rightly says that *Muslims are Muslims and it is an insult to call them 'moderates'; that is, they are all the same* !

It is stupid do-gooding (socialist) westerners who try to differentiate. This is why all Muslims must be treated as suspicious. It is inevitable and to be expected).

Only 52% of migrants into the USA are from Syria. (20th November 2015, Allenbwest.com). 70% of those wanting to travel to the USA want sharia law. In itself this is frightening and dangerous. They also think terrorism is acceptable. It is how most Muslims think – similar numbers can be found in the UK. The same Muslims say it is alright to kill a Muslim who becomes a Christian, or anyone who opposes sharia. Is this what the USA or the UK wants amongst its 'citizens'?

To November last year the following numbers reached the USA. (Source: UN).

- 52% Syria
- 19% Afghanistan

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier

Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

- 6% Iraq
- 6% Eritrea
- 2% Nigeria
- 2% Pakistan
- 2% Somalia
- 1% Sudan
- 1% Gambia
- 1% Mali

Thus almost none are from war areas. And, even if they *are* war areas, to qualify as genuine refugees, migrants must prove their identity AND that the war was aimed at them *specifically*

as

individuals

. The latter is very, very hard to prove. Obama is challenging the USA to take in migrants, saying that "only 2% are males of fighting age" (quoted in Time Magazine). This is a shameful lie, when 62% of them are between the age of 18-25! An even higher number are fighting-age males in Europe, with only 22% being 'children'... but, even then, look at the evidence proving that most 'children' are actually teenagers or older! And, of course, almost NO migrants are Christian... so they remain locked into an unbearable situation while those who persecute and kill them are probably amongst the few million trying to reach Europe!

More on Statistics

Statistics are useful when applied properly and without a desire to deceive. Which is why unqualified data must be treated with suspicion. Theresa May admitted that the "vast majority" of migrants to Europe have come from Africa (and not war zones) as economic migrants (BBC Radio 4, in May). Her statement was followed a short while later by that of the Foreign Secretary, Philip Hammond, who repeated May's kind of information. The Guardian proposed that their figures are wrong, instead giving their own figures. And this is where Twain's warning comes into force, for no-one can provide us with accurate or even vague estimates when almost all migrants throw away their papers! For this reason I will not repeat either side's arguments.

It still stands that Syrians were quite happy to stay in Syria until ISIS ventured forth. Bear in mind that there are two war fronts in Syria: one is the internal war conducted by Assad against his own people. ISIS is entirely separate – they simply used the unsettled country as a base for their own terror. ISIS is made up of mercenaries who want to kill and to impose radical sharia on the whole world. Syria is only a stepping stone in that plan. Now, the Syrians who lived under Assad without wanting to leave, suddenly go north to Europe. The difference is ISIS, which appears to be more murderous even than Assad!

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

Even so, why should Muslims travel to Europe and not to neighbouring Muslim countries? Economic reasons are one proposed reason. Spreading Islam is another. A worst extra reason is that ISIS is sending operatives to Europe to carry out its plan of terror and to spread Islam. No-one knows the full extent of any of those reasons, but most of the migrants shout Islamic verses and call for sharia, and insult or attack those westerners who reject what they say. Once again, much comes down to the throwing away of identity papers.

Then we come to Germany, whose stupidity (or deliberate action) led to the current movement of migrants (I will not call them 'refugees'). For unspecified reasons Germany is not keeping tabs on who comes from where! In other words, this astounding fact means Germany cannot possibly say that ANY migrants are genuine refugees! The reason for this failure is probably in the fact that *"Some 30% of refugees that declare Syria as their country of origin (because it puts them on a fast-track to asylum status) upon the arrival in Germany, lie."*
(Source: German Interior Ministry, and quoted in sputniknews.com).

Germany also said, way back in September 2015, that 83,000 of migrants were 'undocumented' (note there are many videos and reports showing migrants throwing away their documents). Since then, Merkel has told migrants that those from non-war zones must leave. Yes, Right! Of course they will comply! This is probably why vast numbers have simply disappeared from camps and hostels.

The Guardian has published varying kinds of articles on 'refugees', oscillating between reality and fable, and claiming to have real statistics whereas others do not. (This is where I again repeat the plain fact – that *no-one* can know the full truth when so-called 'refugees' throw away their papers).

However, one article points the way to truth (Guardian, 6th February, 2016) by saying that blurring the edges between real refugees and economic migrants, does not help anyone. The journalist, Nick Cohen, lays the blame for this at the feet of 'leftists' (socialists). He said that when he went to Calais he "could not find one refugee from Assad". This supports my own conclusions, described earlier.

One source says *"If warmer weather and calmer seas bring more waves of refugees, it is not*

inconceivable that Europe's front line states will use force to stop them entering.”

(1
st

February, The World Post). I already see this as a foregone conclusion, because, as an earlier quote puts it

“Even the most prosperous states, however, have a finite capacity to absorb them.”

Or, to put it my way – as illegal OR legal migrants are taken in, so the ability of taxes to cope will go down, dramatically. This very obvious fact seems to elude the UK government and do-gooders.

Even before this recent wave of migrants, the UK was struggling tremendously in all areas of social and economic provision for our own citizens – the direct result of taking in large number of migrants who are unemployable and unemployed. As one source said, we must tackle the problem in *their own* countries, rather than allow an unspecified but huge number of migrants to flow into Europe. Otherwise, the UK will fall, as will Europe. And, sadly, civil unrest (dare I refer to it as civil war?) will occur.

France – an Unexploded Bomb

As in all EU countries, the governments are silencing sources of facts, such as the media. And this will make matters far worse.

“Unbound by any First Amendment, the French government exerts pressure on the media to suppress bad news. We do not hear much about the steady thrum of insurrection in the banlieues: the thousands of torched automobiles, the violence against police and other agents of the state, the pressure in Islamic enclaves to ignore the sovereignty of the Republic and conform to the rule of sharia.” (National Review, 28th Nov. 2016)

AND

“What happens in France happens in Belgium. It happens in Sweden where much of Malmö, the third largest city, is controlled by Muslim immigrant gangs — emergency medical personnel attacked routinely enough that they will not respond to calls without police protection, and the police in turn unwilling to enter without back-up. Not long ago in Britain, a soldier was killed and nearly beheaded in broad daylight by jihadists known to the intelligence services; dozens of sharia courts now operate throughout the country, even as Muslim activists demand more accommodations. And it was in Germany, which green-lighted Europe's ongoing influx of

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

Muslim migrants, that Turkey's Islamist strongman Recep Tayyip Erdogan proclaimed that pressuring Muslims to assimilate in their new Western countries is "a crime against humanity."

AND

"If there is a refugee "crisis," it most certainly is no fault of ours"

Referring to vetting in the USA, the same report says: "... vetting only works if you vet for the right thing. Washington, in its delusional Islamophilia, vets only for ties to terrorism, which it defines as "violent extremism" in purblind denial of modern terrorism's Islamist ideological moorings. As the deteriorating situation in Europe manifests, our actual challenge is Islamic supremacism, of which jihadist terrorism is only a subset."

This is an unsaid but vital fact, and one that causes me to reject Islamists and even ordinary Muslims as migrants. In the USA and the UK, governments have been complicit in lying to the public, who are gloriously blind to what having a large Muslim population means in reality.

"For nearly a quarter-century, our bipartisan governing class has labored mightily to suppress public discussion of the undeniable nexus between Islamic doctrine and terrorism. Consequently, many Americans are still in the dark about sharia, classical Islam's societal framework and legal code. We should long ago have recognized sharia as the bright line that separates authentic Muslim moderates, hungry for the West's culture of reason and individual liberty, from Islamic supremacists, resistant to Western assimilation and insistent on incremental accommodation of Muslim law and mores."

Calais ('the jungle') Again...

A senior UK immigration judge says *"Many of the Jungle occupants are not refugees"*. He is talking about well over 18,000 migrants. (Mr Justice McCloskey, in The Telegraph, 10th

March). He therefore adds that there is "no real basis" for most of the Calais dwellers "to remain there".

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

He supposes that these non-refugees are claiming asylum because they perceive a better deal than they can get in France. Unfortunately, this follows his decision to allow four Syrians to join their family in the UK, paving the way for many more to claim they are Syrians. It is significant that so many want to get out of France to get to the UK – which many see as a 'soft touch'. However, he said,

"It seems likely that there is no real basis for many of its occupants remaining indefinitely in the 'jungle' and enduring conditions that obtain there. Many are probably not refugees in any general sense or any sense entitled to recognition. Rather, they are migrant nationals of a number of countries outside the European Union, who, while intending to make a claim for refugee status, decline to make the claim in France due to perceived advantages, correct or otherwise, of doing so in the United Kingdom."

Conclusions

Data on migrants is vast. The leftists make claims, as do the right. They do so with a warped idea of why they should, or should not, allow in so many migrants. Unfortunately, most people, including Christians, are so phased by what is happening to migrants in camps, that they cannot see the reality of what it means to bring in so many Muslims.

I have heard people say they would immediately help migrants if they saw a dire need in front of their eyes. Let me shock you – and ask WHY? There is an assumption that any human being would help another human being in trouble. Let me suggest the following scenario.

1.

You come across a Muslim laying in the street bleeding and go to help him.

2.

Instinct tells you to help because you feel sorry for him.

3.

What you do not know as you help the Muslim, is that around the corner is your young son, whom the Muslim has decapitated.

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

4.

Still wish to help the Muslim?

5.

Then you discover he came into the UK without papers, so his identity was unknown.

6.

Later, deep research discovers he worked for ISIS.

Probably, if you knew, you would not help the Muslim, but would pick up his weapon and kill him. True? Or, as a deluded Christian, do you say you forgive the killer and continue to help him?

Even disregarding this kind of awful scenario, we have international law, which defines who is, and who is not, a 'refugee'. You have read the relevant facts concerning this. Most are NOT genuine refugees, and the biggest majority are NOT from Syria. And even if some are from war areas, how many can claim that their own lives were in danger, to validate their status as 'refugees' and 'asylum seekers'?

The biggest problem, and one that should bar migrants automatically, is that they throw away their papers... remember (above) how many applicants claiming to be Syrian could not even speak Arabic!! We cannot allow emotion and sad stories or sad scenes to sway our minds towards accepting all and sundry.

Some sources, including ourselves, warn against accepting so many Muslims into a western country, when their inclusion leads to unrest. Christians must be VERY careful not to be influenced by fake arguments or their own emotions. I have personally come across Muslims in the UK who appear to have a tough time – women especially. But, this cannot be a proper response to the issue of migrants. The response of Christians MUST be aligned to that of scripture.

'Refugees' and 'Asylum Seekers': 1

Written by K B Napier
Sunday, 13 March 2016 21:09

For Christians, the real and most basic reason to disallow Muslims into the UK is simple: God hates idolaters and pagans, who worship false Gods. We are not given an option to forget this fact and befriend those whom God says He hates.

On top of this, as a Muslim population grows, so we will be pushed out of our own rights and freedoms, which will be replaced by sharia. We have already been warned by some Muslims in the UK to leave the country if we cannot accept them! This verbal assault will soon become legal assaults, as sharia desires gain ground. Also, remember that when a mosque is built or a church used as a mosque, local Muslims claim that town or city for Allah. This is why the proposed London mega-mosque must be thwarted as a reality. There is a good reason why the Saudis have poured big money into the proposal... once a mega-mosque is built it will be taken to mean supremacy over not just London, but over the whole of the UK.

No Christian can willingly befriend those, even 'moderates', whose aim is to take over the country with sharia. Some 'moderates' will, of course, not want to be supremacists, but we can be assured that radicals amongst them will insist they follow the rule of sharia, for all citizens, 'or else'. This WILL happen. Also, no Christian should feel comfortable allowing in ANY Muslim, when God says He hates their pagan idolatry. A Christian who thinks this is a pliable demand by God, is very much mistaken... to befriend what God hates is to reject what God stands for and says.

We must certainly be courteous and 'friendly', on an everyday basis, because that is how any society can live together. But, not anything deeper. There is only ONE reason a Christian may offer anything deeper, and that is to proclaim the Gospel. Invariably, this would include deprecating and condemning Islam at some point. That is when your 'friend' will start to loathe you! If, as a believer, you cannot see the logic in this paper, then you are already lost to reason and scripture. Begin with God, not with statistics, or UN law, or an emotional reaction.

© March 2016

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}