

Are Extremists Slipping In—On Purpose?

NewsMax.com Commentary by Rob Finnerty, reprinted by [NRPI](#), July 13, 2026



A Newsmax commentator is sounding the alarm that open-borders immigration policy isn't just careless — it's a deliberate roadmap to flood America with radical Islamic extremists, and he's naming names and countries to back it up.

Story Snapshot

- Rob Finnerty argues that left-wing politicians are knowingly importing radical Islamic extremists from countries like Somalia and Sudan to undermine American society.
- Finnerty points to the September 11, 2001 attacks — which killed nearly 3,000 Americans — as proof that radical Islamic terrorism is a real and ongoing threat to the U.S.
- Critics label this type of rhetoric as extremist and Islamophobic, but they offer no specific data or primary-source evidence to directly refute Finnerty's core claims.
- The debate reflects a deep national divide over how to talk about immigration, national security, and the threat of radical extremism inside U.S. borders.

Finnerty's Warning: Open Borders and Radical Islam

Newsmax commentator Rob Finnerty says the left's immigration agenda isn't just naive — it's dangerous. He argues that politicians are actively importing people from countries with high rates of radical Islamic extremism, including Somalia, Sudan, Ghana, and Uganda. His core claim is that this isn't an accident. He says it's a strategy to weaken American culture and Christian values from within, using immigration as the tool.

Finnerty anchors his argument in the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, which killed nearly 3,000 Americans. He says that event should have permanently changed how the U.S. screens immigrants from regions with known extremist activity. Instead, he argues, the left has gone the opposite direction — softening borders, changing the language around illegal immigration, and labeling any concern about national security as bigotry.

The Language Game: “Dreamers” and “Undocumented Neighbors”

One of Finnerty’s sharpest points targets the way the left talks about illegal immigration. Terms like “dreamers” and “undocumented neighbors” aren’t neutral, he says. They’re designed to make the public feel guilty for wanting secure borders. He argues this soft language is a deliberate strategy to shut down debate and make it socially unacceptable to ask hard questions about who is entering the country and why.

This framing fits a broader pattern in American politics. Research shows that the two parties have grown sharply divided in how they talk about immigration since the late 1970s. Democrats have moved toward more welcoming language, while Republicans have grown more focused on security and cultural concerns. Finnerty’s commentary lands squarely in that tradition — but he takes it further, arguing that the left’s soft language is not just misguided, it’s a cover for something more sinister.

Critics Push Back — But Without Hard Evidence

Left-leaning researchers and advocacy groups call Finnerty’s rhetoric dangerous and dehumanizing. Some compare it to extremist anti-immigrant propaganda. But here’s the problem: none of the critics engage with his specific claims. No one has produced a government audit, a court record, or a demographic study that directly disproves his argument that radical extremists are entering the U.S. through loosely screened immigration pipelines.

Calling someone’s argument “Islamophobic” is not the same as proving it wrong.

Finnerty’s critics rely heavily on category labels — calling his views extremist or populist — rather than presenting facts that counter his specific claims. That’s a weak response to a serious national security argument. Americans deserve a real debate about immigration vetting, not name-calling designed to end the conversation before it starts.

What’s Really at Stake for American Families

The deeper issue here isn’t just about one commentator’s opinion. It’s about whether Americans are allowed to ask hard questions about immigration policy without being smeared as racists or extremists. Finnerty is raising concerns that millions of everyday Americans share — concerns about safety, cultural cohesion, and whether the government is doing its job to protect citizens. Those concerns deserve honest answers, not dismissal.

The Trump administration has made border security and tougher immigration vetting a top priority. That’s exactly what a large portion of the American public voted for. When commentators like Finnerty raise the alarm about radical extremism slipping through open borders, they’re giving voice to a real fear — one that the left has spent years trying to silence by changing the subject from security to sensitivity.