

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

Contents

World Immigration Patterns	1
Difference from Prior Centuries	2
Some Countries have Sought Immigrants	2
The Situation is in Flux.....	3
Peoples are Different	4
Immigrant Culture and Native Culture.....	5
Immigration has always Hurt the Indigenes	7
Turning point – Zero Fertility	9
Recognize National Interests	10
Ukrainian Policy	10
Keep Ukraine Ukrainian	12

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 rather 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.

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

Difference from Prior Centuries

The character of immigration changed dramatically in the 20th century. 19th century immigration frequently brought others of the same nationality to a new country. This would be English, Irish and Scotch to Australia, New Zealand, and the United States. Spanish and Italians went to New World countries 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 no longer culturally compatible. A stronger statement would be that they are no longer intellectually compatible – a position amply supported by science, rejected viscerally and by charter but never rebutted intellectually by the United Nations.

Some Countries have Sought 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.

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 descendants and both Russia and Ukraine, Stalin saw them as a potential fifth column and ruthlessly extirpated them.

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

The Sarmiento government of Argentina in the mid-19th century looked for European settlers for two reasons. First, 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 bringing in 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 of the Atlantic, which had Paraguay fighting Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil. Paraguay almost won. The more people a 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

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

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.

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 would be 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, they abuse Germany's social benefits, and they are accomplishing the Islamization of Germany.

Another major instance of invited immigration concerns refugees from Syria and Africa, the major influx starting about 2015. This has been little more than pure virtue signaling, but also with an eye to expanding the pool of leftist voters. The phenomenon has affected all of Europe. Most notably, it 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 incredible periods of time. They make the streets unsafe for the native-born women. Rape and grooming of white women is extensive, and diligently covered up by the liberal press which has advocated the open borders policies.

Michelle Bachelet used 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.

The United States is seeking immigrants even today. With the claim that there are not enough qualified workers in high tech, there is an extensive H1B visa program to bring in Indians and Eastern Europeans. It is merely a pretext. These immigrants command lower salaries and will tolerate working conditions, including oppressive political correctness, at which natives bridle.

Many immigrants, including large numbers of illegals, work in agriculture and in slaughterhouses. These are jobs that Americans supposedly will not do. At the same time there are large swaths of unemployed people among the native born. Again, it appears to be mostly a question of money. If the pay were right, and welfare not so generous, native-born Americans would fill the jobs.

The Situation is in Flux

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 had 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. People may feel pressure to move someplace else. Ukraine could start to look appealing.

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

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. Whites in most countries are endeavoring to get away from the militant minorities. Their first impulse is to move out of the cities. But the suburbs are not safe either. And given the demographic and political momentum of the minority, and the likelihood that they will dominate national governments, even 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 in print and on the Internet.

The social programs put in place in the West were written assuming 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 themselves those generous programs. You can enumerate births. 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 will not earn as much money per capita. 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, people with unique and recognized skills, and people in general who are like Ukrainians. 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 magnitudes should be stipulated in kilograms of gold. Law should more strictly define marriages of convenience, ejecting foreigners who commit marriage fraud and sanctioning the Ukrainian parties involved.

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 commonsense 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 misinterpretation of the notion written into the preamble of the United States Declaration of

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

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 with Germany's Angela Merkel, leading to catastrophic results for Germany and the many other countries that followed her example.

Given that people are different, it should be self-evident that immigrants of some nationalities will adapt better to 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...)

It follows that the ideal candidate for immigration would be a diaspora Ukrainian or a Slav from a neighboring country.

Countries of the West used to structure their immigration laws to ensure that immigrants would fit in. The "White Australia" policy remained in effect until the 1970s. The "National Origins" article of the United States immigration law in force until 1966 stipulated that the country would receive immigrants similar to those already in the country. Japan, Korea, and China simply manage not to 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.

Immigrant Culture and Native Culture

Immigrants vary in how similar they are to the native population. Instances in which they were similar include the early settlement of New Zealand, Australia, and the United States. They were originally settled by Englishmen and these Englishmen invited others to join them. This process was relatively smooth. They were culturally similar, and the newcomers assimilated fairly easily. There were 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.

Colonial Americans such as Benjamin Franklin had their doubts about the emigration of Germans. However, the Germans did not bring old world conflicts with them and they were culturally fairly akin to the English. They integrated quite well. As did the Dutch.

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

The French immigrants to America included the Quebecois in northern Maine, who still remain separate and economically depressed, and the Acadians who immigrated to Louisiana, who are likewise economically depressed. Nonetheless, they migrated into fairly empty spaces and did not cause great problems.

The immigrations of the last half of the 20th century, promoted 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 not attained even close to the same level of education and accomplishment as other Americans. By and large they cannot – as the psychometricians could have predicted. They're simply not that smart. They have enabled the Democrat party to achieve its objectives. They have also created chaos.

The Jews are a special case, one which is dangerous to mention. They are a very bright people. Those who came to America have been extremely successful. They have not, however, brought prosperity to the foundational Americans who welcomed them, and they have not brought tranquility. They brought their tradition of political agitation to Europe, Western Europe, Argentina, the United States and Canada with them, and they have continued to foment dissent. They do this by championing every liberal cause that comes along. Whether by the workings of evolution, as Kevin MacDonald would have it, or by 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. It is happening today everywhere that the Jews have ascendancy – which includes 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's. 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 the Jews themselves. Why do they do it? Evolution is peculiar. But for the purpose of this argument, it is sufficient to recognize, as Solzhenitsyn did in his "200 Years Together," (banned in English as "The Crucifixion of Russia") that it worked against the Christian majority in the Russian empire in his time and works against the descendants of Christians worldwide today.

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.

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 are very few Russians in their Far East. 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 in the South Pacific is another example of unwelcome and unhappy immigration. As part of the British Empire it was open to people 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 latter. The same can be said for the countries receiving overseas Chinese throughout Southeast Asia – The Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia. The Chinese are more industrious. It has benefited industry,

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

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 is a special case. The Jews immigrated there in small numbers during the time of the British. It increased until they swamped the country. One can say without a doubt that this has not been to the benefit of the native Palestinians - a war of Biblical proportions goes on today. It is true that the Israelis have established a strong economy, but the original inhabitants have not benefited, and their rights have been severely curtailed.

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, sharing resources and competing with the immigrants. The latter category is certainly the majority. A look at history indicates that immigration almost invariably hurts their interests.

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.

Something like 4% of the 11 million Blacks 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 those 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.

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 defend their own interests through a tough immigration law in 1924.

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 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

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

have become successful small business owners. The solidarity of the “rooftop Koreans” when threatened by Black mobs during the 1965 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 our Bill of Rights - 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 would be a stretch.

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 agriculture, 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 and its Anglo-Saxon character. Civics is no longer taught in American high schools. 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 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.

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.

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

Who benefits? The elites benefit from cheap labor. Leftist political parties benefit from an expanded electoral base. Nongovernmental 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.

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

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.

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, the Baltics and Russia itself – need to survey the rest of the world's experience and set their own policies accordingly. No immigrants! Ukraine for Ukrainians!

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 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. As our productive capacity, in terms of agriculture, continues to increase we should be able to feed ourselves on the land we have now. There is no need for any nation to expand its borders, and likewise no pressure 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. We may pity them, but to accommodate them would be suicide. We must demand that they solve their own problems within their own borders.

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

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

Recognize National Interests

Immigration law needs to straightforwardly recognize national interests. It needs to define those interests as the well-being of the majority of the people, which is a thing apart from the economy, GNP and so forth. The well being of the people must be defined as the ability of the indigenous population to earn a living, marry, raise families, and maintain self-respect.

While there is no need to write this observation into law, it is well to recognize that the United States represents precisely that which is not in the interests of the well-being of the natives. Its citizens overindulge in food, big cars, cheap gee-gaws from China and all sorts of consumer goods. They are not happy, are not having children, and are not passing their values down to those they do have.

No country is obliged to assume the burden of the problems of all of humanity. It is ruining those that try. A national government's obligation is to its own citizens, and none other. To assert this directly is to stand up to globalist propaganda, against the UN, the Brussels bureaucracy, and the one-world dogma emanating from the media.

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 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 resist it.

Note that this expressly goes against what is written in the UN charter on refugees and asylum-seekers. It goes against the EU principles of free movement of people. This is absolutely true. It 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? 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 within the Helsinki agreements, we should be able to all get along. What the countries of the world need is the national will to enforce their borders. To say "This is ours. We will keep it and not allow widespread immigration from any quarter. "

Ukrainian Policy

Getting permanent residency is a first step toward gaining Ukrainian citizenship. Ukraine's regulations are similar to those of many other countries. One can gain permanent residency by:

- Investing \$100,000 in the country
- By virtue of marrying a Ukrainian citizen
- By virtue of kinship with an immigrant
- By virtue of kinship with the Ukrainian citizen
- By virtue of ethnic origin) descent)

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

The laws on citizenship are somewhat different than for permanent residency. People who were associated with Ukraine and Soviet times were automatically accepted as citizens. Ukraine's laws on the acquisition of citizenship by stateless people and asylum-seekers are similar to those of Western Europe. For the moment this is no issue – people in these groups are not putting much pressure on Ukraine.

Ukraine's laws do not differ that much from those of Japan, China, and Korea, which have been quite effective in preventing immigration by people who are not of those ethnicities. The trick is in the application of the laws. These Asian countries make it difficult to get permanent residency in the first place, so there are not that many cases to be decided. They allow the immigration officials a good deal of latitude in deciding on individual cases. The United States, Australia, and other Western countries successfully limited immigration in the past by combinations of:

- National origins laws
- Language laws

There must be mechanisms to deny entry by asylum seekers. The international convention on asylum says that the first country an asylum-seeker enters after leaving his home country is the one that must deal with the problem. Australia has been effective at fending off boats of asylum-seekers. Europe has been much more vulnerable, mostly along its Mediterranean coastline. Ukraine, with coastline only along the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea, should find its maritime borders relatively easy to defend. It is a matter of will. Also, being outside the European Union, Ukraine has a somewhat freer hand in dealing with the issue. The UN High Commission on Refugees already gives Ukraine low marks for its treatment of refugees. Ukraine has been successful in stonewalling their complaints. In other words, they have wonderfully defended the interests of their own citizens. This is to be celebrated, even broadcast to would-be asylum seekers.

At this writing there are no groups advocating widespread immigration to Ukraine. Ukrainian labor is cheap and abundant enough to satisfy the needs of industry. In fact, a great number of Ukrainians are working in the West because jobs available in Ukraine are neither well-paying nor numerous. Should this change, advocates for Ukrainian people should look for support from the traditional champions of the people:

- Orthodox Church
- Organized Labor
- Patriotic Organizations
- Diaspora
- Political parties

Ukraine should seize the moment, while the oligarchs who run the country have no great interest in encouraging immigration, to strengthen the laws to protect common citizens against immigration.

The United States and Western Europe have demonstrated that controlling immigration is a question both of laws and of the will to apply them. Many jurisdictions have simply chosen not to enforce the laws that are already on the books. In this regard Ukraine is already doing a fairly good job when it comes to immigration. The thrust should be to support current

Ukraine must strongly limit immigration

enforcement efforts, and to strongly resist any calls to water them down. Blacks and Muslims throughout the world have learned to rail loudly against supposed “police brutality.” Ukrainian police need to steel themselves against such claims, and the people need to support the police.

Keep Ukraine Ukrainian

There is nowhere in the world where immigration favors the indigenous people. North Americas and Western Europeans have discovered this to their chagrin over the past half-century.

Ukraine, by virtue of its forced inclusion in the Soviet Union and the rapacity of the oligarchs in the post-Soviet period, has not been a magnet for immigration. The country was given the opportunity to witness the catastrophic decay of those countries that have embraced multiculturalism, diversity and widespread immigration.

Ukraine must exercise its right as a sovereign nation to control its own borders. We should welcome home diaspora Ukrainians from abroad, people who are ready to renounce their allegiance to Western democracies and Israel. It must resist arguments to the effect that Ukraine needs more people to make the economy grow, to strengthen its defenses, or to take jobs that native Ukrainian supposedly will not. History has shown that it is usually possible to get immigrants to do things cheaply. It has also shown that there is no way to ever get rid of them, and they are never a long-term benefit to the indigenous people. Ukraine for Ukrainians!