

9604:

Deception plans

Shoulder patches were designed for units of the fictitious [First United States Army Group](#) under George Patton



Under the overall umbrella of Operation Bodyguard, the Allies conducted several subsidiary operations designed to mislead the Germans as to the date and location of the Allied landings.^[32] [Operation Fortitude](#) included Fortitude North, a misinformation campaign using fake radio traffic to lead the Germans into expecting an attack on Norway,^[33] and Fortitude South, a major deception involving the creation of a fictitious [First United States Army Group](#) under Lieutenant General [George S. Patton](#), supposedly located in [Kent](#) and [Sussex](#). Fortitude South was intended to deceive the Germans into believing that the main attack would take place at Calais.^{[28][34]} Genuine radio messages from 21st Army Group were first routed to Kent via landline and then broadcast, to give the Germans the impression that most of the Allied troops were stationed there.^[35] Patton was stationed in England until 6 July, thus continuing to deceive the Germans into believing a second attack would take place at Calais.^[36]

Many of the German radar stations on the French coast were destroyed in preparation for the landings.^[37] In addition, on the night before the invasion, a small group of [Special Air Service](#) (SAS) operators deployed dummy paratroopers over [Le Havre](#) and [Isigny](#). These dummies led the Germans to believe that an additional airborne landing had occurred. On that same night, in [Operation Taxable](#), [No. 617 Squadron RAF](#) dropped strips of "window", [metal foil](#) that caused a radar return which was mistakenly interpreted by German radar operators as a naval convoy near Le Havre. The illusion was bolstered by a group of small vessels towing [barrage balloons](#). A similar deception was undertaken near [Boulogne-sur-Mer](#) in the Pas de Calais area by [No. 218 Squadron RAF](#) in [Operation Glimmer](#).^{[38][2]}

9423:

Nazi Survivor: 'Progressivism And Fascism Come From The Same Ideological Root'

Liberals erroneously claim that the conservative right are fascists, or generally speaking, the farther right a society travels on the ideological spectrum the closer to fascism it gets. It is simply untrue. In fact, conservatism and fascism are on complete opposite ends of the ideological spectrum. **Progressivism and fascism, however, are firmly located on the same side of the spectrum as fascism — the left.**

Unfortunately, those who lived under fascist rule know this all too-well because, to them, there is no faux academic supplement for reality.

Buck Sexton, of the Blaze Radio Show, received a phone call Saturday from a nearly 84-year-old woman named Irma, who lives in Massachusetts today. Irma was born in 1930 under Nazi Germany fascism. Her father fought against the tyranny of big government for years, which resulted in his imprisonment first under the Nazis, and again “under the worst conditions” after communism took over in what was then-East Germany.

Big government liberals, otherwise camouflaged as progressives, falsely argue that their big government ideology separates them from fascism because their purpose is a “moral imperative.” However, historically, there is simply no such thing, there

is only the choice of either centralized tyranny or decentralized freedom. As Irma said, “progressivism and fascism come from the same ideological root.”

According to the Merriam-Webster definition, fascism is “a political philosophy, movement, or regime (as that of the Fascisti) that exalts nation (*and often race*) above the individual and that stands for a centralized autocratic government headed by a dictatorial leader, severe economic and social regimentation, and forcible suppression of opposition.”

In truth, we are hard-pressed to distinguish a difference between progressivism and fascism when we actually review what they mean, ideologically. Both believe in big government control and a dynamic, powerful executive that renders the liberty of the individual subservient to the collective. From his takeover of 1/6 of the American economy through ObamaCare to his defiance of a president’s constitutional duty to uphold the law on immigration and DOMA, though he is often charged of being a socialist, President Obama seems to resemble more a fascist than anything else.

And the reason is simple: Socialism, communism, progressive and fascism all “come from the same ideological root,” just as Irma said. They all in one form or another, at their core, believe that people are best ruled by those educated enough to rule, because people are not capable of making their own choices.

“My biggest regret is that I came here, and we lived a life trusting that we lived under a Constitution that will always be there,” Irma told Sexton. She went on to say that she was “always leery” about what took place in the 1960s and the

political correctness movement that took hold in universities, prompting her to ask herself, “What in the world is this?”

There is one more aspect that connects socialism, communism, progressivism and fascism that is significant. Sure, they all lead to tyranny, but they also all fail.

(Want to read more about political ideologies and their implications, read my book *Our Virtuous Republic*, which dives into great detail about what each philosophy presupposes about human nature. “Liberals who read this book will never see the same face in the mirror again, and conservatives will never find a better argument against big government.”)

[Did 30,000 scientists declare that climate change is a hoax?](#)

[Daniel Churchman: Climate Change](#)

[the Oregon Petition](#)

Petition

We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.

_____ ☐ Please send more petition cards for me to distribute.
Please Sign Here

My academic degree is B.S. ☐ M.S. ☐ Ph.D. ☐ in the field of _____

Name

Street

City, State, and Zip

I have specialized scientific experience in:

Does the Mueller report matter? Why or why not?

9415:

<https://www.lp.org/4-more-libertarians-elected-to-office-in-illinois-oklahoma/>

<https://www.lp.org/libertarians-stage-nationwide-tax-day-protests/>

<https://www.americanlibertyreport.com/articles/democrats-media-the-word-spy-is-different-when-obama-does-it/>



'Hostile And Aggressive'

Migrants Break Through Border Into Southern Mexico, Join US-Bound Caravan

April 14, 2019 4629

A group of around 350 Central American migrants broke the locks on a gate at the Guatemala-Mexico border, forcing their way into Mexico to join a larger caravan of 2,000 or so migrants headed towards the United States, *AP* reports.

According to the National Immigration Institute, the migrants were acting in a “hostile” and “aggressive” manner – and said that they were attacking local police in the Mexican village of Metapa near the city of Tapachula.

The incident echoed a similar confrontation on the same border bridge between Mexico and Guatemala last year.

Migrants breach Guatemala-Mexico border in October, 2018

Several groups of migrants in the southern border state of Chiapas have expressed frustration at Mexico’s cold attitude towards them, as they have been slowed or stopped during their northbound journey, according to *AP*.

A group of several hundred Cuban, African and Central American migrants have been waiting at the immigration offices in Tapachula for documents that would allow them to travel to the U.S. border, where most plan to request asylum.

Some members of that group have scuffled with immigration authorities and broken windows at the offices in recent days, accusing officials of making them wait too long for papers. –*AP*

One group of Central American and Cuban migrants estimated at 2,500 strong have been stuck for at least a week in the Chiapas town of Mapastepec, north-west of Tapachula.

truth April 14, 2019 at 12:10 pm

funny how all thru out history this has been known as INVASION.but the liberals and
dems that orchestrated all of this change it to caravan,so it sounds nicer to the stupid
people,and suddenly it changes.this is nothing but invasion and a crime against all
america

Given that nothing in the US Constitution gives citizens or the president a right to keep tax returns secret, shouldn't Federalist Supreme Court justices agree that statutes requiring presidents or candidates to release their tax returns are valid?

Scott Steward, Most Viewed Writer in U.S. Supreme Court

Answered Apr 8 · Upvoted by **John Marshall**, JD Law, Fordham University School of Law (1977)

The US Constitution is a set of restrictions on the domain and powers of the government, not citizens. The Bill of Rights specifically denies the government any power to infringe on certain basic natural rights, and the Ninth Amendment says that this is not an exclusive list. There may be other rights not specifically listed, which shall also not be infringed by government.

US statutes guarantee the rights of citizens to strict confidentiality regarding the information they submit to the IRS for their taxes. The IRS has by its charter a clear obligation to protect the confidentiality of those records, including from other government agencies. Congress has some extremely limited authority to request tax information, but there has to be a genuine reason for a genuine legislative purpose, and it is patently clear that one person's tax returns are not going to be materially critical to how Congress writes tax laws. Aggregate information on a large number of taxpayers may be useful for some legitimate purpose, but individual data and identities would not be disclosed. So that is a dead end for the Democrats.

The stated reason of the Ways and Means Committee was to determine if the President's taxes were being properly audited. Not a single person on that committee is a currently certified CPA and licensed practicing tax attorney, so none are qualified to audit anybody's taxes, much less anything as complex and arcane as a multi-billionaire with business interests in hundreds of companies

around the world. The premise is preposterous. All they need is a certification by the IRS Director that yes, they have audited his taxes.... No need or authority to see his tax returns. Seeing his tax returns would do nothing to answer the purpose specified by the request.

The requests by the Democrat-run committees fail every smell test of legitimacy, and are brazen and obvious fishing expeditions and witch hunts. Of course the opposition Party wants to pore through his taxes to find grist for the Hate Trump Derangement Syndrome, especially since Mueller, Barr, and Rosenstein all exonerated him on all counts of collusion, conspiracy, or obstruction. The Democrats desperately need new ammunition to try to invalidate his Presidency and fabricate any excuse to impeach him.

Being President doesn't strip anyone of their legal and civil rights. Presidential candidates have filled out detailed financial disclosures that provide a list of every debt they owe and all their business interests. Obviously Democrats cannot find anything incriminating or embarrassing in that, so they want to mine his private tax records for any possible dirt they can find or allege.

Do they really think that even if he were engaged in some kind of criminal activity, for which there is no evidence whatsoever to justify an investigation, that he would report it on his tax returns? Give me a break.

REPLY:

Harold Piskiel

Indirectly, the fifth amendment applies.

Using tax returns for any investigative purpose other than auditing and ensuring proper tax collection, would leave open a window to claim that one cannot be required to file if doing so would incriminate the taxpayer in a non tax matter.

For example, if one makes a living as an illegal drug dealer, and reports the income and pays taxes, then IRS is done.

If these returns could be handed over to DEA for prosecution, then requiring the filing is forced self incrimination.

9312:

Bam:

Budget:

Congress should complete next year's budget BEFORE September 30 (end of FY; no CRs!).



"I feel confident [Ilhan Omar's] words were not based in an antisemitic attitude, but that she didn't have a full appreciation of how they landed on other people where these words have a history and cultural **impact** that might have been unknown to her,"

Pelosi said [1,905](#) [12:34 PM - Mar 7, 2019](#)

Pelosi also said: "The incident that happened... I don't think our colleague is anti-Semitic. I think she has a different experience in the use of words, doesn't understand that some of them are fraught with meaning that she didn't realize."

Then WHY didn't the resolution address the "**impact**", and condemn the antisemitic interpretation of those words.

WHY did the resolution AVOID the words that triggered it, and clarify the intended meaning?

Omar made national headlines days ago when she viciously **accused American politicians of being secretly bribed** to support the State of Israel and of having a **"dual allegiance" to a foreign country.**

Bernie Sanders:

Bernie: No, no, this is the US Senate, we just starve little children, we go bomb houses and buses of children, and we give tax breaks to billionaires, but we don't use dirty words! [13.5K](#) [11:04 PM - Mar 7, 2019](#)

Mueller's Manafort Scam: 4 Years In The Slammer For Helping Ukraine **Against Russia!**

[MARCH 11, 2019](#)

[Andrew McCarthy via The National Review.](#)

Paul Manafort Was an Agent of Ukraine, Not Russia

He is a scoundrel, but he was never a Kremlin operative.

Paul Manafort, the clandestine agent of Russia at the heart of the Trump campaign's "collusion" scandal – oh, wait.

Have you ever noticed what Paul Manafort's major crime was? After two years of investigation, after the predawn raid in which his wife was held at gunpoint, after months of solitary confinement that have left him a shell of his former self, have you noticed what drew the militant attention of the Obama Justice Department, the FBI, and, ultimately, a special counsel who made him the centerpiece of Russia-gate?

According to the [indictment](#) Robert Mueller filed against him, Manafort was an unregistered "agent of the Government of Ukraine." He also functioned as an agent of Viktor Yanukovich,

Ukraine's president from 2010 to 2014, and of two political parties, the Party of Regions and its successor, the Opposition Bloc.

Manafort was not an unregistered agent of *Russia*. Mueller never alleged that Manafort was a clandestine operative of the Kremlin. He worked for Ukraine, not Putin. **Indeed, for much of his time in Ukraine, he pushed his clients *against* Putin's interests.**

Mueller's prosecutors looked on glumly Thursday as Manafort was sentenced to a mere 47 months' imprisonment by Judge T. S. Ellis III of the federal court in Alexandria, Va. After rescinding the cooperation agreement they had extended Manafort following his convictions at trial, **Mueller's team had pressed for a sentence of up to 24 years** for the 70-year-old former Trump campaign chairman.

The judge demurred, pointedly observing that ***Manafort was "not before this court for anything having to do with collusion with the Russian government to influence [the 2016] election."***

The prosecutors won't be chagrined long, of course. Against Manafort, one case with a potential century of jail time was not enough. There's a case in Washington, too. There, Manafort will be sentenced next week, by a different judge who will surely impose a sentence more to the special counsel's liking. The knowledge of that, more than anything else, explains Judge Ellis's comparative wrist-slap, which ignored sentencing guidelines that called for a severe prison term.

Those guidelines were driven by prodigious financial fraud, not espionage. No one has even alleged espionage — even though the investigation was aggressive, even though the two indictments charge numerous felonies, and even though Mueller has had as his star informant witness Manafort's longtime sidekick, Richard Gates, a fellow fraudster who was deeply involved in his partner's work for foreign governments.

Understand: Manafort would never have been prosecuted if he had not joined Donald Trump's campaign. He would not have been prosecuted if Hillary had won the 2016 election and spared Democrats the need to conjure up a reason to explain their defeat – something other than nominating a lousy candidate who stopped campaigning too early.

Manafort's Ukrainian work was not a secret. By the time of the 2016 campaign, he'd been at it for over a dozen years. He wasn't alone. Not even close. An array of American political consultants flocked to post-Soviet Ukraine because that's where the money was. Manafort worked for the Party of Regions, led by Yanukovich. The Obama consultants worked for Yanukovich's rival, Yulia Tymoshenko — the populist-socialist who sometimes colluded with Putin and other times posed as his opponent. The Clinton consultants lined up with Viktor Yushchenko, Putin's generally pro-Western *bête noire*, who was nearly assassinated by Kremlin operatives and who navigated between east and west.

What you may already notice is that Ukraine is complicated. That collusion narrative you've been sold since November 8, 2016? It's a caricature.

The people peddling it know that Americans are clueless about the intricacies of politics in a former Soviet satellite and the grubby bipartisan cesspool of international political consultancy. You are thus to believe that the Party of Regions was nothing but a cat's paw of Moscow; that Manafort went to work for Yanukovich, the party's Putin puppet; and that Manafort's entrée into the Trump campaign was a Kremlin coup, a Russian plot to control of the White House.

Sure. But then ... where's the collusion charge? *If that's what happened, where is the special counsel's big indictment of a Trump–Russia conspiracy, with Manafort at its core?*

There is no such case because the collusion narrative distorts reality.

Manafort is not a good guy. He did business and made lots of money with Ukrainian and Russian oligarchs who, largely through their organized-crime connections, made their fortunes in the post-Soviet gangster-capitalism era, when the spoils of an empire were up for grabs.

Manafort got himself deeply in hock with some of these tycoons. He may owe over \$25 million to Oleg Deripaska, a Russian aluminum magnate. Deripaska, you've repeatedly been told, is Putin's oligarch. That may be true — they are close enough for Putin to have intervened on his behalf when the U.S. government imposed travel restrictions. *But former [senator Bob Dole](#) intervened on Deripaska's behalf, too. [So did the FBI](#), when they thought Deripaska could help them rescue an agent detained in Iran. [So did Christopher Steele](#), the former British spy of Steele-dossier infamy.*

Having business with Deripaska did not make Manafort a Russian spy. **No more than [taking \\$500,000 from a Kremlin-tied bank made Bill Clinton a Russian spy](#).** For a quarter century, the United States government [encouraged commerce with Russia](#), notwithstanding that it is anti-American and run like a Mafia family. As secretary of state, Hillary Clinton worked with the Putin regime to [develop Moscow's version of](#)

[Silicon Valley](#). Business with Russia was like what the Clintons used to tell us about lies about sex: Everybody does it.

Manafort's business eventually soured. There is good reason to believe that, once he was installed as chairman of the Trump campaign — when Trump looked like a sure GOP-nomination winner and general-election loser — Manafort tried to monetize his position of influence. [He hoped to make himself “whole,”](#) as he put it, by demonstrating that he was once again a political force to be reckoned with — offering Deripaska briefings on the campaign, offering his Ukrainian oligarch benefactors polling data showing that Trump had a real chance to win.

Manafort likes the high life. Running with this crowd helped him live it, and helped him hide most of his money overseas, in accounts he could stealthily access without sharing his millions with the taxman.

But all that said,

Manafort was not a [Russian](#) agent. Even Mueller, who went after him hammer & tongs, never accused him of that!

When his Ukrainian oligarch sponsors asked him to take Yanukovich on as a client, Manafort was reluctant. Yanukovich was essentially a thug who grew up in the Soviet system. The corruption of the 2004 presidential election, which Yanukovich's Kremlin-backed supporters tried to steal, ignited Kiev's Orange Revolution. Manafort, a cold-blooded Republican operative who had cut his teeth fighting off the Reagan revolution in the 1976 Ford campaign, calculated that Yanukovich was damaged goods.

But in the shadowy world of international political consultancy, money talks and scruple walks. Manafort's oligarch patrons made the Regions reconstruction project worth his while. He remade Yanukovich from the ground up: Learn English, warm to Europe, embrace integration in the European Union, endorse competitive democracy, be the candidate of both EU-leaning Kiev and Russia-leaning Donbas.

This was not a Putin agenda. It was an agenda for Ukraine, a country with a split personality that needs cordial relations with the neighborhood bully to the east as it fitfully lurches westward. Regions was a pro-Russia party, but that is not the same thing as *being Russia*. What the oligarchs want is autonomy so they can run their profitable fiefdoms independent of Kiev. They leverage Moscow against the EU . . . except when they talk up EU integration to ensure that they are not swallowed up by Moscow. What the oligarchs mainly are is corrupt, which suited Manafort fine.

The unsavory business was successful for a time. Regions returned to power. Yanukovich finally won the presidency and immediately announced that “[integration with the EU remains our strategic aim](#).” It was a triumph for Manafort, but a short-lived one. While Yanukovich rhapsodized about rising to Western standards, he ran his

administration in the Eastern authoritarian style, enriching his allies and imprisoning his rivals.

The latter included Tymoshenko, who was prosecuted over a gas deal she had entered when she was prime minister — with Putin. Russia bitterly criticized her prosecution, and when she was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment, the Kremlin blasted Yanukovych's government for pursuing her "exclusively for political motives." Manafort, meanwhile, continued to airbrush Yanukovych's image in the West, scheming with lobbyists and a law firm to help him defend the controversial Tymoshenko trial — a scheme abetted by lawyer Alex van der Zwaan, who eventually pled guilty to making false statements to Mueller's investigators.

Yanukovych's moment of truth came in late 2013. He was poised to sign the Association Agreement with the EU, a framework for integration. Putin furiously turned up the heat: blocking Ukrainian imports, drastically reducing Ukrainian exports, bleeding billions of trade dollars from Kiev's economy, threatening to cut off all gas supplies and drive Ukraine into default. Manafort pleaded with his client to stick with the EU. Yanukovych caved, however, declining to enter the Association Agreement and making an alternative pact with Putin to assure gas supplies and financial aid.

It was over this decision that the Euromaidan protests erupted. Yanukovych fled the country in early 2014, given sanctuary in Moscow. Subsequently, Regions renounced Yanukovych, blaming him for the outbreak of violence and for looting the treasury. The party disbanded, with many of its members reemerging as the Opposition Bloc, the party to which Manafort gravitated — along with his partner, Konstantin Kilimnik, and his lobbyist associate, W. Samuel Patten. *(Like Manafort, Patten has pled guilty to working as an unregistered agent of Ukraine; Kilimnik, who is in Russia, was indicted by Mueller for helping Manafort tamper with witnesses.)*

Paul Manafort is a scoundrel. He was willing to do most anything for money – even offering to burnish Putin's image as he burnished Yanukovych's. But Manafort was never a Kremlin operative working against his own country, except in the fever dreams of the Clinton campaign's Steele dossier. And his crimes notwithstanding, he'd be a free man today if Mrs. Clinton had won. Instead, he'll be sentenced yet again next week. And this time, he'll get slammed.

The Democrats' Phony Stance on Congressional Constitutional Authority

<http://www.fixthisnation.com/conservative-breaking-news/the-democrats-phony-stance-on-congressional-constitutional-authority/>

In voting this week to reject President Donald Trump's declaration of a national emergency at the border, Democrats in the House claimed that they were simply exercising their congressional right of review. The president, said Nancy Pelosi and others, was trying to strip Congress of its power and turn this nation into a dictatorship. He was stealing power from the legislative branch and making it his own. To our chagrin, more than a handful of Republicans shared that view. It remains to be seen whether or not the courts will.

But without getting into the specific legalities of Trump's declaration, it's worth noticing that constitutional awareness is a relatively new phenomenon within the Democratic Party. They certainly didn't seem all that interested in protecting Congress' power of review during the Obama years. We can scratch that up to simple, partisan politics...but it's really worse than that.

You don't often expect to see the Democrats called out on their hypocrisy in the Washington Post, but columnist Philip Bump did a fine job of it on Tuesday. In his piece, he noted that Congress has been in defiance of the National Emergencies Act for decades.

From the Washington Post: *The text of the National Emergencies Act is clear.*

“Not later than six months after a national emergency is declared,” it reads, “and not later than the end of each six-month period thereafter that such emergency continues, each House of Congress shall meet to consider a vote on a concurrent resolution to determine whether that emergency shall be terminated.”

[...]

By our count, using data from the Brennan Center for Justice, for the duration of every national emergency that has ever been declared, Congress is supposed to have conducted 1,094 reviews of those declarations.

More than a thousand reviews. How many have they actually conducted? The Washington Post and the Brennan Center did a deep dive and found that Congress has exercised this authority – at most – *twice* before this week. And even one of those examples was less about passing a resolution and more about sending a letter to the executive branch.

What does this tell us? Well, it tells us that Congress was perfectly happy, for more than forty years, to leave national emergency discretion up to the President. It was only when it was THIS President – only when it was THIS issue – that they decided it was time to stand up for their legislative responsibilities. That shows no loyalty to the Constitution. That shows no particular heroism. That shows blatant partisan recklessness, and a continuation of the Trump Derangement Syndrome that has gripped the Democratic Party for three years.

Mitch McConnell: Don't let this foolishness taint the Senate.

Miller: Congress Has Already Given Trump the Power to Build the Wall

By [Shawn](#) Last Updated Feb 18, 2019 [0](#)

In an interview with “Fox News Sunday,” White House adviser Stephen Miller said President Trump was confident he could withstand any legal or legislative challenges to his declaration of a national emergency. Miller said that while Congress may have refused to appropriate the desired amount of money for the wall in this spending cycle, they had already given the Executive Branch all of the authority Trump needed to acquire the funds.

“They passed a law specifically saying the president could have this authority,” Miller told host Chris Wallace. “It’s in the plain statute. That’s the decision that Congress made, and if people don’t like that they can address it. But to my point that I made, this would not be even an issue if the president was invoking that statute to support some foreign adventure overseas. You and I both know that that presidents for years have engaged in one military adventure after another, not to mention the fact that we do operations to destroy drug fields in foreign lands in Afghanistan or in Colombia. And we can’t even deal with the criminal cartels operating on our border?”

Democrats have outlined their intention to pass a resolution of disapproval against the White House, but supporters of the president say there are enough pro-wall votes in the

Senate to preserve Trump's veto power. As for the courts, President Trump has already said that he's confident his decision will ultimately prevail.

"So the order is signed and I'll sign the final papers as soon as I get into the Oval Office," Trump said Friday. "And we will have a national emergency and we will then be sued, and they will sue us in the 9th Circuit even though it shouldn't be there, and we will possibly get a bad ruling, and then we'll get another bad ruling, and then we'll end up in the Supreme Court and hopefully we'll get a fair shake and we'll win in the Supreme Court just like the ban."

Miller was similarly optimistic about the president's chances of winning in court, telling Wallace that the subject of the order's legality had already been settled by Congress.

"Obviously, the president is going to protect his national emergency declaration," Miller said. "He's going to protect his national emergency declaration — guaranteed. But the fact that they're even talking about a resolution of disapproval shows you this is a statutory issue and a statutory delegation that Congress made."

Miller said the president was doing nothing more than preserving the strength and security of the nation, in line with his constitutional oath.

"The bottom line is this: You cannot conceive of a nation without a strong, secure border," Miller said. "It is fundamental and essential to the idea of sovereignty and national survival to have control over who enters and doesn't enter the country."