

Limousine liberals want you to rescue Middle East refugees

Michael Costello/Lewiston Tribune

The videos are reminiscent of scenes from the television series, "The Walking Dead." Refugees from the Middle East are shown streaming across Turkey and shambling into Christendom in what can only be described as an invasion. Boats dangerously overloaded with refugees are escaping the horrendous conditions that their own civilization inevitably creates. They risk death to cross the Mediterranean to land in Italy. And the civilized West is expected to bear every cost.

President Barack Obama magnanimously announced that he would welcome 10,000 refugees into the United States this year, but none at his house. Hillary Clinton said that the number should be 65,000. Secretary of State John Kerry later said that we would accept 85,000 next year and 100,000 in 2017.

I wonder where this generosity was when ISIS was slaughtering Christians and Yazidis in Iraq. They could have used asylum and were certainly more deserving.

And of course, the refugees want to come here. In spite of seven years of Barack Obamanomics, we're still a reasonably prosperous country. And as long as you stay clear of a few neighborhoods in large cities ruled for decades by Democrats, this is a safe nation.

And of course, the elitist left is all for bringing Muslim refugees onto our shores. Leftists are for all sorts of things that they don't expect will inconvenience them. California represents an outstanding example of the moral disconnect between the philosophy of liberalism and the havoc it wreaks. In that state, Democrat environmental policy pushed by Bay Area billionaires has thrown tens of thousands out of work a few hundred miles away in the southern San Joaquin Valley. They could have new jobs if California were to permit fracking in that state's incredibly oil-rich Monterrey Shale. But the billionaires who fund Democrat political ambitions don't want that, so it doesn't happen. And the misery they've created doesn't directly affect them, so they don't really care.

It's ironic that the very people who have for their entire lives hated the infidel west are now streaming there by the hundreds of thousands. There was at least one incident when Muslims tossed Christians from one of those boats and left them to drown. But once they reach Europe's shores, they expect Christians to welcome them, feed them and house them.

At least one estimate predicts that 35 million will eventually wash up on European shores and be resettled in civilized countries that will be forced to feed and house them. It's hard to imagine that such a tsunami of immigrants from a culture that loathes western civilization can cause anything other than generations of problems.

A New York Times editorial pleaded with Europe not to give into hate and to accept all the refugees who sought asylum there. There are reasons other than hate to limit immigration and one reason is love of one's own country and culture. And of course, the New York Times editorial board would suffer no direct consequences if millions of refugees settled in Europe.

Countries that are not accepting any Middle East refugees include Russia, China and the outrageously wealthy Arabian Gulf states. Saudi Arabia has offered assistance to European countries accepting refugees, but that assistance was an offer to build hundreds of mosques. The Saudis have offered nothing in the form of housing or food aid.

There are other solutions. Australia often has refugees washing up on its shores, but they aren't allowed to stay. Instead, the Australians transfer their refugees to an island that they essentially rent from Papua, New Guinea. There the refugees are housed and fed until circumstances develop that will allow Australia to move them to a permanent home.

Australia has shown that civilized nations can have humane refugee policies that do not involve self-destruction.

Our neighbors don't have any convenient islands that they're likely to rent to us. So I would like to recommend Martha's Vineyard, off the southern coast of Massachusetts, as the site of our refugee camp.

Martha's Vineyard is thoroughly infested with just the sort of rich Democrats who advocate open-border policies. They imagine that the policies they advocate will never affect them. Stashing hundreds of thousands of refugees at Martha's Vineyard would allow big-time Democrat donors to experience the full consequences of their phony compassion.

And perhaps if we required Bay Area dot com billionaires to house unemployed farm workers, they might moderate their environmentalist zealotry.

I'd be more impressed with limousine liberal compassion if it inconvenienced them a little.

Costello is a research technician at Washington State University. His email address is kozmocostello@hotmail.com.