

RACE, IMMIGRATION, AND LIBERTARIANISM

SIMON KREJSA

While shopping recently, I briefly perused Mark Levin's book, *Liberty and Tyranny, A Conservative Manifesto*. Generally, what I read of his chapter on immigration is surprisingly good for a right-wing talk-radio tub-thumper, and surprisingly critical of both legal and illegal immigration. As a rule, mainstream Republicans and conservatives who are good on illegal immigration are usually bad on legal immigration. But, predictably, he appears to put all or most of the blame on left-liberal "statists." If only he were right and all or nearly all "immigration enthusiasts" were democratic and left-liberal "statists." If so, restrictionists might have a chance to prevail. But, alas, the guilty, in varying degrees of culpability, include most of our ruling elites, "talking heads," think-tankers, etc., from the far left to the neoconservative right.

And of all immigrationists, left and right, libertarians are the most fanatical, extreme, obdurate, impervious to facts, delusional and dogmatic. Libertarians are distinct from all other immigrationists in advocating pure "open borders" and the nullification of all current restrictions on "free immigration." Libertarian rhetoric would make one believe that the U.S. is ruled by Pat Buchanan, Tom Tancredo, Peter Brimelow, and other "know-nothings," "nativists," "xenophobes," and "racists." America and its rulers are engaged in a "war against immigrants" because there are restrictions on the number of people who can enter the country legally and whom employers can hire. Thus, deplorably, only 1.5 million aliens "enrich" the country each year. Paradoxically, the presence of 12-20 million illegal aliens is proof of this "war" since, given a ceasefire and end of hostilities, virtually all of these aliens and tens of millions more would have entered the country legally.

Libertarians are defined and blinded by economic monism, absolutist and abstract principles of freedom and individualism, philosophical and empirical reductionism, and ignorance of human nature. They are oblivious to the nature and significance of groups in the real world. And, like all other immigrationists, they refuse or fail to realize

that race is central and paramount to the immigration debate.

LIBERTARIAN PHILOSOPHY AND MASSIVE NON-WHITE IMMIGRATION

One such ideologue is Professor Walter Block of Loyola University in New Orleans, a leading theorist of the libertarian movement.

Libertarianism is a political philosophy; as such, it is a theory of the just use of violence. Here, the legitimate utilization of force is only defensive: one may employ arms only to repel an invasion, i.e., to protect one's person and his property from external physical threat, and for no other reason. According to Murray N. Rothbard:

The libertarian creed rests upon on a central axiom; that no man or group of men may aggress against the person or property of anyone else. This may be called the "non-aggression" axiom." "Aggression" is defined as the initiation of the use or threat of physical violence against the person or property of anyone else. Aggression is therefore synonymous with invasion.

I shall contend that emigration, migration, and immigration all fall under the rubric of "victimless crime." That is, not a one of the three per se violates the non-aggression axiom. Therefore, at least for the libertarian, no restrictions or prohibitions whatsoever should be placed in the path of these essentially peaceful activities.¹

Thus to oppose immigration, even illegal immigration, on libertarian grounds, the aliens en masse would have to be a criminal gang or invading army engaged in aggression against U.S. citizens and their private property. Only then would illegal immigration "constitute, per se, a physical trespass against person and property or a threat thereof."

Block further explains his absolutist position: "Before considering the specifics, let us clear the decks of one possible misconception: that the libertarian can be 'moderate' on this question, advocating fully

¹ Walter Block, "A libertarian Case For Free Immigration," *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 13(2) (Summer 1998, 167-186), p. 168.

opening the borders at some times, completely closing them on other occasions, and leaving them slightly ajar if it seems warranted." Then he quotes William F. Buckley when he was still sharp and under the influence of Peter Brimelow or at least John O'Sullivan:

At various points in history we have opened, and then gently closed, our borders, pending economic and social assimilation. If there is dogged unemployment, there is no manifest need for more labor. If pockets of immigrants are resisting the assimilation that over generations has been the solvent of American citizenship, then energies should go to accosting multiculturalism, rather than encouraging its increase.²

Block is compelled to reject such "plain-spoken reasoning" on libertarian grounds:

Such a position, whatever its merits on other grounds, is simply not available to the libertarian, who requires consistency with Rothbard's non-aggression axiom. Pragmatic matters such as assimilation can form no part of the libertarian world view. The only issue is: do emigration, migration, and immigration constitute, per se, a physical trespass against person and property or a threat thereof? If so, then libertarians must oppose them totally; if not, they must oppose any and all limits to them. There does not appear to be any middle ground or compromise position consistent with libertarianism.³

So libertarian support for open borders precludes any kind of "moderation" that is flexible or takes into account other interests of other members of the society or the society as a whole, such as concerns that immigration would lead to poverty, unemployment, overcrowding, crime, violence, Balkanization, and racial strife. Absolute support for open borders is imperative even if there is no urgent need for labor because of high rates of joblessness or even if the consequences are negative or even catastrophic and will ultimately destroy the historic American nation and people.

² William F. Buckley, "Immigration Advocates Resist Reasoning," *Conservative Chronicle* (February 12, 1997).

³ Walter Block, "A libertarian Case For Free Immigration."

HOPPE THE HERETIC

To Walter Block and virtually all pure libertarians, individual freedom and the sanctity of private property demand both free trade and open borders. Writes Peter Brimelow: "The most obviously troubling problem from a libertarian perspective is the notion that support for free trade necessitates support for free immigration."⁴

Hans-Hermann Hoppe is an "anarcho-capitalist" who wants to abolish the state but disagrees with Block and the libertarian party-line on massive non-White immigration. But even those few libertarians who are restrictionists must defend and rationalize their heretical position, exclusively or essentially, on libertarian grounds.

So how does one argue from a libertarian perspective that support for free trade (a given for libertarians) doesn't necessitate support for free immigration? Peter Brimelow agrees with Hoppe: "What about property that is owned by the government, i.e, most of the country? There is a libertarian argument that no-one, even foreigners, can be forbidden access to that. But ... Hoppe has countered that these public goods are actually held in common by taxpaying citizens, hence a species of private property. ... To my mind, this is conclusive."⁵

Thus immigration is "forced integration" if a majority of taxpayers who collectively own public property are opposed to such a trespass on and invasion of what, according to Hoppe and Brimelow, is a "species of private property."

The reply to Hoppe by Anthony Gregory and Block⁶ is critiqued by Peter Brimelow. He politely dismisses their reply as "ineffective" and calls attention to their claim that "another anomaly for the Hoppe position surfaces when we consider migration between cities and states within the U.S. If migration from, say, Norway or Brazil to the U.S. constitutes an unwarranted 'forced integration,' then why does not movement of people from, say, Texas to Ohio fall under the same rubric?"

In the peculiar world inhabited by Gregory and Block and other libertarian theorists, borders of all kinds are lines on a map and thus

⁴ Peter Brimelow, "'Immigration is the Viagra of the State' – A Libertarian Case Against Immigration," VDARE.com., June 4, 2008.

http://www.vdare.com/pb/080604_immigration.htm

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Anthony Gregory and Walter Block, "On Immigration: Reply to Hoppe," *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 21(3) (Fall 2007, 25-42).

arbitrary and meaningless. Ergo, an invasion of millions of illegal aliens moving from Mexico to Texas is on a par with U.S. citizens moving from Texas to Ohio, or even from one city in Ohio to another, or even from one neighborhood in a city to another. Once again, the trenchantly commonsensical Brimelow: "The answer, of course, is that Texans and Ohioans are Americans. But Walter, like many libertarians, simply does not recognize the reality, and the necessity, of the national community."

Less absurdly, Gregory and Block note that imported goods are transported by vehicles that use roads and involve other kinds of public property that are owned by taxpayers collectively. So Hoppe, to be consistent, should also oppose free trade if a majority of taxpayers oppose it.

The devastatingly obvious and simple answer to the libertarian dogma that support for free trade necessitates support for free immigration is that imported goods are not people. "Their arrival in a society is not [willingly] subsidized by the taxpayer. Imported goods do not have implications for future transfer payments, much less freedom of speech. And, of course, imported goods don't vote."⁷

It's interesting that given Hoppe's reasoning, American citizens who don't pay taxes would have no right or moral authority to oppose free immigration and open borders even if they were far more adversely affected than most taxpaying citizens. Moreover, they would have no right to use public libraries and so forth.

It should also be noted that imported goods don't commit aggravated assaults, robberies, rapes, murders, vandalism, or home invasions. They don't belong to gangs that engage in drug-trafficking and other felonies. They don't inundate and overburden hospitals, schools, welfare bureaucracies, courts, and prisons. They don't vitiate the quality of life in areas where they settle. They don't belong to La Raza and other militant anti-White organizations. They don't wave Mexican flags and spew anti-American slogans at "Reconquista" rallies. They don't advocate free immigration, amnesty for illegal aliens, racial quotas, indulgence for non-White criminals, the redistribution of wealth from Whites to non-Whites, "hate speech" laws, "hate crime" laws, censorship of "racist," nativist, and xenophobic comments. They don't exacerbate the left-liberal zeitgeist of multiculturalism, political cor-

⁷ Brimelow, "Immigration is the Viagra of the State" — A Libertarian Case Against Immigration."

rectness, the fetish of diversity, the cancer of White guilt, masochism, self-loathing, perpetual atonement and surrender to aggrieved minorities.

Finally, whether the effects of free trade are largely positive or negative for most Americans (as opposed to the business class exclusively) and whether one agrees with Pat Buchanan or with his infinitely more numerous establishment critics, the fact is that free trade won't result in the transformation of the United States into a non-White-majority country of 400 and then 500 and then 600 million people in which European Americans are an increasingly dispossessed and persecuted minority.

WHAT IF WELFARE WAS ABOLISHED AND ALMOST EVERYTHING PRIVATIZED?

Peter Brimelow interviewed Milton Friedman each year when he worked for *Forbes*: "In one of these interviews, Friedman said something that has been much quoted. He criticized the *Wall Street Journal*. ... and said 'They've just got an *idée fixe* about immigration: 'It's just obvious you can't have free immigration and a welfare state'."⁸

The most pernicious consequence of massive non-White immigration is not the expansion of the welfare state but the destruction of the historic American nation and people. What would be more ruinous for White Americans: the expansion of welfare and an end to non-White immigration, or the abolition of all forms of welfare and a policy of free immigration?

Let's imagine a U.S. ruled by libertarians who abolished all forms of welfare and the minimum wage and opened our borders to anyone who wanted to emigrate from anywhere in the world. Thomas Friedman, a Jewish liberal and immigration enthusiast, quotes the comedian Larry Miller in the *Weekly Standard*: "The plain fact is that our country has ... always been and always will be the greatest beacon of freedom, charity, opportunity, and affection in history. If you need proof, open all the borders on Earth and see what happens. In about half a day, the entire world would be a ghost town, and the United States would look like one giant line to see *The Producers*."⁹

Ignoring the grotesquely rhetorical and hyperbolic declaration of

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Quoted in Thomas L. Friedman, *Longitudes and Attitudes* (New York: First Anchor Books, 2003), 338.

"American exceptionalism," what would happen if the US adopted open borders and got rid of all forms of taxpayer-supported social welfare? With the abolition of the minimum wage and government assistance, there would likely be tens of millions of people, jobless or working for pennies an hour, living in homeless shelters and tent-cities or sharing old houses and apartments. Unable to find decent jobs and denied the option to leech off women who receive welfare benefits, untold millions of young males would turn to crime to make money.

Even without government assistance, Third-World aliens who couldn't find jobs would still have it much better in the United States, given private charities, than in the countries from which they emigrated. Think of the billions or tens of billions of dollars that rich and affluent left-liberals from the Big Apple to Tinsel Town would give to charities for non-White immigrants. Churches would also donate billions if not tens of billions to charities. So indigent and jobless aliens would eat and live better in homeless shelters or even "tent cities" supported by private charity than in the countries whose manifold horrors and miseries they escaped by moving to America. All this would be supported by the business class, motivated by a desire to sustain an endless supply of cheap and cheaper labor.

IMMIGRATION, RACE, AND "BIG GOVERNMENT"

But this is all hypothetical, of course, since the welfare state will never be abolished. Indeed, as Peter Brimelow notes, immigration is the "Viagra of the state."

But what I would suggest here is that the immigration influx of the late twentieth century into the U.S. and the West in general has been the Viagra of the state. It has reinvigorated the state, when it was otherwise losing its powers because of the collapse of socialism and the triumph of classical liberalism. It's an aspect of what should be called neosocialism — the statist's argument for government control of society, not in the interests of efficiency — not because government can prevent another Great Depression, etc. — but in the interests of equity, rooting out discrimination, racism and so on. ... Immigrants, above all immigrants who are racially and culturally distinct from the host population, are walking advertisements for social workers and government programs and the regulation of political speech —

that is to say, the repression of the entirely natural objections of the host population.¹⁰

Thus in the future, barring a miracle, the state will be even more potent given the Viagra of Third-World immigration so ardently supported by anti-statist libertarians. Our lunatic immigration policies, which aren't nearly insane enough for libertarians, will ultimately create a non-White majority country — an increasingly impoverished, violent and anarchic society with an ever-increasing demand for big government: more welfare, more social workers, more public education, more government programs, more laws, more police, courts, judges, jails and prisons, more taxes to pay for all this, more redistribution of wealth from Whites to non-Whites. Such a society without a coercive and intrusive state would descend into a hellish state of anarchy, violence, and race war. From a race-realist viewpoint, the problem is not so much an expansion of government per se as a result of massive non-White immigration, but government as a vehicle of non-White empowerment, ascendancy, domination, and ultimately vengeance.

The ultimate irony and paradox is that only the exigent use of "big government" in the present will prevent the far worse and wholly avoidable triumph of much bigger government in the future. Only government action to prevent the mutation of the United States into a non-White-majority country will preclude the eventual utilization of force by a non-White majority government as an instrument of anti-White oppression and revanchism. But for this to occur, immigration restrictionists and race-realists would have to seize control of the government — not likely in the foreseeable future.

A REDUCTIONIST AND INCOMPLETE PHILOSOPHY

Why can't libertarians, with some rare exceptions, see all this? The reason is that libertarianism, if pursued to its utopian extreme, is a reductionist and incomplete philosophy — an ideology divorced from reality and contrary to human nature. Even a libertarian sympathizer and advocate of free markets and limited government like Peter Brimelow is sharply critical of libertarian reductionism: "There is a reason there are no families in Ayn Rand's novels. It's because libertar-

¹⁰ Brimelow, "Immigration is the Viagra of the State" — A Libertarian Case Against Immigration."

ianism is too often an incomplete philosophy. It takes little or no account of the non-atomistic aspect of human experience, of human groups, their dynamics and differences."¹¹

Both in addition to and as a result of this propensity to take "little or no account of the non-atomistic aspect of human experience, of human groups, their dynamics and differences," the racial views of most libertarians and nearly all left-libertarians, are identical to those of left-liberals: race is irrelevant, insignificant, an artificial "social construct." To generalize about racial groups is noxious stereotyping, to criticize non-Whites and to tell the truth about Black and Latino intelligence and crime, Black-on-White violence, etc., is *ipso facto* "racist."

Combined with their hatred of the state as inherently malignant, this explains the perversity of their position on massive non-White immigration. Most critically, it explains their refusal or failure to see that race matters — that race is central to the issue of immigration, that racial differences and the resulting conflicts are by far the single most catastrophic effect of massive Third-World immigration, and would be far more disastrous under a libertarian regime of "open borders" and free immigration. And, of course, it prevents them from seeing how the state will be used by a non-White majority, especially Jews, Blacks and Latinos as an instrument of anti-White oppression and revanchism.

GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS

In discussing race and immigration, it's imperative to distinguish between groups and individuals. By focusing exclusively on individuals and their rights from an abstract perspective, libertarians fail to see the reality of between-group conflict. In respect to massive non-White immigration, the actual characteristics of the group gave huge real-world implications. The paramount question is whether the overall impact of an immigrant group collectively is positive or negative. Individual exceptions don't disprove what is true generally — that the collective influence of millions or tens of millions of individuals is largely deleterious.

The foremost example is Latino immigration, particularly Mexican immigration, legal and illegal. The United States is not importing tens of millions of Latino individuals, atomistic and deracinated. America is importing tens of millions of Mexicans and, consequently, the na-

¹¹ *Ibid.*

tion and culture and history of Mexico. And, most importantly, one is importing tens of millions of Mestizos and pure Amerindians, non-White aliens who carry with them the historical, cultural, political, and racial characteristics of Mexico. Most critically, one cannot understand Mexicans apart from the centrality and significance of race.

Mestizos and Indians have a culture distinct from that of the White population descended from Spaniards. Mexican history has always been driven by race. The destruction of the Aztec Empire, the Mexican-American war of the 1840s, the bracero program of the 1950s, and the present gross racial divisions of wealth and power between the Spanish minority and the mestizo/Amerindian majority all imply the importance of racial conflict as central to Mexican history.

The US is importing a group of people with grievances, not only against the United States but also against European Americans. Mexican immigrants don't remember the Mexican-American war and the loss of the Southwest as atomistic and deracinated individuals but as Mexicans. Their grievances are racial grievances.

Also significant and largely ineradicable are behavioral differences between Whites and mestizos/Amerindians in respect to violence and criminality, as well as average intelligence. The US is importing tens of millions of individuals who on average have an IQ of 89-90, a crime rate 3-4 times greater than that of Whites, and are 19 times more likely to belong to a gang than America's historic European population.

If virtually all Mexicans were of pure Spanish descent, Mexico would be like Spain, not a Third-World but a European country of 40-50 million people, and probably wealthier than Spain given its proximity to the United States. And there would be no invasion of tens of millions of Mexican immigrants, legal and illegal, and all that this entails. If Mexico were 85-90% White, predominantly Spanish but also with many Italians, Germans, Poles, Jews, etc., Mexico would be like Argentina, a European country that was as White as the U.S. in 1960 and far whiter than today's America.

An invasion of tens of millions of pure Spaniards, much less 30-40 million Canadians of English, Irish, French, German, Scotch-Irish descent, would not result in significant increases in violence and criminality, a new underclass to rival that of Blacks, or a politics of racial vengeance and "Reconquista."

Similarly, according to libertarians immigrants from the Middle-East and North Africa should be thought of as atomistic and deracinated individuals who, incidentally, happen to be Muslims. The reality

is that first and foremost, they are Muslims with hostile attitudes to Europeans, Christianity, and Western Civilization. Most insanely, we are inviting armies of terrorists and potential terrorists like the 9-11 mass-murderers and those who've committed other atrocities in Europe and the United States. But libertarians wouldn't even place any limits on Muslim immigration.

HYPOTHETICALLY, IN WHICH NATION WOULD YOU PREFER TO LIVE?

In which society would you prefer to live: a libertarian society with the racial composition of Brazil, Haiti, Nigeria, or Pakistan or a social democratic United Kingdom, France, Germany, Norway, Denmark, Australia, or Canada with a predominantly European population.

The same goes for pro-immigration Christians, especially conservative traditionalists: Would you rather live in a post-Christian but 95% White Denmark or Norway or Canada in which most people are atheists or a Christian Mexico or Nigeria or South Africa?

Similarly, I'd like to ask this question of those who insist that their opposition to massive non-White immigration has nothing to do with race and everything to do overpopulation and its baneful effects. In which society would you prefer to live: a hypothetical America of 100-200 million that was 70-80% Black and mestizo and pure Amerindian and 10-20% White; or a hypothetical America of 400-500 million people that was 100% European or 90% European and 10% North Asian?

If those asked would prefer to live in White nations and societies that don't adhere to their ideological, religious, philosophical, and environmentalist ideals, then they obviously believe that race in general is more important than population density, ideology, religion, economics, and the environment.

Unless they were rich and perhaps not even then (e.g. affluent Whites in South Africa), any minimally sane White person would prefer to live in a social democratic welfare state and that was 90-100% White than in a libertarian country ruled by Blacks and/or mestizos-Amerindians. Virtually all Whites would enjoy a superior quality of life and a higher standard of living even in White countries anathema to libertarians and economic conservatives. Most crucially, despite the evils of welfare and socialism, they would be far less likely to be victims of crime.

SECESSION TO CREATE A BASTION OF WHITENESS?

The destruction of White America is inevitable given the suicidal immigration policies of which Libertarians are dogmatic advocates. The only hope for Whites is a separate nation, conceivably in the Pacific Northwest. Perhaps another and smaller White country could be founded in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine.

I doubt that this will happen. And, practically, I don't know how it could or would be actualized. And I doubt that I'll be alive to take part and move there. But let's assume, for the sake of argument, that such a nation is created.

If so, will millions of libertarians and other free marketeers, globalists and "turbo-capitalists" migrate to this last bastion of Whiteness in North America to escape the non-White-majority dystopia that they and their fellow immigration enthusiasts created? And so, too, with neoconservatives, liberals, even leftists. And once ensconced in this haven of White survival and Western Civilization, will they revert to form and begin to call for open borders? If so, the founders should make them sign an oath that they won't do to this nation what they did to what was once called the United States. And if they violate this agreement, they should be expelled to the anti-White Hell they created. Only then will Whites have a livable society.

Simon Krejsa is the pen name of a free-lance writer living in Wisconsin.