

In January 2018, we sent the following comments to Daniel Riley and asked if he would give a comment. The comments we sent him are below.

Immigration #1 Thoughts to ponder....

"Our Constitution gives the feds ZERO authority over Immigration and no US immigration laws existed until after the Civil war. US deportation is a denial due process while travel restrictions, Border Patrol and ICE are as criminal as the BLM and the EPA!

-- A cowboy in 1860 did not ask permission to cross the border. These restrictions were created by the global elite for division and wealth redistribution, kept in place through propaganda and fear. They have nothing to do with sovereign borders. Our choice is to get informed and stand up, or oppose the Constitution and human rights while becoming pawns for the global elite.

-- I used to think like the herd, then I studied the history. I challenge anyone to prove this wrong with historical FACTS from our Constitution and founding documents. Emotional comments and propaganda will not be accepted."

Immigration #2

If you believe you have more human rights than a foreigner, or that the rights enumerated in our Constitution only apply to documented Citizens like you, then you are ignorant of our Constitution, the laws of nature and natures God. You are the definition of a racist

Immigration #3 1/22/18 Monday 10:55 am cst

Another perspective on anti-borders

It's strange to to railed on by so called patriots defending the right to travel across borders yet not one person can present a factual, moral or constitutional case. They can only regurgitate the propaganda of the global elite.

The idea that human beings must be documented and tracked by government for sovereignty and security is repugnant to liberty. It is the role of slaves and has always been the agenda of tyrants.

Danbury, Connecticut February 13, 2018

IMMIGRATION CONTROL DEFENDED AGAINST OPEN BORDER PROPAGANDIST

I have taken the time to make some observations of a certain individual's discursives concerning immigration in general. His verbal quibble reveals his rash understanding on the topic of immigration as applied to the United States. He postulates that the U.S. Constitution is silent on immigration and therefore the central government has been granted "zero" power to control and enforce the nation's borders. Such a postulation not only exhibits his vulgar folly of deserting his reason but obliges someone to refute such gibberish.

Now see how I, one of those Americans whom you oft dare to call fake patriots and racists, scorn and mock you. For it would be most unworthy for the American nation to take any public notice of you, you nobby. Learn, mercenary noisemaker, learn, turn to Article one, Section eight, Clause four, and find the naturalization clause. This gave Congress the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization. In other words, who, and how an alien becomes an American citizen is determined by the national legislature. For someone of your acuity, I believe I need to further try and clear the fog between your ears. Permit me to explicate that the grant of the naturalization power embraces and infers the power of regulating immigration. Stated differently, the power of regulating immigration is incidental to the power of prescribing rules for naturalization. For example, if you are granted the power over an automobile, you not only have the power to determine its destination, its speed, its route, but also the power to determine who will be permitted as a passenger. In the way the constitution was written, and I am not saying I agree with it, incidental powers are implied. My opponent, with his comprehension of a kindergartner, just cannot grasp the concept of implied powers.

Moving on. Next, my punching bag of wind, turn your attention deficit disorder to Article one, Section eight, Clause three and find the commerce clause. This granted Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. The delivery of people to the United States, regardless of the mode of transportation, is a form of commerce. Foreign passengers to our borders have been taxed and regulated since the founding, first by the states and then by the central government. Furthermore, Article two, Section two, Clause two, the treaty clause, grants power to the President and Senate to make treaties. The realm of such treaties are rightly permitted to deal with questions on immigration between the treating nations. In tandem, these three powers granted by the constitution clearly gives the central government control over immigration into the United States.

Now that I have sham smashed our troublesome grammarian's crafty fabrications by specifically delineating the immigration powers found in the constitution, thus proving the central government has the authority to control immigration, let us throw another truth grenade at him. Scared of a little fire you apostate scarecrow! Let the fire of some Supreme Court case law, which your misguided sense of understanding asserts doesn't exist, further demonstrate my point.

In 1884, The U.S. Supreme Court stated: "Congress has the power to pass a law regulating immigration as part of the commerce of this country with foreign nations." See *EDYE v ROBERTSON*, 112 US 580, 600 (1884). In explaining the immigration power the Court said: "Its an accepted maxim of international law, that every sovereign nation has the power, as inherent in sovereignty, and essential to self-preservation, to forbid the entrance of foreigners within its dominions, or to admit them only in such cases and upon such conditions as it may see fit to prescribe." "In the United States this power is vested in the national government, to which the constitution has committed the entire control of international relations, in peace as well as war. It belongs to the political department of the government, and may be exercised

either through treaties made by the President and Senate, or through statutes enacted by Congress, upon whom the Constitution has conferred power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, including the entrance of ships, the importation of goods and the bringing of persons into ports of the United States; to establish a uniform rule of naturalization; to declare war; and to provide and maintain armies and navies; and to make all laws which may be necessary and proper for carrying into effect these powers. See *EKIU v US*, 142 US 651, 659 (1892).

Our pesky Rambler says, quote, no US immigration laws existed until after the Civil War, end quote. This turd, doesn't hesitate to scrape and throw together onto paper every outright falsehood he hears. Hey numskull, in January 1795 Congress passed an Act establishing a uniform rule of naturalization to carry into effect the power of the naturalization clause; and declared that any alien may be admitted to become a citizen of the United States, or any of them, upon conditions contained in said Act and not otherwise. See *STURGES v CROWNINSHIELD*, 4 Wheat 122, 170 (1817). This ignoramus just doesn't seem to be able to cognize the fundamental principle that immigration may give you the right to leave your country, but that doesn't give you the right to enter any country you choose without the receiving country's consent. This 1795 Act went about prescribing how to get that consent.

Lets now bash our antagonist with a little common sense. A country cannot be a country without borders. The first restraint the laws of nature grant to every country is to reserve to themselves the right to protect and uphold its borders; and to be informed of the name and quality of every foreigner that arrives. Nations have a right to keep at a distance all suspected persons; to forbid the entry of foreigners or foreign merchandise of a certain description, as circumstances may require.

Didn't the Israelites have to bob, weave and war their way through the borders of numerous countries on their way to the promised land? Didn't each Israelite tribe set up their own nation state, with borders, after they conquered the promised land? This "historical fact" proves borders have always been and will always be.

The asinine premise this pernicious weed is basically espousing is a world without borders, without countries, one great big country IS the world. Let us take our adversary's weak and perverted reasoning to its logical conclusion. I shudder with horror while I relate this, but it must be related. If there were no borders, then there must be no private property lines either. These lines act as borders, that the homeowner or property owner can enforce, so they must go too. Therefore, you would not have the right to determine who can or cannot enter your property or home. It is hardly possible for a wise man to agree with such a truly absurd and irrational premise.

Apparently this silly boy believes that border "restrictions were created by the global elite for division and wealth redistribution." O, the nonsense he chatters. I cannot help but quote his claims; for he himself usually destroys his argument by means of his own witness. The globalist want a one world order with one super world government with all its accoutrements. To implement this agenda, the "global elite" first want to entangle all nations into regional economic trade pacts, under the pretense of free trade. Next, their theory is, this will lead to politically connecting all nations, with the concomitant melding together of the nations. This elimination of borders is the death knell of the nation state-something the globalist are determined to accomplish.

Now, you forger of lies, who is the "pawn of the global elite?" You are the one advancing their agenda of border elimination. All you do is lie, lie, lie and return to your lies like a dog returns to his vomit. You, sir, are in the "herd," not us.

The plague and pest that he is, challenges anyone to prove his premise wrong, but then says "emotional comments and propoganda will not be

accepted." Wow! What can I say? The wretch contradicts himself again. All he offers is "emotional comments and propaganda" himself. He contradicts himself so much that contradiction herself seems to be a twin-sister of his. Now that I have dragged him to the light with superior truth, I'll hand him over to be flogged by Satan.

This worthless three legged horse, will probably perpetually go on playing the fool and never return to his right senses. If his thick skull is capable of common sense for a moment, and he is able to utter three words like a man in his sound and sober senses, that are truthful and capable of being understood, then I may remember who you are. The time I have taken here for my refutation, may seem to give this crier's hackneyed chicaneries an importance which they do not deserve. From now on, I exhort everyone to just ignore the rubbish that pours from his mouth, as one would the barking of the neighborhood dog.

Take Good Care