

# Can Freedom Survive Mass Immigration?

JOHN VINSON

When President Trump modestly proposed a temporary ban on refugees from countries believed to harbor terrorists in order to ensure proper vetting, the corporate media erupted with hysteria. That, they sputtered and raged, was “un-American” and an assault on our country’s values. Amid this outrage, more than a few thinking people wondered what was un-American about taking minimal steps to protect the safety of American citizens.

The media express the viewpoint of our economic, social, and political elites, which seems to be that any restraint on mass immigration is an affront to our national values — which raises the question as to what they think those are. Evidently this means that “American values” require America to open her borders to all huddled masses from abroad—irrespective of what mere citizens want. Indeed, as many of these elites seem to think of themselves as citizens of the world, American citizenship and the interests of the U.S. are not matters they value too highly. From a patriotic perspective, their values are patently un-American.

And from that same patriotic viewpoint, one might inquire as to what are true American values and principles. Probably the crown gem of both is our Bill of Rights, the first ten amendments to our Constitution. It affirms our commitment to a free society for American citizens and enumerates specific provisions to safeguard that freedom.

Probably the most fundamental of those liberties is freedom of speech, outlined in the first amendment. The right of citizens to speak freely is truly the basis of all self-government. And we should value it all the more as it is becoming increasingly rare in much of the so-called “Free World.” In Europe and Canada, any speech that censorious elites hate is called “hate speech” and is

outlawed. In those places, even mild criticism of immigration and multiculturalism can put the speaker at risk of a heavy fine or even a jail term. This applies to political leaders as well as ordinary people. One example is Dutch politician Geert Wilders, who has faced prosecution for suggesting that massive Islamic immigration is not beneficial to his homeland.



Fortunately here in America we don’t have such assaults on liberty, but we shouldn’t take this blessing for granted. For some time our well-heeled inquisitors of “political correctness” have set their sights on ways to neutralize the first amendment and use the force of law to silence dissent. One of the arguments they have crafted is that unmanaged speech is a threat to social harmony.

To the extent this is true, it particularly applies to a diverse society where a lack of common culture and identity puts groups on edge against one another and magnifies perceived offenses. That is precisely the kind of society mass immigration is creating. Thus it is probably no coincidence that the would-be speech police want to put criticism of immigration and its consequences off limits. They want a situation where they can offer their censorship as a solution.

Many immigrant groups probably wouldn’t mind because they come from countries with little tradi-

---

*John Vinson is president of the American Immigration Control Foundation.*

tion of free expression, and some like Muslims would avidly embrace restraint on any commentary they don't like. Reducing immigration could promote assimilation to the mainstream of genuine American values, but it would not be in the interests of the free speech haters.

And the suppression of freedom would not stop there. As society becomes more divided and chaotic, a suppression of all liberties would become palatable to many people, an outcome elitist totalitarians would be more than happy to provide.

The elites have two factions. On the right are business and financial interests, and on the left are radical leftists. This seemingly odd alliance recalls the Hitler-Stalin pact. Perhaps in the future these two groups will go against one another as the aforementioned dictators did, but for the time being they are united by common goals. Foremost among these is dismantling nations to promote the agenda of globalism.

The economic interests don't like national borders and sovereignty because they see them as impediments to their limitless greed for gain, and the leftists traditionally have opposed patriotism because it stands as an obstacle to their visions of remaking societies. One individual who combines both groups in his person is the multi-billionaire currency speculator George Soros.

Over the years this leftist plutocrat has spent a considerable share of his ill-gotten gains to undermine national sovereignty around the globe. One of his favorite causes is virtually unrestricted migration.

Neither of these sides cares anything for the allegiances and cultures that citizens of nations want to protect. For the sake of "economic efficiency" the economic faction wants a humanity stripped of all distinctions to become interchangeable cogs of the great international commerce machine. Leftists want docile uniform humans as blocks and bricks for their social engineering projects.

This indifference to the loyalties and aspirations of ordinary citizens certainly reveals their totalitarian mentality, which bodes ill for the future of our freedoms. When the elites through their media trumpet that "diversity is our strength," they are most certainly telling the truth. What they don't mention is that the "our" they reference is themselves and not the rest of us.

The elites cover their evil agenda with moralistic platitudes about tolerance and openness. But tolerance will be the last thing their subjects will enjoy if their agenda prevails. The people of a free country have the right to determine what kind of society they want to have. If they value liberty, they should understand that it cannot survive unending waves of mass immigration. ■

## Is the United States a 'Failed State?'

**K**rittivas Mukherjee, writing in the *Hindustan Times* of New Delhi, India, about the Muslim attack on a restaurant in Bangladesh, observed:

**In layman's terms, a failing or failed state is categorized by what they do not or cannot do. Such states do not control their borders, allowing non-state actors to move in and out without trouble. Parts of such states can be under the control of rebels and warlords.... With every murder, every attack, the country [Bangladesh] is edging towards levels of intolerance and lawlessness where the line between a vibrant, prosperous country and a failed state gets blurred.**

**[Krittivas Mukherjee, "Dhaka restaurant siege: How long before Bangladesh becomes a failed state?" *Hindustan Times*, July 2, 2016]**

**Just ask yourself: how much does this definition fit the United States today? Until Donald Trump was sworn in as president, the federal government refused to safeguard our borders. Gangs control large sectors of our metropolitan areas. Former President Barack Obama has said that maintaining our nation's borders is "not who we are."**

**As President Ronald Reagan reminded us, "The United States has lost control of our borders, and no nation can do that and survive." ■**

**[Presidential Press Conference, *Washington Post*, June 15, 1984]**

**—Wayne Lutton**