

Newsbytes

The First Watch

March 15, 2017

No. 813

Since 2001

Newzbytes is a ministry of Calvary Chapel of Appleton

www.ccapleton.org

“Let us be alert to the season in which we are living. It is the season of the Blessed Hope, calling for us to cut our ties with the world and build ourselves on this One who will soon appear. He is our hope—a Blessed Hope enabling us to rise above our times and fix our gaze upon Him.” Tozer

Ihre Papiere, Bitte! (Your Papers, Please): Are We Being Set Up for a National ID System?

By John W. Whitehead Global Research, March 06, 2017 The Rutherford Institute

“The triumph of the S.S. demands that the tortured victim allow himself to be led to the noose without protesting, that he renounce and abandon himself to the point of ceasing to affirm his identity. And it is not for nothing. It is not gratuitously, out of sheer sadism, that the S.S. men desire his defeat. They know that the system which succeeds in destroying its victim before he mounts the scaffold . . . is incomparably the best for keeping a whole people in slavery.”—Hannah Arendt reporting on the trial of Adolf Eichmann

You can't have it both ways. You can't live in a constitutional republic if you allow the government to act like a police state. You can't claim to value freedom if you allow the government to operate like a dictatorship.

You can't expect to have your rights respected if you allow the government to treat whomever it pleases with disrespect and an utter disregard for the rule of law.

If you're inclined to advance this double standard because you believe you have done nothing wrong and have nothing to hide, beware: there's always a boomerang effect.

Whatever dangerous practices you allow the government to carry out now—whether it's in the name of national security or protecting America's borders or making America great again—rest assured, these same practices can and will be used against you when the government decides to set its sights on you.

Nothing is ever as simple as the government claims it is.

The war on drugs turned out to be a war on the American people, waged with SWAT teams and militarised police.

The war on terror turned out to be a war on the American people, waged with warrantless surveillance and indefinite detention.

The war on immigration will be yet another war on the American people, waged with roving government agents demanding “papers, please.”

So you see, when you talk about empowering government agents to demand identification from anyone they suspect might be an illegal immigrant—the current scheme being entertained by the Trump administration to ferret out and cleanse the country of illegal immigrants—what you're really talking about is creating a society in which you are required to identify yourself to any government worker who demands it.

Just recently, in fact, passengers arriving in New York's JFK Airport on a domestic flight from San Francisco were ordered to show their "documents" to border patrol agents in order to get off the plane.

This is how you pave the way for a national identification system.

Americans have always resisted adopting a national ID card for good reason: it gives the government and its agents the ultimate power to target, track and terrorise the populace according to the government's own nefarious purposes.

National ID card systems have been used before by oppressive governments—in Nazi Germany against the Jews, in South Africa against black citizens, in Rwanda against the Tutsis—in the name of national security, invariably with horrifying results.

In the United States, post-9/11, more than 750 Muslim men were rounded up on the basis of their religion and ethnicity and detained for up to eight months. Their experiences echo those of 120,000 Japanese-Americans who were similarly detained 75 years ago following the attack on Pearl Harbor, a practice the U.S. Supreme Court has yet to declare illegal.

Fast forward to the Trump administration's war on illegal immigration, and you have the perfect storm necessary for the adoption of a national ID card, the ultimate human tracking device, which would make the police state's task of monitoring, tracking and singling out individual suspects—citizen and noncitizen alike—far simpler.

A federalised, computerised, cross-referenced, databased system of identification policed by government agents would be the final nail in the coffin for privacy.

Granted, in the absence of a national ID system, "we the people" are already tracked in a myriad of ways. This informational glut—used to great advantage by both the government and corporate sectors—is converging into a mandate for "an internal passport," a.k.a., a national ID card that would store information as basic as a person's name, birth date and place of birth, as well as private information, including a Social Security number, fingerprint, retina scan and personal, criminal and financial records.

The Real ID Act, which imposes federal standards on identity documents such as state drivers' licenses, is the prelude to this national identification system. At some point, however, it will not matter whether your skin is black or yellow or brown or white. It will not matter whether you're an immigrant or a citizen. It will not matter whether you're rich or poor. It won't even matter whether you're driving, flying or walking.

Eventually, all that will matter is whether some government agent—poorly trained, utterly ignorant of the Constitution, way too hyped up on the power of their badges, and authorised to detain, search, interrogate, threaten and generally harass anyone they see fit—chooses to single you out for special treatment.

You see, the police state does not discriminate.

It's a short hop, skip and a jump from allowing government agents to stop and demand identification from someone suspected of being an illegal immigrant to empowering government agents to subject anyone—citizen and noncitizen alike—to increasingly intrusive demands that they prove not only that they are legally in the country, but that they are also lawful, in compliance with every statute and regulation on the books, and not suspected of having committed some crime or other.

It's no longer a matter of if, but when. In the case of a national identification system, it might start off as a means of curtailing illegal immigration, but it will end up as a means of controlling the American people.

We have been down this road before.

Reporting on the trial of Nazi bureaucrat Adolf Eichmann for the New Yorker in 1963, Hannah Arendt describes the "submissive meekness with which Jews went to their death":

...arriving on time at the transportation points, walking under their own power to the places of execution, digging their own graves, undressing and making neat piles of their clothing, and lying down side by side to be shot—seemed a telling point, and the prosecutor, asking witness after witness, “Why did you not protest?,” “Why did you board the train?,” “Fifteen thousand people were standing there and hundreds of guards facing you—why didn’t you revolt and charge and attack these guards?,” harped on it for all it was worth. But the sad truth of the matter is that the point was ill taken, for no non-Jewish group or non-Jewish people had behaved differently.

The lessons of history are clear: chained, shackled and imprisoned in a detention camp, there is little chance of resistance.

The time to act is now, before it's too late. Indeed, there is power in numbers, but if those numbers will not unite and rise up against their oppressors, there can be no resistance.

As Arendt concludes, “under conditions of terror most people will comply but some people will not, just as the lesson of the countries to which the Final Solution was proposed is that ‘it could happen’ in most places but it did not happen everywhere.”

It does not have to happen here.

As I make clear in my book *Battlefield America: The War on the American People*, we do not have to condemn ourselves to life under an oppressive, authoritarian regime.

We do not have to become our own jailers.
We do not have to dig our own graves.
We do not have to submit.

Constitutional attorney and author John W. Whitehead is founder and president of The Rutherford Institute.
Copyright © John W. Whitehead, The Rutherford Institute, 2017

How Sixty Million Refugees Can Prove Who They Are

By Apolitical



JUANMONINO VIA GETTY IMAGES

A one-woman public-private partnership is trying to provide digital ID to more than a billion people worldwide.

[This piece was republished from Apolitical]

That is the number of people who have no way, not even a birth certificate, of proving who they are. Without ID, these people, predominantly women and children in Asia and Africa, can't get healthcare, welfare or bank accounts.

That figure also encompasses, most urgently, the 60

million refugees worldwide and many women trafficked into forced prostitution, whose lack of ID prevents them getting help.

‘It was one thing when we were living in a paper-based world,’ says Dakota Gruener, Executive Director and presently sole full-time employee of ID2020, the public-private partnership. ‘You can understand how providing people with pieces of paper and ensuring they were included in a larger registry was difficult. But in the era of Google and Facebook, it makes no sense.’

ID2020 has enlisted the UN, some of the world's most powerful tech companies and dozens of start-ups to see whether a new technology, perhaps blockchain, could solve this problem.

ID2020 was started by a pioneer of financial technology, John Edge, who told Apolitical, 'If you create a new derivative contract, it's like a human being born. It's a thing that doesn't exist that now does exist that needs an identity in a system. The trading system we built trades trillions of derivatives, stocks, bonds, and options. And there are systems that manage lots and lots of individual identities and transactions.'

"Look, this is the future. There is just no question."

At a summit ID2020 organised at the UN headquarters in New York earlier this year, Marley Gray, who runs Microsoft's work on blockchain, said, 'We have a sort of technological perfect storm. First is the cloud, then very inexpensive mobile devices, and then this notion of establishing secure identity not just for individuals, but for everything, to be able to track and transact securely. The challenge is not necessarily the technology or the organisation, it's bringing it all together.'

ID2020 is not trying to put forward one particular solution. Rather, it has convened a group including development agencies, think tanks and companies such as Microsoft, PWC, Cisco, Accenture and Deloitte to spend the years to 2020 figuring out what a solution might look like.

Nevertheless, Niall McCann of the UN Development Program, which does not yet have any formal relationship with ID2020 but has been involved in discussions on the project, told Apolitical, 'Look, this is the future. There is just no question that this is the future, digitising paper identity documents and making them into applications on a smart device.'

At the moment, UNICEF makes great efforts to register children at birth, and the UN's sustainable development goal on identity cites birth registration as the benchmark for securing legal identity, but, says McCann, 'What do you do for people whose birth was never recorded or what about countries where management of civil registration is so poor that records have been lost or destroyed or they're simply not able to go back and find a copy for people who've lost one?'

'I've got my birth certificate but it's a very very old piece of paper at this point. It's a piece of paper with no photograph and, even if it did have a photograph, it would be a photograph just of a baby. I hope Ireland has an electronic database to back that up, but what about countries that don't, where people have lost theirs or are carrying around a shabby handwritten bit of paper?'

Moreover, a lot of work on registration is being done at cross-purposes. UNICEF stops tracking people when they become adults, while UNDP engages in huge voter-registration drives, but then often leaves when the elections are over.

"My birth certificate is a very very old piece of paper."

In fact, UNDP has used biometric tech to help create voter registers - preventing people voting more than once - in more than a dozen countries, including the Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea, Zambia, Bangladesh and Nepal. But when it comes to registration, many prospective voters don't have any ID documents to sign up with in the first place. Says McCann, 'So several countries have said, can you now help us do a national identity card or register using this same biometric equipment?'

Attempts to free identity from pieces of paper and bring it into the digital age are proliferating around the world. India's Aadhaar program has scanned the irises and taken the fingerprints of 1.07 billion people, and issued them with an ID number. New South Wales in Australia is switching its driving licences onto smartphone apps and, while the state works up to fully digital driving licences, due 2018, has just begun trialling the technology with things like fishing licences.

But national identity registers come with considerable risks of their own. As John Edge puts it, 'Aadhaar scares the daylights out of me. You wouldn't have wanted to deploy Aadhaar in Rwanda a few years ago. It would be a very efficient way of killing people. A centralised biometric identity system, if it falls into the wrong hands, is a weapon.'

Some countries, like the UK, have rejected proposals for what is essentially a unified digital list of everyone who lives in the country. There are several nightmare scenarios: the people in, say, the driver licensing agency

get to look at your tax records; a racist government cross-references data on ethnicity and crime and abuses the results; the database breaks and people's identities are digitally extinguished.

That is why the people behind ID2020 are especially interested in a decentralised system, i.e. something involving blockchain. The technology, which underlies bitcoin, holds tamper-proof records across a network of computers. Although it seems unlikely that there will ever be a global ID system independent of governments, it is conceivable that the poorest and most vulnerable people would be able to log into a system and prove who they are to social services, banks or foreign governments.

"This can protect a girl stuck in a mud hut with no electricity, no water, no education, not even a road to walk to school" Dakota Gruener has also conceived a means by which to get many of those people registered in the first place. She came to ID2020 from GAVI, a public-private partnership that vaccinates children in poor countries. It has a huge distribution network which an ID scheme could piggyback onto. As Edge puts it, 'You've got the kid's arm in your hand, you're injecting them, and you don't capture their identity or medical records.'

The potential is enormous. In Malawi, for example, some 90% of children are vaccinated, but fewer than 5% have a birth certificate. Worldwide, around 86% of children get three doses of the diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis vaccine, generally considered the gold standard, but an estimated 98% get vaccinated with at least something.

Ruchira Gupta, a campaigner against sex trafficking who also participated in the ID2020 summit, said, 'I think this is going to be system-changing, because it can protect the last girl, who is stuck in a mud hut in a village and has no electricity, no water, no education, not even a road to walk to school, no second set of clothes, perhaps no food, and what that ID can do for her is link her to government services.'

But for all the exciting developments, the question of precisely how this nut can be cracked is complex in the extreme. The World Bank also has a program, ID4D, which is examining some of the policy dimensions. The people involved with ID2020 believe that the answer will come from bringing governments and international organisations together with tech companies and start-ups, partly because private enterprise is pouring money into developing these kinds of technologies, and partly because it would be practically impossible for non-specialists in, say, UNDP or the World Bank, to stay at the forefront of everything that's being invented.

Edge himself is profoundly committed to the project. PTB ventures, a company he cofounded with David Fields, has invested in GovCoin, a blockchain app that the UK government is trialling for welfare claimants. And he says he became interested in socially beneficial business because of a girl he met in a bar, and went on to marry. 'The girl I met works in early childhood development. She asked me on our first date what I was doing to make a difference. And the answer was: not very much.'

The ensuing conversation led him to see Meena, a Lucy Liu film about a girl trafficked into prostitution, then to discovering that 230million children have no form of ID, and eventually to ID2020. 'If I want to write a white paper, there's a hundred places,' he said. 'If you want to start getting the private sector to work with the UN, there was nothing. And who currently has a plan to get some form of identity for the 60million plus stateless people? The answer to my mind is, aside from ID2020, no one.'

Canada's New Blasphemy Laws

by Khadija Khan

March 8, 2017 at 5:00 am

<https://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/10015/canada-blasphemy-laws>

A resolution, M-103, seeking to condemn so-called "Islamophobia," was introduced a few weeks ago in the peaceful country of Canada by Liberal Party MP Iqra Khalid in the House of Commons, sparking a controversy.

A similar motion, labelled M-37, was later tabled in the Ontario provincial legislature by MPP Nathalie Des Rosiers on February 23, 2017, and was passed by the provincial parliament.

M-37, like its predecessor, demanded that lawmakers condemn "all forms of Islamophobia" and reaffirm "support for government efforts, through the Anti-Racism Directorate, to address and prevent systemic racism across government policy, programs and services".

Although these motions are not legally binding, extremists have already started demanding them as laws.

There are, of course, no comparable motions against "Judeophobia" or "Christianophobia".

Neither motion M-103 nor motion 37 exactly define "Islamophobia," leaving that to the imagination of the supposed victim(s).

Hardliners who support this form of censorship, and presumably other restrictions required by Islamic sharia law, aim to blur the line between genuine bigotry and criticism of core problems across the Muslim world, such as the murder of apostates and homosexuals, communal hatred, anti-Semitism, violence against women and minors, female genital mutilation (FGM), child marriage, unequal legal and inheritance rights for women, stoning, flogging and amputation, and social taboos such as honour killings or right to choose a husband for girls or restrict girls' education.

Those who present these motions claim that "Islamophobia" is rampant across the country, but seem blind to Islamic sharia law's endorsement of killing homosexuals, violence against women and minors, atrocities such as those enumerated above, and notions of Muslim supremacy across the planet.

These issues are genuine concerns for millions of Muslims as well as human rights defenders, but are never addressed by those apologists, who always try to present these atrocities as perfectly acceptable "cultural norms".

People in hostile societies put their lives at risk by speaking against the majority; meanwhile, shutting out any criticism against hardliner behaviour in the West actually means giving extremists a license to keep on committing atrocities.

Broadly speaking, in the West, where people have the opportunity to stand up against persecution, Muslim extremists seem determined to sell themselves as victims and to get rid of whatever obstacles contradict a clearly expansionist agenda.

Motion M-103 claimed: "Recently an infinitesimally small number of extremist individuals have conducted terrorist activities while claiming to speak for the religion of Islam".

The sales pitch for M-103 was given a pretty façade of human rights concerns, but actually inside was a veiled endorsement of a Muslim supremacist mentality.

While M-103 asks to recognize the need to curb systematic racism and religious discrimination against Muslims, there are no traces of any systematic hatred or racism against Muslims or any religious groups in Canada.

On the contrary, Canada already has laws to curb any discrimination or abuse against individuals or groups. All that is needed is to enforce those laws already on the books.

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and the Criminal Code, carry progressive laws to handle hate crimes or racism. Section 318, 319(1) and 319(2) are specifically designed to deal with such offenses.

Moreover, criticizing any genuine social concerns about a community or belief system is the democratic right of every citizen in a civilized country.

Motions such as these are how most Muslim societies -- and other authoritarian states -- were founded: by depriving citizens of the basic right to express a difference of opinion, and worse, on the pretense of "doing good." The blasphemy laws of Pakistan were introduced on the premise of protecting the sanctity of the

people's religious beliefs, but the laws only ended up meting out public death sentences to innocent and marginalized victims.

Under Muslim blasphemy laws, such as those being slowly presented to Canada, such deeds are punishable by death or life in prison.

Unfortunately, blasphemy laws are often interpreted as a state's permission to attack, lynch or destroy non-Muslim minorities, while the attackers are regarded as heroes for their crimes.

Victims of these laws also include critics of this barbarism such as Punjab's Governor Salmaan Taseer, Pakistan's Minister for Human Rights Shahbaz Bhatti, and often even human rights activists and the victims' lawyers.

Aren't we setting up the foundation of such norms in the West on pretense of curbing "Islamophobia"?

For example, a supposedly "infinitesimally small" number of jihadis are capable of shutting the mouths of approximately 200 million people (equivalent to the entire Pakistani population), seemingly forever, by literally killing dissent. In the last century, the jihadis' spiritual father, Sayyid Qutb, commissioned Muslims to impose salafist-style Islamic rule on the world by destroying the "infertile West" and eliminating anything non-Muslim.

Qutb's book, Milestones, would undoubtedly be an eye-opener for those still unaware of what is required of "true" Muslims. The same is true of the writings of Hassan al-Banna, founder of the Muslim Brotherhood.

This ideology is clawing its way into very fabric of the West, in places such as Britain, Germany, Belgium, Sweden, America, Australia and France.

It poses an imminent threat to the free world. Free societies will have to pay a heavy price if they choose to ignore the menace of extremism through a policy of appeasement and accommodation.

There is no need for specific laws about "Islamophobia": it is not even defined. Worse, many extremist clerics also consider as "Islamophobic" any criticism of their jihadism, communal hatred, polygamy and violence against women, minors or possibly anyone else they target.

Canada has always been one of the most tolerant countries in the world; please let us keep it that way.

Khadija Khan is a Pakistan-based journalist and commentator.

Why so many Americans call evil good and good evil

WND.com

Many Americans have, to all appearances, gone entirely off the deep end since Donald Trump won the presidency last November, as evidenced by an endless stream of celebrity hissy fits, "mainstream media" meltdowns, comparisons to "Hitler" and "fascism" and hysterical, often-violent demonstrations.

How did so many Americans become so miserable and delusional? Best-selling author David Kupelian, who serves as WND's managing editor, says it's not an accident and it was hardly unpredictable.

To begin with, Kupelian asked Rabbi Eric Walker during a recent appearance on "Revealing the Truth": "What happens when you begin to fall away from common sense and your conscience, doing what's right? Things go badly, you have conflict, you feel depressed, you're angry."

Now, he continued, what if a wildly irrational worldview somehow becomes enmeshed in all of America's major institutions, leading millions of people away from common sense and their consciences? Logically, you will have a whole nation full of depressed and angry people, said Kupelian. In fact, that argument is the premise of

his most recent book, "The Snapping of the American Mind."

"Not only is the left irrational, but it is leading America – good Americans – over the edge," he told the show's host.

This deluded leftist worldview, he said, has led to a situation in which depression is "through the roof" on college campuses, adding that a staggering 130 million Americans are now dependent on some type of mind-altering substance just to get through life. The core reason for all this misery, he said, is very basic: As people move away from what their conscience tells them is right, they come into conflict with their true selves.

Worse, when people reach the point that they not only are at war with their own conscience, but actually glorify and justify their own perverse beliefs and behaviors, they begin to see the goodness in others as evil.

Citing, as one common example, a post-abortive woman who stridently insists the fetus she "terminated" was just a clump of cells and not a human life, Kupelian said: "When you have these people who are, basically underneath it all, below their own level of consciousness, at war with reality ... what happens is, when they see some Catholic sister standing outside Planned Parenthood just praying, they think that person is vile and doing something evil because they feel bad in that person's presence. So, the conscience they are running away from inside themselves pops up in somebody else outside them, and they don't understand what they're dealing with."

These people are rebelling against reality, he said, and a major part of that reality is that there is a God who created them and provides laws of life to guide them.

"A lot of people do not want to believe that we are responsible to a higher power who's going to 'hold it over our heads,' who's going to hold us responsible for the way we behave," Kupelian said. "That whole idea is something that they can't stand."

In Kupelian's view, the denial of God and His laws explains many left-wing positions, such as the insistence by pro-abortion advocates that a fetus is not really a human life.

"When does life begin? You have to be a complete idiot to ask that question!" he said. "Life obviously begins at conception. Things don't grow and grow and grow and grow and grow ... if they're not alive. But we make ourselves stupid because we want to deny God."

Kupelian also called evolution a "stupid idea."

"It's equivalent to standing next to a parking lot full of Ford cars ... and saying, 'There is no Ford Motor Company. These cars all just appeared here because of a tornado in a junkyard, [or] because over a period of time the elements of life became these Ford cars,'" he said.

Human beings are infinitely more complex than cars, Kupelian noted, yet many people deny that we have all been intelligently designed.

"The idea that somehow we became something out of nothing, without an intelligent Creator behind it somehow, is just evidence of a will to not believe in the Creator," he concluded.