



Biden's Immigration Invasion End Game

If illegal immigrants show up outside your door, what are you to do? The answer may be different depending on which state you're in. If you're in a sanctuary state, government is more apt to accept the aliens than others who are not. After all, these are states that have declared they will not cooperate with Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Yet, when 50 of them show up in Martha's Vineyard, they are quickly whisked away to a military base, while calls from border states to control an enormous flow of aliens by securing the border is met with lies and goes largely ignored.



YouTube

In a recent interview with NBC's *Meet the Press*, Vice President Kamala Harris said that the border is secure and that it's a top priority. Take a look. Yet, Democratic Congressman Henry Cuellar from Texas countered her assessment and said there will be more than 4 million illegal immigrants coming into the U.S. just within two years.

Recall that President Biden named the VP as the Border Czar to take care of the problem, but her lack of engagement tells you exactly how much work she's placed into it.

Is she and Biden ignorant of the federal laws, being used as tools to fulfill a political agenda, or have they willingly bought into a much larger scheme? We'll offer an overview and suggest ways you can help restore the Republic in today's episode.

Last June, VP Harris gave a speech in Guatemala to those making the trek to illegally enter the U.S. She said, "I believe you'll be turned back." Obviously, that was not the case.

So why the obvious lie that our borders are secure? Is it merely a case of attracting many new voters for a particular political party in order to win elections? Perhaps, but why would they need to do that if they have control of the elections? The same people telling you our borders are safe and secure are telling you the same thing about elections; although, they were saying the opposite after the 2016 election.

The truth is that migration is a tool used by globalists to achieve specific goals in pursuance of their agenda to create world government. Remember that globalism is the antithesis of Americanism. Globalists work toward merging countries under world government. This world government has been steadily building mainly through the United Nations and its many international affiliates, including the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the International Court of Justice, the World Health Organization, the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and many more.

To place the United States under world government would mean the end of the great experiment of freedom the Founding Fathers began. They wrote in Article VI of the Constitution that the Constitution and laws and treaties pursuant to the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. Yet, in the UN Charter, Article 25, it reads, "The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the





decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

Article 25 makes no mention about the charter being subservient to a country's guiding documents. Plus, the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights seems to suggest that rights come from government and not God.

Article 2 of their <u>declaration reads</u>, "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration."

Summarize that to mean you're granted rights through this Declaration. After a quick review, you'll notice the right to bear arms is missing. There's a fatal flaw. Also, if government, even world government, is granting you rights, those are called privileges, not rights. As stated in the U.S. Declaration of Independence, rights are granted by God and governments are instituted to protect those rights.

Ironically, the UN's declaration site boastfully claims their declaration of human rights is the most translated document in the world. Because they don't acknowledge God, perhaps they're ignorant of the fact that the Bible holds this distinction.

Globalists see no origin or arbiter for rights other than government, and again, noting that government-granted rights are actually privileges that can be altered or suspended at any point by those in charge.

Who would be in charge of world government? If we looked at those who have run the United Nations, perhaps that would give us an accurate profile of the person or people who may be put in charge.

During its founding, Alger Hiss ran the United Nations in 1945. He was later exposed as a Communist and Soviet spy.

Next was Trygve Lie from 1946 to 1952. He was a member of the Social Democratic Labor Party which was an offshoot of the Communist International.

Dag Hammarskjold followed from 1953-1961. He claimed his political hero was Communist China's mass murderer Chou En-lai.

U Thant served from 1961-1971 and said that Lenin's Communist goals were "in line with the aims of the UN Charter."

Kurt Waldheim, a former officer in the Nazi army, ran the UN from 1972-1981.

Marxist Javier Perez de Cuellar served as head of the UN from 1982 - 1991.

Boutros Boutros-Ghali called for an end to "absolute and exclusive sovereignty" and served from 1992-1996.

Then, serving from 1997-2006, Kofi Annan was accused of complicity in the massacres occurring in Europe's Bosnia and Africa's Rwanda.

Ban Ki-moon, serving from 2007-2016, was instrumental in pushing Agenda 21/2030, a radical environmental agenda that favors nature over humans.

And currently serving is socialist António Guterres, who helped engineer the massive tsunami of Islamic immigration in the West. Last week, he said at the UN meeting in New York that "the United Nations charter and the ideals it represents are in jeopardy and we have a duty to act," especially in way of climate change, poverty and war.

Each of these UN leaders are on the far-left of the political spectrum. How do you think these people





are going to dictate to a country that values God-given rights and freedom from tyranny? They will use force.

While it currently doesn't have a way to enforce its policies, given the veto power of countries on its Security Council, Brian Urquhart, then Under Secretary-General of the United Nations for Special Political Affairs wrote in the Fall 1981 issue of Foreign Affairs, how enforcement is supposed to work.

"The Charter describes a system for maintaining international peace and security which assumes that all governments will play the roles assigned to them. Those involved in disputes will avail themselves of the means available in the Charter to settle those disputes peacefully. If they fail to do this the membership of the United Nations, under the guidance of the Security Council, will take a series of steps designed to persuade them to do so. The governments concerned will heed and obey the injunctions of the Council. And if in the end the threat to peace persists, the Council, led by its permanent members, will apply enforcement measures, ranging from economic sanctions to military action, to restore peace and security."

That gives you an idea of what we can expect if the United States is ever placed under world government through the United Nations. If we fail to disarm our population, refuse to phase out petroleum, do not nationalize our police, don't adopt censorship based on hate speech guidelines, or fail to recognize and implement the latest LGBTQ+ directive, then we can assume that any of these would be seen as a threat to peace and the country then would be hit with measures ranging from economic sanctions to military action.

In the end, world government will control your lifestyle, abolishing your choices, your liberties, and your free practice of rights. The UN has focused on key topics and tools to use as leverage to get member-nations to act according to its agenda, slowly usurping the legislative process of these nations. Immigration is just one of these topics. Let's give you an idea of how pervasive this is.

On its website, the UN <u>wrote</u>, "The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development recognizes for the first time the contribution of migration to sustainable development. 11 out of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) contain targets and indicators relevant to migration or mobility. The Agenda's core principle is to 'leave no one behind,' not even migrants."

Under world government, a nation's borders are mere lines on a map and would mean just as much as county boundaries do now in an individual state. Leave no one behind can mean accepting all who want to enter the country, regardless of reason and character. The UN has already written an immigration policy for members, so that would supplant America's existing immigration laws under world government.

The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration <u>suggests that</u> "No country can address the challenges and opportunities of this global phenomenon [migration] on its own."

This is the typical globalist mindset. It's the same thing we heard during the "pandemic." They get you to collective think instead of solely relying on the laws, policies, and processes of an individual country. This can lead to mass formation psychosis as Dr. Robert Malone exposed.

The UN Compact also mentions, "We must empower migrants to become full members of our societies, highlight their positive contributions, and promote inclusion and social cohesion. We must generate greater predictability and certainty for States, communities and migrants alike. To achieve this, we commit to facilitate and ensure safe, orderly and regular migration for the benefit of all."





The U.S. already has a legal pathway for immigration. Unfortunately, policy changes throughout the last 50 years have made it more enticing to come to the U.S. illegally. Plus, each presidential administration has largely dealt with illegal immigration by tweaking policy and then usually ignoring the fact that our borders are not secure, while illegals stream in by the millions, as is the current situation with the Biden administration.

The Compact claims it "is a non-legally binding cooperative framework that recognizes that no State can address migration on its own due to the inherently transnational nature of the phenomenon. It requires international, regional and bilateral cooperation and dialogue."

The term non-legally binding or non-binding is the same phrase used in its Agenda 21 project. It was used by the media, establishment politicians, and others to discredit the efforts of The John Birch Society and others in exposing the anti-American agenda of Agenda 21. Because it was portrayed as non-binding, our efforts were labelled as conspiracy theory.

Yet, what steps were taken by Agenda 21 partners to implement this in federal, state, and local government? It was made binding and legally binding when government created laws based on the principles of Agenda 21.

As mentioned, the Compact calls for dialogue, and the only dialogue America should contribute to it is that we are a sovereign nation and will follow our own laws on it. In essence, go pound sand and get off of our lawn.

The Compact gives lip service to national sovereignty by writing, "The Global Compact reaffirms the sovereign right of States to determine their national migration policy and their prerogative to govern migration within their jurisdiction, in conformity with international law."

See what they just did? They are dictating that our sovereignty is dependent upon conforming with international law. In America, there is no international law above the Constitution.

It continues, "Within their sovereign jurisdiction, States may distinguish between regular and irregular migration status, including as they determine their legislative and policy measures for the implementation of the Global Compact, taking into account different national realities, policies, priorities and requirements for entry, residence and work, in accordance with international law."

Again, it dictates what we MAY do, as if the UN is the final arbiter of this policy.

It does the exact same thing with the rule of law and due process.

"The Global Compact recognizes that respect for the rule of law, due process and access to justice are fundamental to all aspects of migration governance. This means that the State, public and private institutions and entities, as well as persons themselves are accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated, and which are consistent with international law."

Again, you do as you want, but within our confines. Folks, this is why we shouldn't be part of any such international organization.

The Compact also suggests that there needs to be a whole-of-government and a whole-of-society approach in regards to developing and implementing policies and practices across all sectors. This is reminiscent of the topics of LGBTQ, climate change, gender dysphoria, and other topics that most Americans have chosen to not be part of, but that the media, government, and a small minority of loud, organized activists have decided you will accept and you will implement.





All of this gives you a new perspective on "leave no one behind." It also means leave no one alone.

There would be no one to represent you in world government or to respect the sovereignty, independence, rights, governing structure, culture, or heritage of a nation. If America adopted and implemented this compact, legal migration to the U.S. would be open to all, without regard to reason or character.

Throughout the years, The John Birch Society has covered instances of concern regarding immigration, particularly how recent illegal immigration came about and the types of migrants surging through the borders.

From our January 1963 JBS Bulletin,

Because of the vicious defiance, circumvention, and undermining of the Walter-McCarran immigration laws during the Eisenhower Administration, there are today at least five million people from foreign lands who are illegally in our country. Many of them are under the direction of that most vicious and perhaps most extensive of all Communist fronts, the Committee For Protection Of Foreign Born.

The Comsymps [that's short for Communist Sympathizers] in Washington count heavily on exercising enough influence or control over these five million aliens, by one means or another, to use their votes at the polls. But much of this control is tenuous, and subject to constant erosion, especially among many of these aliens who have been here long enough to be honestly registered voters.

Then, the August 1970 JBS Bulletin reported, "More than fifteen thousand hardcore Communists were brought into this country at one time, from Hungary alone, late in 1956. Hundreds of thousands have been pouring in for years, from all over the world, in complete violation or circumvention of our immigration laws."

This has continued throughout the years, with amnesty being granted under President Reagan that, according to *The New American* magazine, "did not solve our illegal immigration problem.... After a sixmonth slowdown that followed passage of the legislation, illegal immigration returned to normal levels and continued unabated."

Just who are those coming across the border should be an important question to be asked.

In our *American Opinion* magazine of March 1972, Congressman John Schmitz wrote, "Intelligence sources report large colonies of Chinese springing up in such countries as Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Jamaica, and Mexico. They are for the most part trained guerrillas apparently assigned to aid cadres of local Communists in fomenting revolution. And now, thanks to the abolition of all nationality quotas through recent radical amendments to the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, we can expect increasing Maoist infiltration through our exposed southern flank."

An interesting side note to this discussion is that in prior debate over whether or not the U.S. should join the League of Nations, which was the precursor to the United Nations, some deeply concerned members of the U.S. Senate suggested that before they even began to think about ratification of the treaty that would have made the U.S. a member, they offered amendments that would "deny authority to the League to regulate such internal affairs as tariffs and immigration; and specifically delineate





America's absolute right to reject League mandates." (July 1980 Bulletin)

Telling us that these Senators were on to the League's motives of stripping the U.S. of its sovereignty and independence. But when it comes to the United Nations, too many in Congress are not standing up for even the most basic principles of what makes America a sovereign nation.

Because this compact was written and negotiated during the Trump administration, the U.S. thankfully did not participate in the talks. Plus, it still hasn't signed onto it.

Yet, globalists do not give up that easily. The leading globalist thinktank for the last 100 years has been the Council on Foreign Relations. In its September/October 2022 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, the authors suggest ways to force immigration reform by doing an end-run around Congress and targeting action on the state level.

They wrote,

States can force action on international climate agreements, reinvigorate immigration strategies, and forge crucial international research partnerships. Doing so will help set the global agenda, but it will also help preserve the viability and strength of the United States in the world order....

... Foreign governments can strengthen their long-term relationships with the United States, regardless of who is in power in Washington, by building ties with individual states and their dependent cities....

When congressional action on an issue isn't possible, federal agencies should partner with their state equivalents to pursue policy goals....

And as other countries exploit growing rifts, key states could be left looking to each other and the world rather than to the federal government for leadership....

What no one should ignore is that U.S. states have the power as well as the motivation to both challenge Washington and shape the global policy agenda.

Again, we've got to go back to the Agenda 21 rollout more than a decade ago. Agenda 21 was mainly implemented through ICLEI, now known as Local Governments for Sustainability. It followed the same game plan as the Foreign Affairs article is suggesting. It targeted local cites, villages, towns, and counties to become members that implemented Agenda 21 objectives that were in direct violation of property rights, and helped to introduce climate change and other radical environmental legislation.

Now, they're suggesting doing the same thing with immigration. We'll remind states not to violate Article 1, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution that places prohibitions on states in regards to foreign relations. And let's also keep aware of how our nation's enemies may use these potential partnerships to advance their espionage and infiltration activities.

In the September 26, 2022 issue of *The New American*, author William Hoar documents Biden's flip-flop on securing our borders and how Biden's immigration policy has become a de facto amnesty for tens of thousands of the more than two million backlogged cases in immigration court. This is the amount that they have at least admitted to throwing out. Plus, Americans see the steady stream of illegals that currently come in at 8,000 per day, with sometimes 500 in a group who look for Border Patrol agents to guide them. As the article points out, agents are now used as social workers for processing, instead of





patrolling and enforcing.

This is nothing new when you look at it in the scope of building world government. Biden's Build Back Better is a UN-project, so why should anyone be surprised when millions of illegal aliens cross our borders? It's all part of the agenda of swapping Americanism for Globalism, and sovereignty for slavery.

Each Presidential administration in recent memory has either flown in unvetted or poorly vetted migrants to destinations within the U.S. or moved illegal aliens across the country instead of releasing them back into Mexico. However, President Trump did do more to engage with foreign leaders in an attempt to stop the flow of aliens and also helped to secure the border in places. What used to be a trickle has now erupted into a flood, an invasion of people that we really don't know who they are and why they are here. America has a lawful immigration policy. The Executive Branch has the authority and duty to execute the laws. It's high time he did.

So, what can we do? You can be part of a national grassroots movement that works to provide constitutional solutions to safeguard and restore American liberty, freedom, independence, and sovereignty. We work on key projects that give the electorate, elected officials, and other local influencers the tools to rightfully restore the Republic and to win the larger battle. All that word salad means is that we love freedom and we work to keep it.

If you agree, join The John Birch Society today to begin working with others in your area on local projects.

I'm Bill Hahn for The John Birch Society and until next time, stay informed, stay active, and get organized, patriots!







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.