

Non-citizen Voters in California

by Miles Mathis

October 23, 2026

Possibly the biggest submerged story this week is the Justice Department suing California over its refusal to keep illegals from voting, losing the suit to a Democrat-appointed judge, the Supreme Court pausing that decision, etc.

My first reaction to this was the same as it has been all along, on all questions of this nature: wondering if a lawsuit is really the logical action here for the Feds. Can't anyone enforce any laws at any level without ten-year lawsuits first? It seems like just another way to gum up the system, making sure nothing ever gets done. Plus, if California will ignore the Feds, wouldn't it just ignore the courts?

None of it makes any sense, as usual. Starting with this, [from an article today](#):

In a 78-page decision, Judge Sparkle Sooknanan—a Biden-appointee—said the DOJ had downplayed the risk that its attempts to combat voter fraud could disenfranchise US citizens. “The challenged policy represents the federal government’s attempt to decide who gets to vote. But Congress has left that authority where our Constitution has always placed it: with the states,” she wrote.

Sounds like a runaround to me. More baloney created just for the papers. Why? Our first clue is that “78-page decision”. Why would it take 78 pages to decide this, or any other question? At least it isn't 81 pages or 47 or 33, but it still reeks of fiction. Our second clue is that name. Are we really supposed to believe someone/something named Sparkle Sooknanan got itself elected/appointed to be a judge?

I am not a fan of the DoJ, under Trump or under anyone, but why would they need to downplay the risk of disenfranchising US citizens? They are targeting non-US citizens, and no one is claiming they aren't. To dismiss on that basis, the lawyers for California or the judge would have to show those targeted were actually citizens, but there is no report of that, the judge diverting immediately into manufactured issues.

Plus, that decision is false on the face of it. One, the Constitution does not allow States to let non-citizens vote if they want to, and neither does any other law of Congress. Two, the Constitution is a federal document, so the question was initially decided by the Feds, *not the States*. Three, Congress is also federal, so this Sparkle Sooknanan—supposing she exists, and supposing she is a she (this is California, after all)—has just contradicted herself twice in two sentences. Four, we have this:

Since 1997, the [Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996](#) has prohibited non-citizens from voting in *federal* elections, with the threat of fines, imprisonment, inadmissibility and deportation.[\[6\]](#)[\[7\]](#)[\[8\]](#)

That is a Federal law, passed by the US Congress. Furthermore, [zero States allow non-citizens to vote](#) in State elections, according to laws on the books since 1926. Are we supposed to believe Judge

Sooknanan doesn't know that?

Five, if Congress didn't give the Feds the right to decide this or police it, they certainly didn't give it to the courts. The courts have no way to enforce anything.

That's really the question, isn't it: if the States decide to break a law, who polices them? Who enforces the laws against the States? If not the Justice Department, then who?

The analogy and precedent, of course, is the Civil Rights cases of the 1950s and 60s, where some southern States decided to ignore laws against segregation. The Feds were finally forced to send in troops to enforce the laws. I would assume most liberals were and are in favor of that, so they can't be Constitutionally opposed to policing by the Feds, to keep rogue States in line. And yes, I would say we can define States who allow non-citizens to vote as rogue States. I am a liberal and living in California, but I would say that California under Newsom is definitely a rogue State in this regard and many others. The place is corrupt beyond all imagining, especially in Sacramento and Socal. Which is not to say the Red States are any better, but that is another question. I will leave it at this: the Red states are not being accused of letting illegals vote to pad their numbers. Republicans are not claiming it should be allowed, but Democrats ARE.

I know what the reverse argument is: Trump's DOJ can't be trusted to police this because they are also corrupt, and may be targeting specific counties in California for their own purposes. That's also true, but it doesn't mean California *isn't* illegally allowing non-citizens to vote. They are and some party should force them to stop. If the court were to be of any use here, it would be to limit Donald and his DOJ to that stated purpose. In a rational universe, you would have expected this judge to rule on whether these voters on these lists **were or were not citizens** and whether DOJ pulled these voters equally out of all counties, Red and Blue, and so on. She should have ruled on the question at hand, not invented some convoluted and contradictory larger issue, burying it in a 78-page pile of chicken feathers.

Which leads me back to where I started: this is all so illogical, and such a weak feint from the Feds, that I have to think it is the usual bluff. I don't think Trump really wants to stop illegals from voting, but he has to pretend to in order to appeal to his conservative base. I think both parties want things to be like they are, otherwise they wouldn't be this way. As I have reminded you before, things never reverse under Republican administrations, they just continue on as before, with some different yakking to cover it. The US, like Europe, continues to drop its borders, dooming its original populations. So whether or not you believe in replacement theory is beside the point: populations ARE being quickly transformed whether you believe it or not, and whether you are Red or Blue has nothing to do with it. It isn't a matter of belief, it is a matter of numbers, and no one contests that populations are changing very quickly.

As a liberal, I am supposed to think that is a good thing. What is wrong with the US and Europe becoming multiracial bazaars? Melting pots? If the previously European (white) make-up of both places dies out, who cares? Whites are no better, so who cares?

Well, Matt Walsh and others are making the argument whites really *are* better, so I don't need to go there. I will make a different argument, as usual, since that is my function, and since that one is generally drowned out by modern propaganda coming from the government itself. I don't need to argue whites are better to make this work.

It goes like this: Is China a melting pot? Is India a melting pot? Is Nigeria a melting pot? Is Indonesia a melting pot? Not really. Yes, those places show a lot of local variation, with different tribes and dialects and so on, but they are not melting pots in the way the US or Europe have become melting pots. China is not experiencing a huge influx of whites or blacks or Hispanics. Neither is India. India is not experiencing a huge influx of Chinese or Russians or Hispanics. Nigeria is not experiencing a huge influx of Asians or whites or Hispanics. There has been some increased stirring worldwide in the past two centuries, but nothing like we are seeing in the US and Europe now. So the question is, why have the US and Europe been targeted like nowhere else in the past 50 years? This has happened in one lifetime, so it has to look very strange.

You will say they haven't been targeted by nefarious overlords, as I imply, they have only been targeted by stressed foreign populations, drawn to the wealth of the US and Europe. But although the second part is obviously true, it has always been true. These people were always drawn to the richer nations, as you would expect, but in the past they were mostly kept out. The US gladly took some, since we needed the people, but Europe already had high populations and didn't really need them. Both the US and Europe now have high populations and don't need more people, especially not poor people. So why are they letting in more and more, if it isn't a purposeful replacement? Given that whites *are* being replaced, you can't blame us for thinking we are being replaced, can you? Given that the middle class is being replaced by the lower class, or pushed down into it, you can't blame us for thinking it is happening, can you? We would have to be stupid to believe otherwise.

That doesn't imply whites are better, it just implies we aren't any worse. We have a right to our places like anyone else does. Just like China doesn't want its culture replaced by whites or blacks or Indians or anyone else, and India wants to keep its traditions, Europeans naturally want to keep theirs. The Germans and French have been fighting to keep their traditions for centuries, to make sure Germany didn't become French and France didn't become German and so on, so you can't really blame them for not wanting to lose their traditions to Somalia or Pakistan or anywhere else. The French and Germans were both white, probably indistinguishable to Somalis to Pakistanis, so their pride wasn't originally about being white, it was about protecting their local identity and traditions, which were understandably important to them. Traditions that couldn't survive in a boiling melting pot.

There is also this to think about: a large portion of the European economies is tourism. What is this tourism based on? It is based on local white European tradition: local art, customs, architecture, and music. Tourists—even white American tourists like me—go to Germany to see people being German, drinking their German beers in their German architecture surrounded by their German art and music and so on. Japanese and Russian tourists go to Italy to see Italian art and architecture and history. They don't go to Rome see the Colosseum torn down and replaced by a melting-pot bazaar of multicultures. They go to England to see English museums and churches and hedgerows and old stone fences and castles. They don't go to see Arabs and Moroccans. If they want to see Arabs and Moroccans they go to Arabia or Morocco. My point being not that there shouldn't be any Arabs or Africans in Europe, but that if current trends continue, with White culture being denigrated and decimated, with churches torn or burned down, and museums no doubt next, the entire tourist trade in Europe will be destroyed, and with it a sizable portion of their economies.

The other side will again say, so what? Destroy the past. Life is for the living. European history is a history of empire and oppression and nobody cares anymore if it dies.

But that doesn't explain the tourism, does it? If nobody cares and European civilization deserves the trash heap, why is Europe the tourist destination of the world? Those millions of tourists from all over

the world apparently *do* care about that culture, otherwise they would not spend all that time and money going to experience it. And we must assume they care because—despite the politics or economies that created it—it is beautiful. So if the Europeans, of whatever color or background, were smart, they would protect those traditions and those monuments and that architecture and that art and that history and that culture as their greatest possession. **They would do all they could to keep it just as it was.**

Which requires a brief pause. As I write about this, I keep thinking of Notre Dame. You might say the Parisians do value it, since they just spent millions rebuilding it. Yes, but unfortunately those in charge used it as an excuse to update it and overclean it, which was a mistake. It may have even been burned on purpose, to allow for that.* Those old churches should never be updated, since we don't want them to be up-to-date. We love them for being beautifully outdated. See Chartres Cathedral, as perhaps the greatest surviving example of dark and dirt. Notre Dame should only have been returned as much as possible to its prior state, or the damage used as an excuse to return it to an even more beautiful *former* state, jettisoning all modern modifications. That is the opposite of what was done. The shiny new Notre Dame is a travesty to all artistic eyes.** Tourists coming to Paris want to see the old Notre Dame, not this new monstrosity. Anyone with taste must be disappointed. So it is actually bad for tourism.



Note the glitzy fake chandeliers, instead of the rows of old votive candles.

[I have written about this previously](#), applying that theory to all of Paris rather than just Notre Dame, if you are interested.

You will say it is too late regardless, what's done is done regarding Notre Dame. No. It could easily be returned to any former state, as long as we have pictures of how it was. They can make new picture frames that look almost exactly like old picture frames, by antiquing them. You use the old materials and then add a patina, etc. I have done it. You could do the same thing for most of what was lost at Notre Dame, not including Old Master paintings and sculpture. However, most sculpture is bronze, stone, or terracotta, which survives a fire unless it has something fall on it. I believe the loss was

minimal there. But they didn't even try to do that at Notre Dame, modernizing the interior in horrible ways.

I believe some of this will soon be reversed. They will eventually figure out I am right here and reverse a lot of these decisions. You will say they can't make it darker and dirtier, but they actually can, and should. And if they don't, God will, given time. Where man is shallow, God is deep, and all returns to him.

In my opinion, Europe needs to be protected more and restored less. The old things need to remain old, if for no other reason than that is what people are coming to see. No one wants to see a restored Roman Forum or a rebuilt Stonehenge. Save that for Las Vegas.

But back to the US. If I am right and Trump is just running another feint, with the Phoenicians behind both parties planning to replace the middle class with an imported slave population, that is another reason to move up the revolution to tomorrow. One of my readers from England asked me today if he needed to stockpile food for a week and prepare for war, as he is being told by the news. I told him no, that was just more fear porn being used to justify another increase in “defense” spending. But now I add that you don't need a stockpile if you are prepping for a revolution that starts tomorrow. In a revolution, it will be the Phoenicians shut in, not you. They need a stockpile, but you don't. And they know that: why do you think they have built all the bunkers? If they believed their own bluffs, they wouldn't need bunkers, would they?

I feel I can't end without reminding you one more time: your revolution in the US or Europe is not against the immigrants, of any color, or your fellow citizens of any color. It is against the Phoenicians pushing this chaos for a century, that is to say the governors. They will try to get you fighting the immigrants or your neighbors or your wives or your children or your parents, but don't fall for it. You want a revolution, not a civil war. There is a big difference.

*Don't believe me? [Go here](#) and notice that they admit

As of July 26, a powerful milestone has been reached in the restoration of Notre-Dame: all 16 copper statues that once encircled the base of the spire are now back in place.

The statues, which were first installed in 1861, include the 12 apostles and the symbolic figures of the four evangelists: the angel (Matthew), lion (Mark), bull (Luke), and eagle (John). The statues now once again face outward in groups of four, encircling the 300-foot-high spire.

Their restoration was made possible in part thanks to the early support of major French and American sponsors, who contributed **even before the 2019 fire. Miraculously, the statues had been removed just days before the fire**, sparing them from damage or destruction.

Miracle? Or plan?

And then there's [this](#):

In 2015, a tech-savvy art historian named Andrew Tallon used lasers to create detailed 3-D scans of the cathedral (among other historic buildings) and found, for one thing, that its builders took shortcuts. The western end of the cathedral, Tallon told National Geographic in 2015, “is a total mess...a train wreck.” The interior columns don't line up and “neither do some of the aisles,” *National Geographic* reported.

Convenient they were able to correct that just four years later, raising millions to do it. Also amazing that

National Geographic was able to report that just in time to prepare you for the update. But again, that couldn't have been planned, right?

Also suspicious that almost none of the paintings or sculptures were damaged. With the entire roof and spire coming down from very high, along with huge bells, everything beneath should have been crushed. But all of it was said to have been saved during, or just before, the fire. Impossible to believe.

****[For example](#),**

The New Design: Six **contemporary** Pentecost-themed stained-glass windows designed by French artist Claire Tabouret and fabricated at Atelier Simon-Marq are scheduled for installation in late 2026.

The Historic Windows: The existing monochrome geometric windows were created in the mid-19th century by renowned architect Eugène Viollet-le-Duc and Jean-Baptiste Lassus. They survived the April 2019 fire completely intact.

Before the window debate, critics also pushed back against broader post-fire interior modernization proposals (dubbed by some detractors as an attempt to "Disneyfy" the cathedral), such as **modern lighting, new contemporary art installations, and the use of chemical cleaning pastes** on historic interior stone walls.

This not only turned the walls an unnatural and antiseptic bright white, it was toxic, due to the latex, ammonia, and EDTA used.

As part of a “tourist friendly” makeover, confessional boxes, altars and classical sculptures were replaced with modern art murals and new light and sound effects designed to create “emotional spaces”, according to a report in the Daily Telegraph.

Also controversial has been that a large part of the money to restore has come from billionaires, who likely bought undue influence, explaining the tacky decisions made.

And don't forget the golden rooster on top, another modern atrocity. What blind artist designed that?

