

Texas vs Homeland Security

[Texas vs Homeland Security](#)

by [Joseph P. Farrell](#), [Giza Death Star](#)

January 26, 2021

The brewing troubles among American states has cranked up another notch again, according to this story spotted and shared by B. And not surprisingly, Texas is at the center of it.

But first, a little contextual review.

For some time, if you've been watching the American states, there has been a quiet, but growing, "pushback" against federal government overreach. Some American states, for example, have passed "constitutional money" resolutions, recognizing bullion and bullion coins as legal tender. Texas went much further just a couple of years ago, and created its own state bullion depository. More recently, a legislator in South Carolina prepared a bill that that state would recognize all bullion coins as legal tender. Utah followed Texas, and created its own version of a bullion depository and went further, even starting a private bullion backed currency which it promptly started to market... in Hong Kong. Missouri, even more recently, is considering a kind of "preemptive federal nullification" law, forbidding any state official or law enforcement officer from enforcing any federal law in violation of the U.S. constitution, a measure primarily designed to protect 2nd amendment rights, but I strongly also suspect designed to protect first amendment rights. Then, of course, we've seen the story of Texas Governor Abbot trying to woo the NASDAQ exchange's data centers from New York and New Jersey to Texas, along with "other exchanges."

In that context, consider this article shared by B., a letter from the attorney general of Texas to the Department of Homeland Security, or as we like to call it here, the *Reichsicherheitshauptamt*, in response to recent moves by the new federal administration:

[Response to DHS's Unlawful Pause on Removals](#)

Mr. Paxton pulls no punches:

Dear Mr. Pecoske:

Yesterday you ordered a blanket halt on nearly all deportations of illegal aliens. This complete abdication of the Department of Homeland Security's ("DHS") obligation to enforce federal immigration law is unlawful and will seriously and irreparably harm the State of Texas and its citizens.

Specifically, your memorandum directed DHS to impose "an immediate pause on removals of any noncitizen with a final order of removal [subject to limited exceptions] for 100 days to go into effect as soon as practical and no later than January 22, 2021."¹ Should such a directive be legal or left unchallenged, DHS could attempt to renew that directive indefinitely or issue a similar directive for an even longer period of time. That would allow the Biden Administration to grant blanket amnesty to the vast majority of the illegal aliens in this country with the stroke of a pen and without congressional approval.

Border states like Texas pay a particularly high price when the federal government fails to faithfully execute our country's immigration laws. Your attempted halt on almost all deportations would increase the cost to Texas caused by illegal immigration. DHS itself has previously acknowledged that such a "pause on . . . removals" will cause "concrete injuries to Texas." See Agreement between Department of Homeland Security and the State of Texas ("Agreement") § 2.

As a result of that particularized interest in the effective operation of our immigration system, Texas has agreed to cooperate with the federal government in its execution of immigration enforcement. See Agreement. Your attempt to halt deportations violates our Agreement in multiple ways.

...

This letter serves as notice that Texas believes DHS has violated the Agreement; it is not a comprehensive list of the many legal defects in your memorandum. See Agreement § 8. Texas would like to resolve this dispute, but you must immediately rescind the January 20 Memorandum. DHS's failure to provide Texas with pre- implementation notice of the memorandum—combined with its quick implementation of the memorandum—makes waiting impracticable. We require an immediate response or we will seek relief to enjoin your order, as contemplated by the Agreement. Agreement § 6.

Best regards,

Ken Paxton

Attorney General of Texas

And there you have it. The response, I suspect, from fedgov.inc and its "courts" will be to ignore the whole thing. Texas, you'll recall, file suit concerning abnormalities in the last election, which suit was promptly dismissed by the Supreme Tribunal (one hesitates to call it a court any more), on the grounds that the State of Texas had no standing before the tribunal, a move which I predicted it would make. The other response, I suspect, will come in the form of other states joining in the pushback against more overreach. These too, I suspect, regardless of the form they take, will be ignored or shoved aside.

One thing that won't be shoved aside is the continued corporate exodus from states such as New York or California,

an exodus which has already benefitted Texas and Florida.

So what's the bottom line? The pattern is clear: overreach from fedgov.inc, state push back, a federal system no longer even pretending to represent the best interests of the states, or their peoples... you get the idea. And the bottom line is that the United States are in deep trouble (and yes, the return to pre-Lincoln usage is deliberate).

See you on the flip side...