



Written by [JKelly](#) on June 4, 2018

Published in the June 4, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 11

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Willful Ignorance?

Should federal judges be required to have a basic knowledge of the U.S. Constitution?

The very first word in Article I, Section 1, of the U.S. Constitution is “All”: “All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.” However, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program was created (actually “legislated” into existence) in 2012 by President Barack Obama — not by Congress — as a stopgap measure that would shield from deportation people who were brought into the United States as children.

Participation in the program comes with a range of benefits. Along with permission to remain in the country, recipients can also get work permits.

Recently, Judge John D. Bates of the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia said that the Trump administration’s decision to terminate DACA was based on the “virtually unexplained” grounds that the program was “unlawful.” The judge stayed his decision for 90 days and gave the Department of Homeland Security, which administers the program, the opportunity to “better explain its reasoning” for canceling it. If the department fails to do so, it “must accept and process new as well as renewal DACA applications.”

Judge Bates described the Trump administration’s decision to phase out DACA as “arbitrary and capricious because the department failed adequately to explain its conclusion that the program was unlawful.” Immigration advocates hailed Judge Bates’ ruling, saying it highlighted the failure of the administration to “justify” the program’s termination. Under Judge Bates’ ruling, unless the administration can justify its decision within 90 days, the cancellation of the program will be rescinded.

The Trump administration argued that Obama had abused his authority and circumvented Congress to create DACA. President Trump urged Congress to find a legislative remedy to replace it and expressed support for giving the young immigrants a path to citizenship. Despite broad bipartisan support for the beneficiaries of the program, Congress has failed to agree on a solution. Trump has called for a tough crackdown on illegal immigration and construction of a wall along the border with Mexico.

Conclusion: President Obama, as a liberal Democrat, had the power to sidestep the Constitution, but President Trump, as a conservative Republican, must “explain his reasoning” and “justify his decision” to correct Obama’s ignoring of Article I of the Constitution and explain and justify his position that immigration laws of this country, enacted by the U.S. Congress, cannot be evaded. Judge Bates should read Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

Richard T. Regan, J.D.

Metairie, Louisiana

Why Leave the Iran Deal?

In regard to President Trump withdrawing from the Iran nuclear agreement, I ask, “How can Trump justify this?”

How does Boeing’s loss of \$20 billion in aircraft sales to Iran, a nation that is unable to pose any danger to the United States, benefit America or its workers?

How can a single-subject Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (the Iran nuclear deal), faithfully observed, be deemed to be “so flawed and dangerous” by almost all congressional Republican lackeys? Are these congressmen so afraid of Saudi Arabia and Israel meddling in their next campaigns that they abjectly follow every directive from the warmongers now populating the “Ministry of Love” surrounding



Written by [JKelly](#) on June 4, 2018

Published in the June 4, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 11

our president, even to the risk of war?

Now that Congress is on the verge of ceding to all U.S. presidents unlimited war-making license, through provisions in the 2018 Authorization for Use of Military Force, how soon before made-in-America bombs start raining on Iran?

How many innocent civilians, worldwide, must continue to die from bombs and/or resultant plagues, before America is returned to the vision of George Washington, who advocated not being involved in the politics of any nation, much less being subservient to them?

Now, what nation would ever again consider negotiating with us?

Russell W. Haas

Golden, Colorado



Written by [JKelly](#) on June 4, 2018

Published in the June 4, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 11

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.