

Are Democrats Trying to Replicate the Immigration 'Surge of 1996'?

A disturbing new revelation suggests the Obama Administration is attempting to use its authority to influence the upcoming elections to benefit the Democratic Party.

Back in 1996, with Democrats—particularly President Bill Clinton—facing a difficult re-election battle, the Clinton Administration relied upon an “immigration surge” in which nearly three times the normal volume of naturalization requests was approved that helped them at the voting booth. The “Citizenship USA” program implemented by the Immigration and Naturalization Service was the brainchild of Chicago Alderman Daniel Soilis, who said it would “provide the Democrats with a strategic advantage” because “people stuck in Chicago’s naturalization bottleneck represent thousands of potential voters.”

It came at a severe national security cost. INS had naturalized more than 180,000 aliens under the CUSA initiative without doing fingerprint checks, and more than 80,000 aliens had fingerprint checks that generated criminal records, but were naturalized anyway.

If that sounds familiar, you’re not alone.

Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) and Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee Chairman Ron Johnson (R-Wis.) are concerned about history repeating itself, too. Following the DHS Office of Inspector General’s report that 858 people who had outstanding deportation orders were allowed to gain citizenship under aliases, and a new report that DHS officials are pushing for faster naturalization processing “due to the election,”

they're demanding answers.

The wrote to Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson:

We write to express serious concern about an apparent push by your department to rush the adjudication of naturalization applications before the upcoming presidential election, presumably in an attempt to create as many new citizen voters as possible.

Specifically, we are seeking answers about a copy of an internal agency communication from supervisors at a U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) field office asking adjudicators to expedite and even work overtime to adjudicate pending N-400 (naturalization) applications. According to the attached email sent to adjudicators in the USCIS Houston field office on July 21, "The Field Office due to the election year needs to process as many of their N-400 cases as possible between now and FY 2016" (emphasis added). The email encourages staff to work overtime to move their cases, almost certainly to the detriment of processing times for other immigration benefit applications, and announces that the office would be opened on weekends to accommodate such overtime work.

Your department seems intent on approving as many naturalization cases as quickly as possible at a time when it should instead be putting on the brakes and reviewing past adjudications, especially in light of this week's Office of Inspector General report that found USCIS granted U.S. citizenship to at least 858 individuals from "special interest" countries (i.e. countries that are of concern to the national security of the United States) or countries with high rates of immigration fraud, who had final deportation orders under another identity.

In the letter, Grassley and Johnson asked what steps the department is taking to prevent the processing of citizenship

applications for political reasons, and to ensure national security safeguards are properly utilized. They are also requesting an interview with the DHS employee who generated the email in question.

Teacher Makes Kids Compare Hitler, Trump Speeches

Instead of parsing participles, a public high school English teacher has been using her classroom to wage an ugly propaganda campaign against Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump and his supporters.

“Basically, the only people who seem to be safe from this guy are white Christian males,” the teacher said in a classroom discussion recorded by a student. “Am I missing anything? Oh, American—white, Christian, male Americans.”

The unidentified teacher at North Carolina’s Cedar Ridge High School even made students watch speeches delivered by Hitler and had them compare them to speeches that Trump had delivered, outraged parents tell me.

A.P. Dillon exposed the teacher’s anti-Trump propaganda campaign on her **popular blog, LadyLiberty1835**. **Click here to read Ms. Dillon’s transcript.**

The Orange County School District told me they are aware of the recording and the classroom comments.

“We take these issues seriously,” the district spokesman told me. “The matter is under review. We conduct our reviews in a manner fair to everyone involved.”

The Trump-bashing came during a lesson on ethos and pathos.

“He is in fact the master of pathos,” the teacher told students. “So who knows what his actual motives are but he is a master at manipulating his audience, right? He knows where the fears lie and he is going right after them.”

She went on to accuse the GOP nominee of “poking the fryers under particular niches of people in this country—people who are anti-Mexican, people who are anti-Muslim, people who are anti-woman.”

Parents told me the teacher has been bashing Trump for quite some time and that’s why students decided to secretly record her lessons.

“My son was very uncomfortable,” one dad said. “He felt like she was attacking anybody who liked Trump or anybody’s parents who liked Trump. She didn’t say anything bad about any other politician.”

Parents did not want to be identified because they feared retribution “from the very liberal school district.”

“Most conservative parents don’t want to fight the system because they know they are going to be shouted down,” the dad told me. “Every parent is reticent to speak out because we are afraid the school board will come after us. We’ve seen them do that in the past.”

Parents are accusing the teacher of outright indoctrination.

“She compared the Hitler speeches to things that Trump says—stuff like nationalism to making the country stronger,” a parent told me. “They played a video showing Hitler’s speeches—translated into English.”

After the teacher found out she had been recorded, she demanded that students turn over their cell phones, one parent alleged.

“She made the kids drop their phones in a basket by the door,” the parent said. “So we just told the kids to either take notes or record her on their laptops.”

What’s happening at Cedar Ridge High School is a classic example of how the left is using the public school system against us. American classrooms have been turned into indoctrination centers for the left.

And the only way to eradicate this scourge in our public school system is for parents and taxpayers to stand up to local school boards.

Stand up to the academic bullies who are poisoning the minds of our young people.

Stand up to their enablers on the school boards. Vote them out of office.

Demand that your voice be heard.

Remember folks, silence in the face of evil is evil itself.

Ted Cruz: ‘I Will Vote for the Republican Nominee’

U.S. Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) ended his months-long holdout and formally announced his support for Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump in a statement posted to his official Facebook page Friday afternoon.

The statement generated an immediate reaction from #NeverTrump voters who say they feel “betrayed” by his decision. A short time later, Donald Trump issued a statement saying he was

“greatly honored” to accept Cruz’ endorsement.

“I am greatly honored by the endorsement of Senator Cruz,” he said. “We have fought the battle and he was a tough and brilliant opponent. I look forward to working with him for many years to come in order to make America great again.”

The lengthy statement on Cruz’ social media page reads:

This election is unlike any other in our nation’s history. Like many other voters, I have struggled to determine the right course of action in this general election.

In Cleveland, I urged voters, “please, don’t stay home in November. Stand, and speak, and vote your conscience, vote for candidates up and down the ticket whom you trust to defend our freedom and to be faithful to the Constitution.”

After many months of careful consideration, of prayer and searching my own conscience, I have decided that on Election Day, I will vote for the Republican nominee, Donald Trump.

I’ve made this decision for two reasons. First, last year, I promised to support the Republican nominee. And I intend to keep my word.

Second, even though I have had areas of significant disagreement with our nominee, by any measure Hillary Clinton is wholly unacceptable—that’s why I have always been #NeverHillary.

Six key policy differences inform my decision. First, and most important, the Supreme Court. For anyone concerned about the Bill of Rights— free speech, religious liberty, the Second Amendment—the Court hangs in the balance. I have spent my professional career fighting before the Court to defend the Constitution. We are only one justice away from losing our most basic rights, and the next president will appoint as many as four new justices. We know, without a

doubt, that every Clinton appointee would be a left-wing ideologue. Trump, in contrast, has promised to appoint justices "in the mold of Scalia."

For some time, I have been seeking greater specificity on this issue, and today the Trump campaign provided that, releasing a very strong list of potential Supreme Court nominees—including Sen. Mike Lee, who would make an extraordinary justice—and making an explicit commitment to nominate only from that list. This commitment matters, and it provides a serious reason for voters to choose to support Trump.

Second, Obamacare. The failed healthcare law is hurting millions of Americans. If Republicans hold Congress, leadership has committed to passing legislation repealing Obamacare. Clinton, we know beyond a shadow of doubt, would veto that legislation. Trump has said he would sign it.

Third, energy. Clinton would continue the Obama administration's war on coal and relentless efforts to crush the oil and gas industry. Trump has said he will reduce regulations and allow the blossoming American energy renaissance to create millions of new high-paying jobs.

Fourth, immigration. Clinton would continue and even expand President Obama's lawless executive amnesty. Trump has promised that he would revoke those illegal executive orders.

Fifth, national security. Clinton would continue the Obama administration's willful blindness to radical Islamic terrorism. She would continue importing Middle Eastern refugees whom the FBI cannot vet to make sure they are not terrorists. Trump has promised to stop the deluge of unvetted refugees.

Sixth, Internet freedom. Clinton supports Obama's plan to hand over control of the Internet to an international

community of stakeholders, including Russia, China, and Iran. Just this week, Trump came out strongly against that plan, and in support of free speech online.

These are six vital issues where the candidates' positions present a clear choice for the American people.

If Clinton wins, we know—with 100% certainty—that she would deliver on her left-wing promises, with devastating results for our country.

My conscience tells me I must do whatever I can to stop that.

We also have seen, over the past few weeks and months, a Trump campaign focusing more and more on freedom—including emphasizing school choice and the power of economic growth to lift African-Americans and Hispanics to prosperity.

Finally, after eight years of a lawless Obama administration, targeting and persecuting those disfavored by the administration, fidelity to the rule of law has never been more important.

The Supreme Court will be critical in preserving the rule of law. And, if the next administration fails to honor the Constitution and Bill of Rights, then I hope that Republicans and Democrats will stand united in protecting our fundamental liberties.

Our country is in crisis. Hillary Clinton is manifestly unfit to be president, and her policies would harm millions of Americans. And Donald Trump is the only thing standing in her way.

A year ago, I pledged to endorse the Republican nominee, and I am honoring that commitment. And if you don't want to see a Hillary Clinton presidency, I encourage you to vote for him.

WATCH: When a Woman's Choice Leads to Brutal Violence, It Goes Too Far

Pro-choice activists often extol the virtue of women's self-determination on the issue of abortion. Perhaps you're on the fence about whether a "woman's choice" to abort overrides any other ethical concerns. Why should you or I care?

In a new video just released, young mother and blogger Lisa Smiley reveals it's simple: because a baby, with a heartbeat and its own unique DNA structure, is killed in the process. That's why.

Is there any logic to this argument of "women's choice"? Let's put it into proper context. When another life is hurt or killed in the process of expressing a woman's right to choose, then there's something grossly wrong. What happened to the child's rights?

No one talks about what happens in an abortion. In a D&C procedure, the body of the baby is cut into pieces with a sharp steel knife and extracted from the womb. In another procedure, the baby is dismembered and vacuumed out.

Sometimes, the baby is expelled and flushed down the toilet. Or, a saline solution is injected into the womb, to burn the baby's skin and poison her to death. In partial-birth abortions, the baby is partially delivered while still alive. The doctor punctures the base of the baby's skull and sucks her brains out to kill her.

Is this brutal and bloody killing of an innocent life the kind

of “choice” women knowingly sign up for? No! The abortion industry lies every day to vulnerable women, as my own personal story attests.

We hear it all the time: “It’s a woman’s body, so it’s a woman’s choice.” Really? A baby is not part of a woman’s body, it’s in her body—that baby is a unique and separate living being.

How many women do you know who would agree to have part of her body or limbs cut up and suctioned out? An innocent life had no say in whether or not to be subjected to violence, as science now shows the pain a baby feels in the womb.

The next time you hear abortion is a woman’s choice, don’t fall for that argument. A right to slice up, cut up, and suction out our own babies is not a matter of choice. It’s a matter of right or wrong, just or unjust. Tell that person a “woman’s right to choose” can never, ever justify abortion.

{eoa}

Debby Efurd serves as president of Dallas-based Initiative 180 and its program of recovery, *Peace After the Storm*. She earned a bachelor’s degree in counseling from Dallas Baptist University. Debby is the author of *Go Tell It!* (which released in 2015) and a blogger for Bound4LIFE International, a faith-based pro-life organization.

Reprinted with permission from Bound4LIFE.

WATCH: 'The Voice' Contestant Cries Out for God as Violence Rocks the Nation

Missionary kid and former Oral Roberts University student Brian Nhira penned a song for hope and freedom after the violent outbreaks in Charlotte.

With the help of friend Aaron Brave, Nhira sings out for peace and revival in the midst of violence.

I'm singing for peace

I'm singing for freedom

I'm singing for you and me to believe in

Hope for the world

Watch the video to see more.

Donald Trump Launches New Faith-Based Advisory Committee

The Donald Trump campaign has launched a new advisory support group for the Republican presidential nominee, which gathered for the first time Thursday at Trump Tower in Manhattan.

The Catholic Advisory Group—a key element of Trump's Faith and Cultural Advisory Committee—is meant to provide input on

issues and policies important to Catholics. Many of those issues—click here to see them—are also important to evangelicals and other faith-based voters.

“The formation of this group represents Donald J. Trump’s endorsement of a range of issues and policies important to Catholics and other Christians, and his desire to have access to the wise counsel of such leaders,” the campaign said in a written statement. Joseph Cella, Founder of the National Catholic Prayer Breakfast, will reportedly serve as the campaign’s liaison with the group’s members.

A number of other high-profile Catholics have responded to the announcement.

“On the issues and policies of greatest concern to Catholics, Donald Trump will fight for Catholics whereas Hillary Clinton is openly hostile to those issues of greatest concern to Catholics and will attack the core teachings of the Catholic Church, and has worked against them as first lady, as U.S. senator and as secretary of state, and would continue to do so if she is elected president,” U.S. Rep. Sean Duffy (R-Wis.) said. “Catholics are particularly concerned that she would pack the Supreme Court with three to five young ideological liberals whose decisions will have far-reaching and long-lasting implication for the Catholic Church and the lay faithful on everything from the pro-life issue to religious liberty to health care and educational mandates, just to name a few.”

“America is on the wrong track, as economic opportunities wane and families face a coarsened society where people of faith feel bullied, disrespected and marginalized,” American Conservative Union Chairman Matt Schlapp added. “We have slipped so far, so fast, at a pace quickened by our failure to uphold the dignity of unborn life. There are moments when people of deep faith have to stand up. Voters who know deep in their soul that America needs to heal also know we need

refreshing, bold conservative leadership. 2016 is one of those times and I'm proud to support Donald Trump for president."

Warning: 'Black Swan' Epidemics Coming to America

"Black swan" epidemics could easily be on their way to America, Lt. Col. Robert Maginnis tells Jim Bakker.

"We got a taste of it in the Ebola in Liberia and West Africa, and how it was devastating to those people," Maginnis says. "Well, just imagine if it came to this country."

The Center for Disease Control and Prevention is not prepared for a pandemic of this magnitude, he continues.

Watch the video to see how to prepare.

6 Questions Congress Has Over the Proposed 'Internet Transfer'

The internet began as a U.S. government-funded program to develop robust, fault-tolerant communication via computer networks across the country and around the world.

And while it has now grown into the "World Wide Web," much of

the original infrastructure—created at taxpayer expense—still exists. So, President Obama’s plan to relinquish control of those assets has triggered a number of concerns from all corners of the government.

U.S. Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) is leading an effort on Capitol Hill to prevent the transfer, which is set to take place Sept. 30. That effort gained two big allies Thursday when the chairmen of the House and Senate judiciary committees penned a joint letter to Attorney General Loretta Lynch, demanding answers to a number of key questions.

Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) and House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) asked in their letter for Lynch to explain the Justice Department’s role in advising the Obama Administration in its plan. They also expressed their concern about the proposal, “given an abundance of unanswered questions” relating to Internet openness, control of government domains, the disposal of government property and antitrust considerations.

Specifically, they raised concerns that the proposal relies upon a non-binding letter between the U.S. and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers to safeguard top level domains such as .gov and .mil. Additionally, they want to know the details of any legal analyses that may have been made about the constitutionality of relinquishing ownership of U.S. government property—such as the Root Zone File—without congressional approval, and the anti-trust implications of the agreement with ICANN.

“With so many outstanding questions remaining, especially in the areas in which DOJ would seem to have direct subject matter expertise, we believe it is important to understand what input and contributions the Attorney General and the DOJ made in blessing this transfer and in answering many of the specific questions that were raised by other agency participants during the process,” the letter states.

Here are the six questions they asked of Lynch:

1. With regard to the security of the .mil, .gov, and U.S. governmentally administered TLDs, does the Attorney General and the Justice Department believe that the mere exchange of letters between NTIA and ICANN is preferable to a binding legal agreement? If so why? Please provide the Department's rationale?
2. Did the DOJ advise NTIA regarding this resolution of government administered TLDs?
3. Should ICANN delegate U.S. government administered TLDs, contrary to current assurances, what action will the DOJ take?
4. With the lack of certainty over the disposition of government property in the IANA transfer, has NTIA ever referred this issue to DOJ for analysis or has DOJ ever conducted an analysis of this question on its own? If so, what are its findings?
5. Does the Attorney General believe that there is no possibility that NTIA's planned transition of the IANA functions may potentially relinquish ownership of United States property? What analysis did you conduct to come to this conclusion?
6. As a member of the DNS Interagency Working Group or otherwise, has the DOJ conducted a review of the antitrust implications of NTIA's termination of its contract with ICANN? If so, please provide a copy of this review. If not, why not?

"This unalterable action poses serious ramifications for the security and openness of the Internet," their letter concluded. "As a member of the DNS Interagency Working Group, we'd like to know what role that you and the DOJ played in this transition."

Avoid These Carnal Weapons When Dealing With Relationship Wounds

Relationships are complicated—they're messy, difficult and take a lot of work. Sometimes they go wrong and people hurt us, or we hurt them, causing pain that goes deep. It's inevitable: As long as there are people in our lives, there will be pain!

Fortunately, God knew this so He put a lot of practical wisdom about relationships in the Bible.

In his series "How to Restore a Wounded Relationship," IHOPKC director Mike Bickle shares real life examples of how to heal the hurt and disappointment that so many of us feel.

Whether you've been hurt by a child, boyfriend or girlfriend, co-worker, or spouse, the Lord wants to bring restoration and healing. He can touch the deepest hurts and untangle even the most complicated relational webs, because "with God, all things are possible" (Mark 10:27).

The most common way a relationship is wounded is through corrupt, perverse and sarcastic speech. The Bible also warns against complaining, which hurts our spirits and drives people away.

"Death and life are in the power of the tongue" (Prov. 18:21).

"A wholesome tongue is a tree of life, but perverseness in it breaks the spirit" (Prov. 15:4).

Our speech includes what comes out of our mouths *and* what we

type, text and post online. Corrupt, perverse words grieve not only the Holy Spirit but the speaker and the hearer as well, so we should follow David's example and ask God to "set a guard" over our mouths and hands (Ps. 141:3).

When we accuse others unfairly or criticize, belittle and make fun of them, the relationship suffers. We tell ourselves it's nothing, or just innocent play, but over time a tiny sore can become a gaping wound; what starts as a tense or strained relationship fractures or becomes openly hostile if the hurt isn't addressed.

And this is true whether we're on the giving or receiving end: The pain from corrupt speech will always show up, even if we try to deny it. As Christians, we must learn to deal with hurt emotions.

The Bible exhorts us to avoid saying perverse things: "Let no corrupt word proceed out of your mouth, but what is good for necessary edification, that it may impart grace to the hearers (Eph. 4:29). This is our goal, and something we can all start practicing.

But what if damage has already been done? Jesus instructs us to go to our brother (or sister) and make a godly appeal. We are to go to them when they have something against us (Matt. 5:23–24) *and* if we have something against them (Matt. 18:15–20). This is hard, but God will help if we partner with Him!

A godly appeal means coming in the right tone, timing and spirit, in a way that shows love for the person—even if they are an enemy (Matt. 5:44). It involves humility and being willing to affirm the person, even while telling them how their actions or words were hurtful or wrong.

And we must follow the right process, by going to them individually before sharing the matter with others (Matt. 18:15–20). If a meeting is going to be especially tense, you

may seek counsel from a godly friend or mentor about how to handle yourself, but this is *not* the same as sharing the problem with multiple people or gossiping about it.

Relationships take time to develop and can be damaged quickly by a careless word or gesture. The healing may take time, but God is faithful and will guide us if we ask. Often, we will have to confess our own faults and show mercy in order to receive it from others and from God (Matt. 5:7; 6:14–15).

The bottom line is to speak and act in love. As Mike explains, “The one who loves most is the one who wins in God’s court.” Similarly, the writer of 1 Peter 4:8 exhorts us to “above all things have unfailing love for one another, because love covers a multitude of sins.”

*A Detroit native who was raised in Vermont and Connecticut, **Adam Wittenberg** worked as newspaper journalist until 2012, when he moved to Kansas City to complete the Intro to IHOPKC internship. Afterwards, he earned a 4-year certificate in House of Prayer Leadership from IHOPU and is now on full-time staff in the Marketing department. Adam is also active in evangelism and has a vision to reach people everywhere with the good news of Jesus Christ.*

Billionaire #NeverTrumpers Are Now Boarding the ‘Trump Train’

He spent nearly \$6 million in an effort to prevent Donald Trump from winning the Republican Party’s presidential nomination.

Now TD Ameritrade founder Joe Ricketts has decided that if he

can't beat the Trump Train, he might as well join it. The former financial backer of the #NeverTrump faction announced this week he's going to donate \$1 million to the GOP candidate's surging presidential campaign.

"The Ricketts decided they could not sit back and watch Hillary Clinton become the next president of the United States," longtime Ricketts political strategist Brian Baker told *The Wall Street Journal*. "Even though the Ricketts supported other candidates during the primary, they believe it is time to unite behind the nominees ... This is all about helping Republicans win in the fall."

Joe and his wife, Marlene, donated several million dollars to former Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker's failed presidential bid. They then donated more than \$5 million to an anti-Trump advertising campaign run by the Our Principles PAC—a group which supported U.S. Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) in the GOP primary.

Their son, Pete, is governor of Nebraska, while another son, Tom, is the owner of the Chicago Cubs baseball team. Pete Ricketts endorsed Trump in May.