

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

Contents

World Immigration patterns	2
Difference from prior centuries	2
Some countries seek immigrants	3
German farmers into Russian Empire – Volga and Dnieper.....	3
Miners into the Ukrainian Donbas	3
Argentina in the late 19th century.....	3
German Wirtschafswunder in 1960s	3
German / Scandanavian virtue signaling ca 2015	4
Chile – southern cone today.....	4
Change is coming quickly	4
Peoples are different.....	5
Immigration has always hurt the indigenes	6
European emigration to the rest of the world	6
Involuntary immigrants – African slaves	6
Southern and Eastern Europeans to America	6
North East Asians to California.....	6
Non-Europeans to America	7
Recent migrations within Europe.....	7
Non-European migration to Europe.....	8
Northeast Asia – the holdouts.....	8
Conclusion	8
Immigrant Culture and native culture	8
Other Northern Eurpeans.....	9
Non-Europeans.....	9
The Jews	9
Russia.....	9
Fiji	10
Israel	10
Turning point – zero fertility	10
Against the UN and one world dogma	10

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

World Immigration patterns

The world is divided between countries that encourage or accept extensive immigration and those that don't. The United States and Canada and most of Western Europe have had relatively open immigration over the past half-century. Japan, Korea and China have not accepted immigrants. Policies for the rest of the world don't much matter – few people want to emigrate to them.

The Visegrad countries in Europe – Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia – are under unrelenting pressure from the European Union in Brussels to accept asylum-seekers. They refuse, with increasing vigor. Immigration is a hot topic in countries to the west of them such as Austria, Italy and Greece. The majority of their citizens, though not the governments, think that enough is enough. They do not want more immigrants.

There are some benighted corners of Europe in which immigration is not yet an issue. Not many people want to come to Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus or Russia. Welfare is just about nonexistent both for natives and immigrants alike. There are more than enough native jobseekers to fill the unskilled labor requirements. People don't speak English, and the native languages are difficult to learn and not taught abroad. Skilled workers such as programmers will find better pay in the West.

All for the good. I propose that my adopted Ukraine articulate and even strengthen its immigration policies now, before any significant pressure mounts to change them. We can expect a financial crisis in the West sooner than later. Just as an example, United States government is spending twice as much money - \$6.8 trillion as it raises in taxes – about \$3 trillion. A \$3.8 trillion deficit is close to 19% of the gross domestic product – totally unsustainable. The aggregate deficit of the 27 members of the European Union is harder to estimate, but it appears to be on the order of about \$3 trillion – also unsustainable, and probably somewhat optimistic.

Difference from prior centuries

The character of immigration changed dramatically in the 20th century. Nineteenth century immigration frequently brought others of the same nationality to a new country. This would be English Irish Scotch to Australia, New Zealand and the United states. Spanish and Italians to the New World such as Argentina.

In the 21st century, immigration is almost invariably by people who are quite unlike the natives and who will have difficulty assimilating.

The asylum policies adopted by the United Nations in the 1950s envisioned the typical asylum-seeker to be a European refugee from the world emerging from the desolation of the Second World War. These were people of European cultures who would fit in. Even at the time immigration was not a universally applauded principal. Since that time, the nature of asylum-seekers has changed radically. They are simply no longer culturally compatible. A stronger statement would be that there are no longer intellectually compatible – position amply supported by science, rejected viscerally but never rebutted intellectually by the United Nations.

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

Some countries seek immigrants

National governments have in times past sought immigrants. They felt the need to increase their populations, and sometimes openly conceded that the immigrants would have a higher level of culture and be more productive than the natives.

German farmers into Russian Empire – Volga and Dnieper

Peter the Great attempted to remake Russia on a European model. He moved his capital to St. Petersburg, as far West as possible, and employed Germans and other Western Europeans to build his Navy and advise on the structure of his government. His granddaughter, Catherine the Great, invited German farmers to exploit the underutilized lands of the Volga and Dnieper basins. They came and prospered. The beer I drink bears my family name, Seibert – here spelled Zeebert. Tragically for their descendents and both Russia and Ukraine, Stalin saw them as a potential fifth column and ruthlessly extirpated them.

Miners into the Ukrainian Donbas

There was also internal migration within empires. The Jews were moved all over the place at the whim of that tsars, and ruffians from all over the Empire were attracted to the Donbas to work as coal miners.

Argentina in the late 19th century.

The Sarmiento government of Argentina in the mid 19th century looked for European settlers for two reasons.

First of all, the indigenous Creoles, or gauchos, descendants of the early Spanish arrivals and the Indians, were not very productive. They were content to live off the cattle that ranged free on the vast pampas, dirt poor with large families and no education. Sarmiento and the elites wanted a modern country and they concluded that Europeans would be the best way to do it.

A second motive was to build a population sufficiently large to defend the country. This is during the time of the war the of the Atlantic, which had Paraguay fighting Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil. Paraguay almost won. The more people country has, the more resources it has to fight a war. Sarmiento's immigration program was certainly beneficial to the immigrants – people from all over Europe, and especially Jews.

European immigration was not beneficial to the Creoles. They descended rapidly to the bottom of the pecking order in their own country, where they remain today. If the Creoles had had any awareness, they would've resisted the move but they couldn't. Much like the American Indians, had they had the power they should have resisted the emigration of Europeans. It was detrimental to their interests.

German Wirtschaftswunder in 1960s

The German business wonder of the 1960s is another instance of the conscious importation of large numbers of immigrants. Ludwig Ehrhardt encouraged the mass inflow of guestworkers from Turkey to man Germany's factories. As is always the case, it was done under false pretenses and with no analysis of the potential downside. They promised that the guestworkers were just exactly that, guests, and they would leave. Of course they did not. They are still there three generations later. They are not vastly productive, the abuse Germany's social benefits, and they are accomplishing the Islamization of Germany.

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

German / Scandanavian virtue signaling ca 2015

Another major instance of invited immigration concerns refugees from Syria and Africa, the major influx starting about 2015. This has been nothing but pure virtue signaling, also with an eye to expanding the pool of leftist voters. The phenomenon has affected all of Europe. Most notably, he resulted in the first widespread immigration into Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland.

It has not worked out well. These countries, which had no prior history of slavery, colonialism, or much contact all with Africa and the Middle East, have gotten a crash course. The immigrants remain on welfare for an incredible period of time. They make the streets unsafe for the nativeborn women. Rape and grooming of white women is extensive, and diligently covered up by the liberal press which has advocated the open borders policies.

Chile – southern cone today

Michelle Bachelet use the same kind of virtue signaling in Chile. It earned her a prominent position in the United Nations - High Commissioner for Human Rights. She brought in thousands of Haitians who had no skills and have not assimilated. Her career success came at the expense of the Chilean people.

Change is coming quickly

Change could come quickly. As noted in the opening paragraph, many observers believe that there is a significant recession, a depression even, emerging that will affect countries throughout the world. Racial tensions have been rising precipitously in the West even despite relatively good economic times and full employment. Unemployment, which skyrocketed in 2020 due to coronavirus, has disproportionately affected immigrants and minorities. They may feel pressure to move someplace else. Ukraine could start to look appealing.

Multiculturalism throughout the West is resulting in social chaos, exemplified by the Black Lives Matter movement in the United States. Politicians and social justice warriors have been encouraging many groups of minorities to nurse grievances against the white majority: Jews for historical discrimination, most notably the Holocaust; Blacks for slavery, colonialism and Jim Crow; Middle Easterners for alleged job discrimination and slights against Allah; Native Americans for usurpation of their traditional lands.

Fanning the flames of dissent has been very successful. White people have been backfooted just about everywhere. There are strong movements in most countries to get away from the militant minorities. The first impulse is to move out of the cities. But the suburbs are not safe either. And given the demographic momentum of the minority, and the likelihood that they will dominate national governments, even the rural backwaters are not safe.

At the present there is no more than a trickle of Westerners into the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. But it is increasingly a topic of discussion.

The social programs put in place in the West have assumed a healthy and growing tax base. The fallacy has long been visible – there are simply not enough babies being born to the people who voted in those generous programs. You can count the people. What one cannot state openly, but is evident to any intelligent observer, is that the people who replace the indigenes are not by and large as productive. They will not create as much value, and hence

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

will not earn as much money. The tax base will not be big enough to support the generous healthcare, unemployment and pension systems that are now in place.

Before this happens in the West, I advocate that Ukraine firmly reiterate its current policy on immigrants. Keep it limited to spouses of Ukrainian citizens, overseas Ukrainians, people ready to invest in the Ukrainian economy, and people with unique and recognized skills. If anything, the country should raise the stakes and close the loopholes. Law should better specify the size and character of investments. Given that fiat currencies are in the process of collapsing, investment amount should be stipulated in kilograms of gold. Law should more strictly define marriages of convenience, ejecting foreigners who commit marriage fraud and fining the Ukrainian parties.

Peoples are different

People throughout the West are obliged by political correctness to deny human biodiversity. It has been observed since the time of Herodotus that different races differ on average in just about every measurable way: height, physical structure, skin color, eye color, hair texture, sex drive, maternal instinct, desire for education, openness, work ethic, aggressiveness, introversion, and intelligence. Ukrainians of course observe these things. These common sense observations are transparent in Ukrainian jokes about Germans, Jews and Gypsies.

Going against millennia of human experience, the UN statement on human rights sets forth the proposition that all people are fundamentally the same. This is a deliberate misunderstanding of the idea written into the preamble of the United States Declaration of Independence that all people are equal under the law. None of the American founding fathers believed that people of all races were equal. Quite the contrary, they openly discussed the ways in which Blacks and Indians were different and were difficult to assimilate into white society.

The United Nations High Commission on Refugees, with a mission of finding homes for the world's displaced, likewise downplays the fact that people are different as it twists arms in the effort to find countries willing to accept refugees. They were successful in twisting the arms of Germany's Angela Merkel, with catastrophic results for Germany and the many other countries that followed its example.

Given that people are different, it should be self-evident that immigrants of some nationalities will fit in better in Ukraine than others. The profile of an ideal immigrant might be the following:

- has Ukrainian work ethic (or perhaps German)
- has the ability to learn the Ukrainian language
- has the ability to perform a job that is in demand within the Ukrainian labor market
- looks Ukrainian
- has Ukrainian temperament (open, peaceful, gregarious...)

Countries of the West routinely structured their immigration laws to ensure that immigrants would fit in. The "white Australia" policy remains in effect until the 1990s? The "National Origins" article of the United States immigration law of 1924 stipulated that the country would

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

receive immigrants similar to those already in the country. Japan, Korea and China simply did not allow immigrants who are not compatible with the people already there.

Ukraine is perfectly within its rights to define the kind of immigrants it wants. It already does. As there may be more immigration pressure brought on by the chaos in the West, it is time for Ukraine to re-articulate and better define the kind of immigrants it will accept.

Immigration has always hurt the indigenes

The elites of Western society have contended that immigration is an unqualified good. The opposite has always been the case. In assessing immigration, one must look at the interests of three classes of people involved: (1) the immigrants themselves, (2) the elite members of society who would invite and employ immigrants, and benefit politically, and (3) the rest of society, burdened with absorbing the immigrants. The latter category is certainly the majority. A look at history indicates that immigration almost invariably hurts their interests.

European emigration to the rest of the world

The arrival of Europeans was detrimental to the interests of the indigenous Americans, Australian aborigines, middle Easterners and Africans. However they may have benefited from the fruits of civilization, such as modern medicine, transportation and the like, their traditional ways of life were shattered. As always, a few native elites became rich. Nevertheless, we can take at face value these people's almost universal claims today that they would be better off had the Europeans never come.

Involuntary immigrants – African slaves

Something like 4% of the 11 million people enslaved by their fellow Africans and sold for transport to the New World arrived in the United States. This was certainly against the rights and interests of these involuntary immigrants. Their distant descendants continue to complain after seven generations of freedom. Their import was against the interests as well of the non-slaveholding classes in the South, the value of whose products and labor was diminished by the competition from slaveholders. It was against the interests of the common men in the North, those who sent their sons to war to end the institution of slavery. Alexander de Tocqueville wrote, comparing Ohio with bordering Kentucky, that it was even against the interests of the slaveholders themselves. Ohioans, who had to do things for themselves, were simply harder working and more successful.

Southern and Eastern Europeans to America

The late 19th century wave of immigration to the United States from Southern and Eastern Europe made Carnegie, Rockefeller, Vanderbilt and others fabulously wealthy. They favored hiring immigrants, grateful for any work, too unlike in background and even language to organize, over native-born Americans. Yes, the economy grew, but at the expense of the well-being of the descendants of the founding fathers, who finally mustered the political muscle to pass a tough immigration law in 1924.

North East Asians to California

In California I grew up among Japanese and Chinese kids, most of them third or fourth generation Americans. They were indeed the “model minority,” in that they were hard-working

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

and responsible citizens. Mark Twain described the Chinese working on the railroads in glowing terms in his 1870 "Roughing It." The Japanese immigrants in California became prosperous farmers before being rudely relocated during World War II. Korean Americans have become successful small business owners; their solidarity when threatened by Black mobs during the Los Angeles riots is legendary.

There is no doubt that they are successful on their own terms. Were they a boon to the foundational Americans who admitted them as immigrants? Probably not. The Asians are on balance smarter – they displaced the indigenes in jobs and professions. The immigrants never fully adopted the values of the host culture. To this day, for instance, the most vociferous defenders of free speech, the right to assemble and freedom of association are the foundational Anglo- and German- Americans. However it might benefit these Asian immigrants, they simply haven't adopted these aspects of the culture. To argue that their coming to California helped the people who were already there is a stretch.

Non-Europeans to America

The 1924 immigration law remained in force for 41 years as industrious members of the previous wave of immigrants rose in power within academia, industry and the government. Robert Strauss, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, openly stated that his party would benefit from admitting impecunious immigrants. With no stake in the American project, the political support of these newcomers could be easily bought with indulgences. Moreover, they provided cheap labor for slaughterhouses, nursing homes and other businesses. For the past 55 years the United States has received wave after wave of immigrants, primarily from Latin America and elsewhere in the global south.

The resulting society has forgotten its historical ties to English culture and common law, its Anglo-Saxon character. In particular, the society lost the sense of mutual trust and obligation that philosophers such as Edmund Burke so celebrated. It is said that in modern American society the law is what you can get away with, not what you recognize as an obligation to your fellow man. America has become a society of lawyers, used by the rich to scrupulously justify their exploitation of their fellow Americans. Having in general no ethnic bonds to them, the elites feel no compunction about exploiting the common man to the full extent possible.

Recent migrations within Europe

Recent immigration to the developed countries of the West, while it has benefited the elites, has been detrimental to the citizens of those countries. Polish and Ukrainian plumbers have displaced native born workers in England, France and elsewhere. Good for the immigrants, but it has resulted in two generations of less skilled native Europeans with diminished job prospects. This "brain drain" has likewise impoverished Ukraine and Poland as its most skilled citizens have gone abroad.

The culturally similar Ukrainians and Poles have certainly not been as detrimental to their host countries as immigrants from more different civilizations. They are not as inclined to become welfare dependent, engage in crime, or bridle at local customs such as the way women dress or eating pork.

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

Non-European migration to Europe

People from radically different cultures rarely become comfortable with European society, whether in the Americas or Western Europe. A small minority does learn to fit in, but most remain on the outside, avoiding and detesting the citizens of their host nation. All in all, it would be hard to claim that the immigrants themselves are better off. We should probably take their constant complaining at face value. They are not happy, and there is nothing that could be done to make them happy. They are simply too different.

Who benefits? The elites benefit from cheap labor. Leftist political parties benefit from an expanded electoral base. Nongovernment organizations – and also out-and-out smugglers – derive a lot of income from shepherding emigrants to their destinations.

How does the common man benefit? The only consistent answer anywhere in the world is a wider choice of cuisine in the restaurants. Aside from that, it is all negative. It is a very paltry benefit to offset the loss of jobs and the social chaos that immigrants bring. The common man, if he recognizes his self-interest, should stand up against immigration. He should recognize the lies being told by the elites.

Northeast Asia – the holdouts

Japan, China and Korea have always been xenophobic. It continues to serve them well. Their populations are shrinking. They have to become more and more inventive, using robots, for instance, to take the place of people in nursing homes.

The populations of these countries are shrinking relatively quickly. Given that their peak population densities were quite high, they can certainly afford to downsize. The question is whether the shrinkage can be arrested and stabilized at a reasonable number.

Whatever the case, these countries have done well to avoid immigration. They will retain their national character as they work through their demographic issues.

Conclusion

The developed countries of both Europe and the Americas are experiencing increasing chaos. The Visegrad countries have figured the game out and are robustly resisting immigration. The European members of the former Soviet Union – Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova and Russia itself – need to survey the rest of the world's experience and set their own policies accordingly. No immigrants! Ukraine for Ukrainians!

Immigrant Culture and native culture

Immigrants may be similar to the native population or different. Instances in which they were similar. Include the instances of the population of New Zealand, Australia and the United States. They were originally settled by Englishmen and these Englishmen invited other Englishmen to join them. This process was relatively smooth. They were culturally similar and the newcomers assimilated fairly easily. Their resources enough to support all of them. It actually achieved the other objectives of expanding the economy, improving trade, and raising the general level of welfare. It improved the defense of settlements in America against the Indians and against the French. It was probably a good idea.

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

Other Northern Europeans

Colonial Americans like Benjamin Franklin had their doubts about the emigration of Germans, but the Germans did not bring old world conflicts with them and they were culturally fairly akin to the term to the English. They mixed they integrated pretty well. Likewise, the Dutch.

The French immigrants to America included the Québécois in northern in Maine, who still remain separate and economically depressed, and the Acadian's who immigrated to Louisiana. Ditto – economically depressed. Nonetheless, they moved into fairly empty spaces and did not cause great problems.

Non-Europeans

The immigrations of the last half of the 20th century, promoted by Democratic Congress people by Democratic politicians with the more or less open intention of swinging the electoral base in their favor, have been much more pernicious. The immigrants have simply not attained the same level of education and accomplishment. By and large they cannot – as the psychometricians will tell you. They're simply not that smart. They have enabled the Democrat party to achieve its objectives. They have also created chaos.

The Jews

The Jews are a special case, one which is dangerous to mention. Those who came to America and they have been extremely successful. They are a very bright people. They have not, however, brought prosperity to the Anglo-Saxons who welcomed them and they have not brought tranquility. The Jews brought political turmoil to Europe, Western Europe, Argentina, the United States and Canada when they immigrated and they continued to foment dissent. They do this by championing every liberal cause that comes along. Whether by the workings of evolution or conscious design, they have worked to disquiet the Anglo-Saxon founders and disrupt their ability to form stable families and to reproduce themselves.

The irony in this is that these radical Jews, advocating changes in society, inevitably aggravate the majority in the host country and foment anti-Semitism. It happened throughout European history, certainly in the Weimar Republic, leading to Hitler, and it is happening today. Everywhere that the Jews have ascendancy – which is in much of Europe and America.

Another irony is that their advocacy of nontraditional families, and sex is impacting their own numbers more than anybody else. They're simply not reproducing. When they do marry, they often marry outside the religion. So the Jews' advocacy is for projects that undermine the host society, but more than anything else undermine themselves. Why did they do it? Evolution is peculiar. But for the purpose of this argument, it is sufficient to recognize, as Solzhentstyn did in his "200 Years Together," banned in English as "The Crucifixion of Russia," that it worked against the Christian majority of the Russian empire in his time and works against the descendants of Christians worldwide today.

Russia

The Russians are being invaded from inside. That's a problem of Empire – very disparate people are gathered within a single nation. Muslim majorities are displacing Christians in the cities. The Muslims, Chechens, most obviously, are a tough, nasty people who are more accustomed to violence than their Russian hosts. Moreover, in the Russian Far East the Chinese are spilling over simply because they need land and the Russians have it. It would be hard to claim that this is terribly detrimental to the Russian population because there is no

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

is very little Russian population in the Far East. Nonetheless, the Chinese invasion is real. The chances are that nothing will be done about this. Inasmuch as both countries are experiencing negative population growth, it will probably be a self-limiting phenomenon.

Fiji

Fiji in the South Pacific is another example of unwelcome and unhappy immigration. As part of the British Empire it was open to immigration from other members of the Commonwealth. The majority of the immigrants were Indians. They are simply more industrious, perhaps smarter than the native Fijians. It has not gone well for the Fijians. The same can be said for the countries receiving overseas Chinese throughout Southeast Asia – Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia. The Chinese are more industrious. It has not gone well for the countries that they immigrated to. It has been good for the industry, for the gross national product, but it has not been that beneficial for the average citizen. Read “World on Fire” by Philippine-born American Amy Chua.

Israel

Israel is a special case. The Israeli Jews immigrated to Israel in small numbers during the time of the British. Then they essentially took over and swamped the country. One can say without a doubt that this has not been to the benefit of the native Palestinians. The war is of biblical proportions and goes on today. The immigration was not been whatsoever beneficial to the natives. It is true that the Israelis have established pretty good economy, but the original inhabitants have not been severely marginalized.

Turning point – zero fertility

This is a turning point in world history. Fertility in most of the world has fallen below replacement levels. Some project the earth’s population will peak in 20 years at just over 9 billion. This means that for the first time in the history of man on the planet Earth, even now there is no compelling need for one tribe to displace another.

If peoples of the developed world can be content to live within the land that they now hold, there should be enough room for everybody. The populations will remain stable or diminish, and as our productive capacity, took in terms of agriculture, continues to increase we should be able to feed ourselves on the land we have now. There is no compelling need for any nation to expand its borders, and likewise no compelling need for emigration, except from desperately poor countries that are unable to curb fertility and whose citizens have little of value to offer in labor markets anywhere.

Just as the Helsinki Accords confirmed territorial integrity and the inviolability of national borders back in 1975, we should the nations of the world should confirm the nature of the people within those bold borders by enforcing strict immigration laws. increased immigration will bring no overall benefit to the citizens of any country.

Against the UN and one world dogma

The New World Order, One World agenda of the United Nations and progressives worldwide is outdated. Conservatives in the United States have been skeptical of the United Nations since its inception. Europe’s disastrous experiment with mass immigration from Africa and the Middle East over the past half decade has soured them as well. It is becoming increasingly

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

clear that mass immigration is the pet project of wealthy liberal elites. The more the ordinary people in any country learn about it, the more they resisted.

Note that this expressly goes against the UN charter on refugees and asylum-seekers, it goes against the EU principles of free movement of people. This is absolutely true means that the new world order was mistaken and should be revoked.

Rodney King asked, rather disingenuously, why can't we all just get along? As Robert Frost said, good fences make good neighbors. As long as each people is content to stay within the borders that they have been given historically and by consensus with the Helsinki agreements, we should be able to all get along. What we put the countries of the world need is the national will to enforce their borders. To say that this is ours. We will keep it and not to allow widespread immigration from any quarter.