

Venezuela Has Been Dealt With. Somali Scammers Should Be Next.

DW dailywire.com/news/venezuela-has-been-dealt-with-somali-scammers-should-be-next

Matt Walsh

January 5, 2026



One of the benefits of taking some time off, and letting the news of the day unfold for a couple of weeks without responding to it (or even hearing about it), is that you gain some perspective. You inoculate yourself from the usual call-and-response outrage cycles, the latest "true crime"-style conspiracy nonsense, and so on. Then, when you return, it's easier to take stock of the issues that matter, and the ones that don't. This is clarity that, on the Right, we've needed for some time now. And over Christmas and New Year's, in a kind of one-two punch, that clarity arrived. We were treated to a contrast that was so stark and so sobering that it's impossible to ignore.

First, there was the man-on-the-street video of the Somali daycares and health care centers, posted by the YouTuber Nick Shirley. Of course, the fact that Somalis are openly scamming Americans is not exactly new information. There have been dozens of reports — from outlets like Alpha News, County Highway, the Manhattan Institute, and so on — documenting, in excruciating detail, just how widespread the corruption is. Federal prosecutors proved that Somalis ripped off hundreds of millions of dollars from taxpayers as part of the so-called "Feeding Our Future" scam — and that's just one of their fraudulent organizations, where they pretended to feed children in exchange for federal reimbursements. Somalis have also set up fake "autism treatment centers" on virtually every block, which is another scam that's cost hundreds of millions of dollars in just the past five years. And then there's the adult daycares, the normal daycares, the "home health aides," the "housing stabilization services," and so on. Somalis have scammed all of it. In

fact, even before Nick Shirley's video came out, the state of Minnesota [announced](#) that they were pausing all new licenses for "home and community-based human services providers," because "the unprecedented increase in provider applications over the past five years far outpaces the increase in people receiving services."

In other words, Somalis were clearly pillaging the treasury — and they weren't being remotely subtle about it.

And really, that's the part of Nick's video that was so significant. Everyone already knew what the Somalis were doing. We all knew that the average Somali has a low IQ. We all knew that half of the population of Somalia lives on roughly a dollar a day — yes, a dollar a day. Something like 70% of the population is below the poverty line. They have an economy so primitive that it's hard to even comprehend it. And we all knew that there was never a universe in which importing hundreds of thousands of these people was ever going to improve this country.

What was surprising about Nick's footage is how open and obvious the fraud is. It turns out that, if you simply walk up to these Somali establishments and attempt to patronize their business, they'll respond by asking, "Why?" Yes, "Why." They'll respond with total befuddlement about the mere idea that someone would want to pay them in exchange for the goods and services they're supposed to be pretending to provide. And meanwhile, they'll collect millions of dollars from taxpayers. They'll park Range Rovers out front. They'll bark at you, in some incomprehensible Star Wars language, when you ask them why their daycare doesn't have any children inside of it, or why a single building houses more than a dozen "clinics" that all, supposedly, serve the same purpose.

We are not talking about a subtle operation here. It shouldn't take much to shut it down completely. You could simply cut all federal funding to the state of Minnesota, for starters. That would be the obvious solution. There's no reason for taxpayers to fund anyone else's daycare in the first place, even if the operations were in fact legitimate. But there are about a million other solutions, too. For example, the FBI could set up cameras outside of every daycare, and log the entrance and exit of every single person — and then check those numbers against the billing records. With AI, it wouldn't be particularly difficult to do. It would cost, what, a hundred bucks for the camera? And maybe a few thousand dollars to hire someone to program the AI? Why hasn't something like that been done? We're talking about hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of fraud here, when you add up all the different scams.

If the government actually wanted to stop the fraud, it could obviously do so. In fact, they've done it before.

Watch:

Minneapolis sent \$12 million in federal meal funds to a Somali restaurant claiming to feed 4,000–6,000 kids daily.

The FBI watched for six weeks—about 40 people showed up.

That's how normalized corruption looks. pic.twitter.com/iXxUxmBA1B

— Derrick Evans (@DerrickEvans4WV) [January 4, 2026](#)

Credit: @DerrickEvans4WV/X.com

The only reason this kind of 24/7 monitoring isn't mandated by law outside of every daycare and "health clinic" that receives millions of dollars from taxpayers is that the government wants the fraud to continue. That was the lesson of the Nick Shirley video, which dominated social media towards the end of 2025. It wasn't really a revelation, in the sense that it didn't reveal some previously unknown conspiracy. Though it was very important footage, and Nick deserves a lot of credit for going out and capturing it. But as important as it was, it was also extraordinarily, almost unbelievably frustrating to watch, because it raised an obvious question. As Nick went from daycare to daycare, it was impossible not to ask, "Why are we allowing this? Why is no one monitoring these daycares? Why doesn't the government simply ignore the NGOs and the special interests and the ACLU and the lawyers, and shut all of this down immediately, by force? Why can the FBI send SWAT teams after the January 6th grandmothers, but not Somali fraudsters who openly despise this country and all of the white people in it?"

Then, in the new year, we saw exactly what the federal government can achieve when it decides, contrary to the advice of "experts" and the "norms" that are supposedly sacrosanct, to actually take decisive action for the benefit of American citizens. It turns out that indeed, the U.S. government is capable of using its overwhelming power within our own hemisphere to advance our own interests in a direct and tangible way. There's nothing that stands in our way. There is no military or militia that's powerful enough to stop us. There is no "international law" that holds us back, because international law is a fake concept. The only "laws"

that exist are rules that are codified by, and enforced by, a legitimate governing authority — and enforced with violence if necessary. That's it. Those are the only laws. That's what a law is, by definition. Everything else is just a suggestion.

That's why Donald Trump invoked the Monroe Doctrine — or the "Don-roe Doctrine," as he called it — in his press conference after the U.S. attack on Venezuela. It's also why Trump invoked Manifest Destiny during his inaugural address last year. This administration understands that "America First" means that America should rule over the Western hemisphere and use its power to advance the interests of our people. We are not beholden to the approval of the United Nations, or to the Somalis in Minnesota, or any other group that would happily eradicate all white people from the planet, if they ever gained any kind of military superiority whatsoever.

We're also not beholden to precedent. We don't have to let our military go to waste, idling in hangars and bases all over the world, because of the failures of past wars. You'll often hear this argument — that, because the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Vietnam were quagmires, we should never again topple a foreign regime or wage war over natural resources. That was the implication of Thomas Massie's recent remarks, which I'm going to play because, in general, I respect Thomas Massie. He's a Republican. He's not a mindless MSNBC drone, repeating DNC talking points.

Here's what he said.

Watch:

Wake up MAGA. VENEZUELA is not about drugs; it's about OIL and REGIME CHANGE. This is not what we voted for. pic.twitter.com/myxr979BqU

— Thomas Massie (@RepThomasMassie) [January 4, 2026](#)

Credit: @RepThomasMassie/X.com

Well, yes, this is about oil and regime change. Donald Trump has come out and said that many times. And there's nothing wrong with that, whatsoever.

Specifically, it's about the oil infrastructure and the oil rights that the socialists in Venezuela, led by Hugo Chavez, seized from U.S. corporations two decades ago, without fair compensation. The Venezuelans brought in companies like ExxonMobil and ConocoPhillips in order to construct the facilities — including pipelines and factories — that were necessary to extract and sell the oil in

Venezuela. We're talking about some of the most valuable oil deposits in the entire world, worth trillions of dollars today. Americans were entitled to a share of the profits in exchange for investing billions of dollars. But the Venezuelans broke the deal after the fact. They compensated the Americans for the book value of the infrastructure, but not the value it was creating. And in doing so, Venezuela spiked gas prices and stole billions — really, trillions — of dollars, not to mention an invaluable strategic resource.

The Venezuelans also proceeded to introduce a tremendous degree of inefficiency to the whole process, because they had no idea how to maintain the infrastructure they seized. So now, Venezuela is responsible for producing roughly 1% of the world's oil. In the 1970s, before they nationalized the oil industry, they supplied nearly 10%.

It's the duty of the American government, particularly in our hemisphere, to protect the property rights of American citizens and American companies. It's also the duty of the American government, when possible, to ensure that natural resources in this hemisphere are used for the benefit of American citizens — instead of being wasted by socialists. That's why, when Thomas Massie (and the Left) complains about how we're "going to war for oil," and how this is about "regime change" — the appropriate response is to say, yes, that's correct. That doesn't mean it's going to be a replay of the Iraq War. It doesn't mean that we're going to have troops on the ground in Venezuela for 20 years. It doesn't mean that Venezuelans are identical to jihadis in Fallujah. It means that we're doing what's necessary to advance the interests of our own people.

Venezuelans managed to go from extreme wealth to eating zoo animals for food in the span of about 20 years — all while sitting on some of the most lucrative oil reserves on the planet. Even if they hadn't stolen the oil from us — which they did — you could still make a very strong argument that the United States has the moral right, and even responsibility, to seize control over the vital resources that these people are squandering — and even worse, allowing to be exploited by our global adversaries. And that's to say nothing of the drugs they're trafficking into our country, which are killing Americans. And all of these facts make this very different from interventionism in the Middle East. This is our hemisphere. Our region of the world. This was a 90-minute military mission, not a 20-year mission. There is a clear benefit to the American people in the case of the Venezuela operation, whereas there was no discernible benefit to the American people in

Iraq or Afghanistan. And on top of that, Venezuela doesn't have Islamic militants with the will and the ability to wage any kind of meaningful counterstrike. So it's a very different situation by just about every measure.

More generally, no American should oppose turning countries like Venezuela into vassal states, subordinate to the United States. That's what we should do with inferior countries in our region of the world who cause problems for us — particularly when those inferior countries are run by socialists. It just has to be done the right way so that we're the beneficiaries of the arrangement — not a quagmire that costs us billions of dollars and thousands of American lives.

Having more control over global oil supplies will put us in a better position against our adversaries like Russia, improve our negotiating position with Canada (which is run by another hostile socialist government), and undermine China's ambitions because they don't have vast oil reserves. Meanwhile, Cuba's communist government has been propped up by oil money from Venezuela (which is why Cubans were guarding Maduro at his residence when Delta Force got there). It looks like Cuba's communist government is about to fall, as well. And Colombia's socialist leader may not be in power for very long either, based on how Trump is talking lately.

In other words, we have a real chance, after the attack on Venezuela, to topple — or at least severely undermine — communists throughout the hemisphere. Unquestionably, that's a good thing — especially since, as you've probably noticed, communism is on the rise domestically. New York just installed a Muslim socialist who explicitly endorsed "collectivism" when he was inaugurated. It's now more urgent than it's been, at any point in memory, to directly combat communism in our hemisphere. Even aside from the oil, that's worth fighting for.

I will concede that, at this point, we can't say definitively whether this attack will turn out the way the Trump administration expects, or whether we'll begin "nation building" in Venezuela. No one can say with certainty, one way or the other, exactly what will happen next. And when Donald Trump — who was clearly going on zero hours of sleep — said that the United States will "run" the country of Venezuela, he admittedly (and probably unintentionally) raised the possibility of another nightmarish, never-ending occupation.

But at the moment, we should give Trump the benefit of the doubt here.

First of all, last night, Venezuela's new president [said](#) she wants to work with the United States — not that she has much choice. Other administration officials, including Marco Rubio, have suggested that's the approach we're going to take. Additionally, there are no indications that we're staging for any kind of occupation. It appears that we're going to pressure Venezuela to open up the oil fields to the United States, under the threat of more decapitation strikes — and it doesn't seem like any more action will be necessary. Venezuela is clearly incapable of resisting the U.S. military in any meaningful way. (It's enough to make you wonder if we couldn't have taken a similar approach to Afghanistan and Iraq, rather than sacrifice thousands of American troops in a profoundly misguided campaign to sell Muslims on the wonders of democracy and equal rights. Maybe, instead, we could have simply demolished their government, crippled their ability to oppose us, and moved on within a week.) In any event, as for Venezuela, it doesn't appear that we have any reason to engage in "nation-building," and we shouldn't — especially since Maduro wasn't particularly popular in the first place.

Also, as we should all know by now, Donald Trump will often use words very loosely, in a way we're not meant to take literally. So when he says we'll "run" Venezuela, we have to keep that in mind. A year ago, for example, Trump [said](#) we'll "take over" Gaza and that "we'll own it." There was a flurry of articles at the time about how Trump was going to send troops to occupy Gaza, and how it'd be just like Iraq, and so on. But, especially with the benefit of hindsight, we can safely say that Trump didn't literally mean that we'd make Gaza the 51st state. He meant we'd bring some order to the situation there. There's every reason to believe that, with Venezuela, he's basically saying the same thing.

There's also reason to believe that there could be many additional benefits to converting Venezuela into a client state of the U.S., beyond securing oil reserves for the United States. Which isn't to say that we make it an actual state, with voting rights and all the rest of it, obviously. Here's just one possibility: Venezuela could receive immigrants and refugees who can't be deported to their home countries, which is an arrangement we currently have with El Salvador and Panama (which, itself, was subject to a successful U.S. coup during the first Bush administration, and has been a reliable ally ever since). That would be an unequivocal, positive development for the United States and every American citizen living here. I haven't seen anyone make that suggestion, but it's the kind of policy that we should be talking about. It's what we voted for in the last election. We didn't vote for inane podcast drama. We voted for observable, significant

improvements in the day-to-day lives of Americans. And right now, one of the biggest obstacles to deporting illegal aliens is that many countries won't accept them. Venezuela can now be a top destination for these illegal aliens.

Speaking of podcast drama, you may have noticed that some self-described Right-wingers are coming out against the attack on Venezuela, on the theory that Israel is somehow involved. The idea, I guess, is that, if not for Israel, then no wars would ever be fought, and we'd all live in utopian harmony. So the idea is that the shadowy Jewish cabal is pulling the strings, as usual. A mildly-less-deranged version of this sentiment is that Venezuela is the victim of godless globalists, because they supposedly have some vaguely conservative values (like opposition to gay marriage). Never mind the fact that Venezuela doesn't allow freedom of speech or free markets. Never mind the fact that Venezuela's government routinely intimidates Christians, and abolished the right to private property — which, you know, is one of the most fundamental rights for any functioning society. We're meant to conclude that, somehow, Venezuela is really a conservative place, and that's why the sinister globalists want to take it down. It's contrarian, for the sake of being contrarian. And it's intended to make you think that the United States isn't exceptional, and that we can't simply "do things" that meaningfully make the world — and more importantly, this country — a better place to live.

But that's not true. We are exceptional. And in a matter of hours, we can put an immediate end to some of the biggest problems facing this country — problems that no administration has bothered to solve. We can shut down every single Somali fraudster and deport all of them back to Somalia. Then we can tell the leaders of Somalia — to the extent that Somalia has leaders — that if they don't stop sending scam artists to our country to bilk our taxpayers and send the money back to their country, Delta Force will be paying them a little visit next. We can do that. We can also require Mexico to stop the flow of fentanyl into this country, or we can go to war with the cartels ourselves. We can demand that Canada give us more trade concessions, restore freedom of speech, end the church burnings, and stop its rampant discrimination against white men — or else we can destroy their entire economy overnight (especially now that we have access to Venezuelan oil, and don't need Canada's). We can denaturalize and deport foreign infiltrators like Zohran Mamdani and Ilhan Omar, who lied about their communist sympathies when they became American citizens. We can spend our money in ways that benefit Americans, instead of foreigners who hate us.

Those are the two options we have. We can choose Minneapolis' dysfunction and never-ending decay on the one hand. We can let invaders sabotage us, using our "norms" as a shield. Or we can use Delta Force in Venezuela as the model. We can go in, do what needs to be done, and get out quickly. An entire generation of Americans, including conservatives, has been conditioned to believe that the latter option is impossible. But it's not. All that's necessary — all that was ever necessary — was decisive action, before any response was even possible. That's what we just saw in Venezuela. And it's what we need to see in this country, and across this hemisphere. Foreign invaders and their NGO lawyers need to recognize that the Monroe Doctrine — and Manifest Destiny — are infinitely more valid than whatever "international law" they want to hide behind, as they rip us off in plain sight. That's because, unlike the UN Declaration of Human Rights or whatever, someone is capable of enforcing Manifest Destiny and the Monroe Doctrine. That someone is the United States of America.