



BORDER ENFORCEMENT EMPLOYER SANCTIONS AMNESTY CRIME HEALTH CARE  
JOB DISPLACEMENT NATIONAL SECURITY INCOME INEQUALITY IN-STATE TUITION  
SPRAWL POVERTY ENVIRONMENT STATE/LOCAL COOPERATION E-VERIFY  
WAGE SUPPRESSION ASSIMILATION SANCTUARY CITIES ECONOMY  
POPULATION CHAIN MIGRATION GUEST WORKERS REFUGEES

# The (Il)logic of Open Border Libertarians

An Essay by Eric Ruark, Director of Research

May 21, 2014

## Introduction

Libertarianism has gained a more prominent position within American political discourse in recent years, in large part because younger voters are increasingly rejecting the politics of both major parties and are looking for alternatives. As libertarianism becomes a broader political movement, self-identified libertarians are attempting to define the core philosophy or set of principles that characterizes that movement. Much like the Tea Party, which is working to forge its identity as an organized political party, libertarianism is experiencing the growing pains that go along with transforming a limited movement into an effective political force.

There is much debate about what are the fundamental principles of libertarianism and how those principles apply to immigration policy. Libertarian proponents of the free movement of people across borders, most notably those employed by the Cato Institute and the Reason Foundation, portray their embrace of open borders as an immutable ideological component of the libertarian cause, the *only* position a true libertarian can take. However, even a cursory reading on the issue reveals that many scholars who hold positions of influence within the libertarian movement have not embraced mass immigration as a practical objective, and, in fact, view it as a means to a more powerful and intrusive central government.

Big-business interests have a large stake in the outcome of the debate over immigration, and they have spent much money supporting libertarian “think-tanks” that espouse an open-border policy for the United States. By all appearances, this has very little to do with any principled commitment to libertarian principles, but is a way to provide ideological cover for multi-national corporations who lobby for the passage of legislation that will undermine the standing of American workers and force taxpayers to subsidize the costs of a cheaper foreign labor force. An open border, or at least a more open border, would allow corporations to further consolidate their hold on the U.S. economy, while the middle class would lose more of its economic and political power.

FAIR does not promote or denigrate libertarianism, but we do wish to have an honest debate about immigration policy and corresponding political solutions. One does not have to be a libertarian to see that certain commentators who claim to speak on behalf of the movement are using disingenuous and sometimes dishonest arguments to present their position as *the* libertarian position on immigration.

## Don't Know Much About History

Open-borders advocate Alex Nowrasteh of the Cato Institute has advocated letting in almost everyone who wants to come to the United States, and has presented this as the historical norm. Nowrasteh declared his support for open borders on National Public Radio (NPR):

“My dream setup would be a system where only criminals, suspected terrorists and those with serious communicable diseases like drug-resistant tuberculosis are barred from coming to the United States to live and work”...Open borders were the law of the land for almost 100 years of American history, [Nowrasteh] points out. He says between 50 million and 100 million people might move to the U.S. if those rules were reinstated now. He says that's fine. Compared with Europe, the U.S. is a big, empty country.<sup>1</sup>

Such a policy position is shallow on numerous fronts. Nowrasteh fails to take into account that sufficient security and health checks of tens of millions of people a year would not be feasible, while at the same time it would vastly expand the bureaucracy of the federal agencies tasked with carrying out screenings. He also mistakes geographic size with habitable area. Everyone in the world may be able to fit physically into America, but this has nothing to do with the sustainability or desirability of that arrangement. However, the most egregious error is his assertion that America had an open border policy in the post-colonial era. He compounded this gaffe in an unintentionally comic article he wrote for *The Huffington Post* in March 2012.

Nowrasteh started by stating the following about the Naturalization Act of 1790:

Passed in the first Congress, it had *zero* restrictions on immigration. You read that right, the first immigration law passed in the United States, by the Founders themselves, supported *open immigration*.<sup>2</sup>

But just two lines later he went on to state:

Eligible persons had to reside here for two years, have a good moral character (that is, not be a criminal), and be a free white person. That last provision shamefully excluded indentured servants, slaves, and former slaves. But there were no restrictions on who could come here and work for the American dream.<sup>3</sup>

Nowrasteh preposterously characterized a law that barred indentured servants and all non-whites from ever becoming citizens, and that existed alongside chattel slavery, as a system where “there were no restrictions on who could come here and work for the American dream.”

Nowrasteh attempts to conflate the modern-day distinctions between immigration and naturalization, while ignoring the entire history of slavery in the United States, and the treatment of Native

Americans, in order to invent a past that never happened. In 1790, most foreigners came to the United States as slaves, who definitely were not free to “work for the American dream,”<sup>4</sup> Those who did immigrate to the United States voluntarily were almost exclusively European, and predominately from northern Europe, and they came to the United States with the intention of settling permanently.<sup>5</sup> Federal restrictions on who could naturalize, combined with residency and employment restrictions in most states, were a genuine impediment to immigration, which was minimal in the post-colonial period.<sup>6</sup> To point out that the Founding Fathers did not set out to solve the non-existent problem of unrestricted immigration does not mean that they sought to encourage immigration to America, as was amply demonstrated by the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, signed into law by President John Adams.

Libertarian historian and economist Thomas E. Woods correctly pointed out in a 2007 editorial for *Human Events* that the Founders shared an apprehension that uncontrolled immigration would have the potential to cause social and political turmoil if incoming immigrants did not share the same values as early Americans. For example, Mr. Woods cited the following letter from George Washington to John Adams in 1794, in which Washington argued that there was no need for the United States to encourage immigration:

...except of useful mechanics and some particular descriptions of men or professions....The policy or advantage of its taking place in a body (I mean the settling of them in a body) may be much questioned; for by so doing, they retain the language, habits, and principles (good or bad) which they bring with them.<sup>7</sup>

Thomas Jefferson concurred with Washington’s opinion. In his *Notes on Virginia* Jefferson wrote:

Every species of government has its specific principles. Ours perhaps are more peculiar than those of any other in the universe. It is a composition of the freest principles of the English constitution, with others derived from natural right and natural reason. To these nothing can be more opposed than the maxims of absolute monarchies. Yet, from such, we are to expect the greatest number of emigrants. They will bring with them the principles of the governments they leave... These principles, with their language, they will transmit to their children. In proportion to their numbers, they will share with us the legislation. They will infuse into it their spirit, warp and bias its direction, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass.<sup>8</sup>

Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, supported the admission of skilled immigrants, but he warned that America’s immigration system should be carefully managed. Hamilton, often Jefferson’s political antagonist, agreed with Jefferson on the perils of excessive immigration:

The safety of a republic depends essentially on the energy of a common national sentiment; on a uniformity of principles and habits; on the

exemption of the citizens from foreign bias and prejudice; and on that love of country which will almost invariably be found to be closely connected with birth, education, and family. [Jefferson's opinion] is undoubtedly correct, that foreigners will generally be apt to bring with them attachments to the persons they have left behind; to the country of their nativity; and to its particular customs and manners. They will also entertain opinions on government congenial with those under which they have lived; or if they should be led hither from a preference to ours, how extremely unlikely is it that they will bring with them that temperate love of liberty, so essential to real republicanism?<sup>9</sup>

There are many quotations by the Founding Fathers like the ones above. Nowhere will one find evidence of their support for unrestricted immigration. By appealing to the authority of the Founders, one can make persuasive arguments pertaining to current political debates, but while it would be wrong to suggest that the Founding Fathers were opposed to any future immigration to the United States, it is absurd to argue that they favored “open immigration.”

## Don't Know Much About Political Theory, Either

A controversy occurred in January 2014 when Walter Block, a libertarian who supports open borders, was quoted in *The New York Times* as saying that slavery was “not so bad.”<sup>10</sup> Block pushed back against those who were upset by this, explaining that what he meant was that “slavery was innocuous: you could pick cotton in the healthy outdoors, sing songs, they would give you gruel, etc.”<sup>11</sup> Block's only objection to slavery was that Africans were coerced into this system, as any coercion violates his fundamental belief in the non-aggression principle (NAP). Block's response to the furor raised in *The New York Times* story revealed a very telling aspect of radical libertarian philosophy – its reliance on intrinsic rights taken on a faith that ascends to the level of fundamentalist religion.

Block says that his mission “is to convert the entire world to the one true faith, libertarianism.”<sup>12</sup> Accordingly, someone who is a self-professed Nazi could:

...deny the Holocaust, sing Nazi songs, wear big black leather boots, salute swastika flags, build ovens, do the goose step, etc. (I am nothing if not a bi[g] tent libertarian.) You could even place Jews, blacks, gays, Romany, and all other non-Aryans in these ovens, provided, only, they went there voluntarily. The only thing we libertarians would not allow them to do, so important do we think it is, is violate the NAP.<sup>13</sup>

While many libertarians disagree with Block, as he readily admits, and most would not state the libertarian ethos as he does, Block does highlight what is at the core of open-border libertarianism, namely that one has the absolute right to engage in any behavior one sees fit, and to be free from any physical coercion as long as one's actions do not infringe on the rights of another. This can be traced back to the Utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, but its ultimate root is in Jean-Jacques Rousseau's view of the individual as perfect in the “state of nature” and only corrupted

through the establishment of government. From this starting point, radical libertarians adopt the view that the individual has certain rights that are universal, including the right not to be restricted in movement by “artificial” borders.<sup>14</sup>

Libertarians who argue that that the NAP allows for one to engage in any behavior that is not coercive ignores the actual coercion and ill effects that accompany “victimless crimes,” one of which is the coercive force exerted by immigrants who crowd into a nation that is unwilling to receive them. It also summarily dismisses all competing rights claims without attempting to refute them. However, its most fundamental weakness is that it leaves unanswered the question of whence absolute and inviolable rights originate.<sup>15</sup> What open-border libertarians cannot explain, or at least refuse to discuss, is how the right to unrestricted movement came to exist, and who or what guarantees it.

The American Constitution reaches back through thousands of years of European political thought and is rooted in natural law (both Christian and pre-Christian) combined with contemporary Enlightenment political theory. It is a written compact that identifies and enshrines particular civil rights that are guaranteed to American citizens. Open-border libertarians often present arguments that are antagonistic to traditional Western political and religious traditions, while offering no comprehensive set of enumerated rights that could serve as a practical political compact. One may embrace open borders as necessary to fulfill an inalienable “right” to migrate wherever one wishes, but one should also acknowledge that this stance presupposes a privilege that negates the entire oeuvre of traditional Western political philosophy concerning the relationship between individual freedom and personal responsibility within a political community. There is no historical precedent (or any other compelling evidence) to support the argument in favor of open borders. Yet, those who endorse this idea insist that the end result would be a utopian “free market.”

## Libertarians Recognize the Civil Right to Limit Immigration

More thoughtful libertarians acknowledge the imposition of the real world, and have accordingly tried to work out a reciprocal set of individual rights that could be plausibly maintained by a common agreement forged as a political compact, such as that set forth in the U.S. Constitution. Unlike open-border libertarians, who concoct fantastical (transcendent) arguments about what ought to be, libertarians who recognize the need to limit immigration offer up practical (imminent) arguments about how to advance the libertarian cause in the here and now. A widely accepted view among leading libertarian scholars is that if mass immigration is unwanted by the host population at-large then it represents a form of aggression by their own government against those who wish to freely use their property and resources. One explanation is offered by libertarian theorist Murray Rothbard, in which he explains how mass immigration violates the property rights of a nation’s lawful citizens:

...a totally privatized country would not have “open borders” at all. If every piece of land in a country were owned by some person, group, or corporation, this would mean that no immigrant could enter there unless invited to enter and allowed to rent, or purchase, property. A totally privatized country would be as “closed” as the particular inhabitants and property owners desire. It seems clear, then, that the regime of open

borders that exists *de facto* in the U.S. really amounts to a compulsory opening by the central state, the state in charge of all streets and public land areas, and does not genuinely reflect the wishes of the proprietors.<sup>16</sup>

In addition to the defense of private property offered by Rothbard, the first Libertarian Party presidential candidate, John Hospers, set forth the following in response to the standard open borders position:

When one person treads on, or in any way occupies, however temporarily, the property of another person, unless the property owner has consented to the other person being there, the first person is by law guilty of *trespass*. It is the property owner's right to have the trespasser removed from his property. Shouldn't that same legal principle apply to people from outside the country?<sup>17</sup>

Open-border libertarians often make the argument that an individual's property rights supersede the right of any government to restrict how an individual can use his property, and so they would reject Rothbard and Hospers's arguments. What this brand of libertarianism ignores is that property rights are recognized and protected by the government, as are other formal, legally binding contracts. The government does not "own" the United States, it is instead the agency through which property rights are defended against those who would violate them. The establishment of the United States as a constitutional republic was predicated largely on the assumption that the government was central to the protection of individual rights, prominent among them the right to private property. It is the role of government within the framework of the Constitution to prevent the collection of power into the hands of a small group of individuals who are willing to use coercion to force others to comply with their demands. If the federal government has, in the opinion of the libertarian, grown to be oppressive, eliminating all government will not result in more individual rights and greater protections for private property holders, but precisely the opposite.

Open-border libertarians ignore two essential points in their attack on limited immigration regulated by the government. The first is that residents of the United States enjoy freedom of movement within the United States, so a national policy enacted by Congress is necessary to prevent one state from essentially setting immigration policy for all other states. The other thing overlooked is that the federal government was established by the voluntary association of the states, which agreed to allow for "a uniform Rule of Naturalization" to be determined by Congress. Again, one may argue today that the federal government has exceeded the limitations placed upon it by the Constitution, but setting a unitary immigration policy is one of its enumerated powers.

This leads to a more fundamental point on which open-border libertarianism rests and one that is often obscured in immigration debates: the contention that there can be no such thing as property held in common and, therefore, crossing an international border can never violate the rights of individual citizens, since it is not a violation of private property rights. Ultimately, this results in opposition to any and all borders and, with it, an attack on national or state sovereignty. Those who hold to this position maintain, unaware of the paradox, that the state must force the citizenry to comply with the

dissolution of national borders in order to prevent any grouping of people who wish to preserve themselves as unique and separate from others. This is a clear repudiation of the Constitution as a valid compact since there can never be a “people” who comprise a “we.”

This is clearly an untenable political argument, which is why most open-border libertarians refrain from candidly stating their actual position. The border is recognized by almost all Americans as an inviolable boundary denoting a sovereign nation. Most Americans also believe that someone who crosses that boundary without official permission not only violates the collective rights of all citizens, but violates the property rights of individual citizens who oppose illegal immigration. To declare that laws prohibiting illegal immigration are invalid because they impede the free flow of labor is an explicit endorsement that an individual employer who wishes to employ illegal aliens can violate the rights of his fellow citizens with impunity. In order for this scenario (known as anarcho-capitalism) to work, an employer could invite a worker onto his property, but never allow that worker to enter anyone else’s property (public property would not exist) without violating others’ property rights.<sup>18</sup> One can imagine that this would likely entail a great deal of coercion and force.

### Protecting *American Workers* Is Not a Vice

The United States government must effectively control immigration to prevent a dystopia of competing interests in which advantage is gained by power rather than merit. The reason the government fails in this standard at present is that a small but very powerful political and economic elite who profit from the current levels of immigration have gained enormous leverage over immigration policy and enforcement. Meanwhile, the costs are passed onto America’s taxpayers; a reality that libertarians may oppose but cannot deny. To be consistent, libertarians should distinguish between a desire for more and, hence, cheaper labor and the public benefits that may arise from bringing in workers from overseas who can provide broad economic benefits to the American people. While it is understandable that employers would welcome an increase in labor, which allows them to suppress wages, it is just as understandable that workers want wages to be protected against an immigration-supplied surplus of job seekers. It is through an undue influence on the U.S. political system that big business and labor-intensive employers are pressuring government to undermine workers’ interests. This may be a logical cost/benefit analysis by employers, but it is not a necessity of profitable business operation in the United States.

There are more than enough available and qualified workers already here. Libertarian economist Thomas Sowell recognized that there is not a need for more immigrants in the labor market. Specifically, he has countered the argument that farmers “need” to import foreign labor in order for crops to be harvested as follows:

Farmers may wish for more farm workers, just as any of us may wish for anything we would like to have. But that is wholly different from thinking that some third party should define what we desire as a “need,” much less expect government policy to meet that “need.”<sup>19</sup>

Mr. Sowell has argued that there is plenty of native-born labor to do farm work. Wages just need to be allowed to rise, so that native-born labor will do the work at the rate that the U.S. farm labor market would naturally bear without the importation of cheaper foreign labor:

In a market economy, when farmers are seeking more farm workers, the most obvious way to get them is to raise the wage rate until they attract enough people away from alternative occupations — or from unemployment. With the higher labor costs that this would entail, the number of workers that farmers “need” would undoubtedly be less than what it would have been if there were more workers who are available at lower wage rates, such as immigrants from Mexico.<sup>20</sup>

Sowell also argued that farmers’ “need” for immigrant labor also carries with it several externalities that pose a burden on U.S. citizens, such as taxpayer-funded benefits that immigrants may consume.<sup>21</sup> When it comes to externalities that arise from mass immigration, many libertarians simply choose to ignore such consequences rather than square them with the libertarian philosophy. As columnist Ilana Mercer has stated:

Open border fundamentalists seldom address devastating arguments against their case. Maybe they can’t. But they generally prefer to respond to philosophically limp positions. Immigration fetishists seem to like advancing positions not worth a straw. The intellectually honest, however, will try to reply to a valid opposing argument, no matter who makes it. Unless he can’t. Then he must concede defeat. Alas, among the open-border clique, intellectual honesty is as scarce as unskilled labor is abundant across the land.<sup>22</sup>

If mass immigration led to widespread prosperity, then allowing in more immigrants than at any other time in history should not have led to one of the worst, and most prolonged, economic downturns the United States has ever experienced. There are about 65 million native-born Americans between the ages of 18 and 65 who are not working, and wages for most workers have decreased, not increased, with the influx of foreign workers.<sup>23</sup> The so-called recovery that followed the recession of 2007 has not extended to most American workers, as most new job openings have gone to foreign-born workers.<sup>24</sup> A libertarian might argue that this is because foreign workers are “better” than Americans workers, who can’t compete in the global economy. This is a ludicrous position, but one that supporters of mass immigration have repeatedly made. However, those who write off the ability or willingness of American workers still have to come up with a solution of how to deal with tens of millions of unemployed Americans who are increasingly antagonistic to a federal government that fails to take their interests into account when setting immigration policy.



## The Trickle Down Externalities of Open Borders

The open-border libertarian places all the emphasis on the employer's "rights," while all other considerations are swept aside. This is an endorsement of an immigration system in which the profits from hiring illegal aliens accrue to those who employ them, while the immense costs of illegal immigration are borne by taxpayers. A farmer who hires an illegal alien to pick tomatoes receives the benefit of reduced labor costs, but that farmer does not prevent (and under law cannot prevent) an illegal alien from leaving the confines of the farm and taking advantage of taxpayer-funded services, such as health care, or public education for his children; nor does the farmer prevent an illegal alien from accessing welfare programs through his U.S.-born children. The farmer does not prevent an illegal alien from driving on taxpayer-funded roads, or using any other public facility. An illegal alien may pay some taxes, but an illegal alien who is earning \$11.00 an hour paid under the table is avoiding all payroll and income taxes, and any sales or property tax he pays will fall far short of his cost to taxpayers. Legalizing that illegal alien tomato picker may increase his tax contributions slightly, but it would also exponentially increase his access to government entitlements, including Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare.

Because most immigration to the United States is family-based rather than skilled-based, we admit many immigrants who have low levels of education and job skills and, consequently, have low earnings and are net recipients of taxpayer support. On average, only around 7 percent of immigrants are sponsored by employers. The nepotistic empowerment of immigrants to largely determine future flows of immigrants puts strains on the budgets of state and local governments, and leads to overcrowded schools, congested roads, deteriorating infrastructure, and an erosion of the quality of life for the majority of Americans.

The current U.S. immigration system exacerbates poverty and contributes to the problem of the medically uninsured. The war on poverty has failed in part because of the failure of the United States government to establish a rational immigration system. Immigrants are more likely to live in poverty than the native-born (19.9% to 13.5%), and immigrants and their children constitute one-fourth of those living in poverty.<sup>25</sup> Even immigrants who have lived in the United States for over twenty years have a poverty rate that is 50 percent higher than U.S.-born adults.<sup>26</sup>

Libertarians who support open borders overlook or obfuscate a response to the problem of welfare and other taxpayer-funded services received by illegal aliens, and increasingly by legal immigrants. A 2013 report by the Cato Institute stated that non-citizen immigrants are "less likely to receive public benefits than those who are native-born."<sup>27</sup> The researchers were able to reach this conclusion only by skewing their methodology. The report's authors ignored all welfare use by naturalized citizen, and they excluded many federal programs, such as WIC (Woman, Infant, Children), free or reduced school lunch in public schools, and taxpayer subsidized public housing, as well as state-funded benefits.<sup>28</sup> The Cato study also counted children of immigrants as native-born, which is technically true, but it distorts the results in a way that would not happen if the comparison was between native-born and foreign-born households. The standard is to compare native-born-headed households with immigrant-headed households, the latter of which includes U.S.-born children. The logic for comparing households is that

U.S.-born children of immigrants would not be in the United States if their parents had not immigrated here, and the use of welfare by these children should be counted as a cost of immigration.

As Dr. Steven Camarota, research director at the Center for Immigration Studies, points out, the Cato researchers also fail to make a true comparison of the impact of immigration on the public, by only looking at those with low incomes. In effect, what the report does is demonstrate that low-income immigrants use welfare at rates similar to low-income Americans, which is why admitting so many low-skilled immigrants is bad policy. Camarota explains:

Immigrants are 50 percent more likely to belong to that category [low-income] (as defined in the report) than are natives. What matters to taxpayers is the overall rate of welfare use by immigrants, which is high, not their use of welfare relative to that of natives with the same income or education level. Because immigrants are more likely to be poor, they are significantly more likely to use welfare; if we compare only low-income immigrants and natives, we would miss this key point.<sup>29</sup>

The libertarian argument that mass immigration, particularly the mass immigration of low-skilled workers, will not grow the welfare state reveals a fanciful attempt to avoid all evidence and logic.<sup>30</sup> The only plausible reason for a libertarian to support policies that grow the welfare state would be in anticipation of the ultimate bankruptcy of the government, but that hypothetical eventuality would not mean an absence of a state power. As Michael Lind has pointed out, there is not, nor has there ever existed, a true libertarian nation-state. This does not preclude the existence of one in the future, but it stands as a very real impediment to any thinking person believing that open borders will turn the United States into a libertarian country.

## A Free Market?

Open-border libertarians are driven by what they see as the economic logic of the unrestrained movement of labor. However, their arguments are purely theoretical and can only ever exist in theory. The world is, and will continue to be, divided into nation-states that are in competition with one another, sometimes to the point of open hostilities. Nation-states, when competent, control their borders and regulate the flow of immigration. Yemen and Somali may have *de facto* open borders, but only a delusional person would argue that these countries should serve as a model for the rest of the world. Even the United States, which has a government that allows excessive immigration, including high levels of illegal immigration, has a border that is far from “open.” The problem with the current immigration system is that the United States government is permitting high levels of immigration, including much illegal immigration, in order to enrich narrow special interests. A situation in which employers can have access to an inexhaustible supply of cheaper foreign labor to undercut wages and conditions for American workers is not a “free market” but its antithesis.

There is a vigorous debate over how current immigration affects wages, working conditions, employment levels, etc., in the United States, but no reputable economist argues that there should be no regulation of economic activity or no restriction on immigration; or that adding tens of millions of

more immigrants to the U.S. labor force over a short period of time would improve the standing of American workers, or would reduce the fiscal costs of immigration borne by taxpayers. The real dispute is over the economic and fiscal effects of current immigration policy, and how pending legislative proposals, which would grant amnesty to 12 million illegal aliens and at least double annual admissions of immigrant and guest workers, would change the situation, for better or for worse. No one in government is calling for unlimited immigration because that would be political suicide, but politicians like Paul Ryan and Jeb Bush take the position that more is always better, which aligns with the arguments of open-border advocates.

Those who favor high levels of immigration are almost exclusively confined to pointing out that adding more people to the economy through immigration increases the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). It is true that population growth results in a larger GDP, but it does not follow that growth in the GDP equals prosperity. In fact, much of the growth that America has experienced since the 1970s has been uneconomic, meaning the costs incurred are greater than the benefits received.<sup>31</sup> The GDP includes all economic activity, including government spending, so payments made to unemployed Americans contributes to “growth.” Genuine prosperity depends on how our economy grows, and the GDP tells us nothing about whether growth has been beneficial or not. Per capita GDP, while not an optimal measure, does reveal more accurately how well growth has benefitted workers within an economy. Current immigration patterns lower the per capita GDP of Americans, while increasing unemployment and reducing wages, all while “growing the economy.”<sup>32</sup>

Open-border libertarians, however, treat any and all growth as a magic elixir that will not only transcend economic realities, such as the law of labor supply and demand, but the laws of physics. It is impossible to have infinite growth in a finite world, and yet the open-border argument is predicated on rapid growth in perpetuity. A rational person recognizes limits, such as the finitude of natural resources. Open-border libertarians simply ignore these limitations, and often regard the environment as an adversary to be vanquished. Their economic philosophy is built on the neo-classical theoretical model that ignores energy as the primary factor of production, as well as dismissing environmental effects of energy extraction and use. The open-border economic model, as economist M. Shahid Alam succinctly put it, “exists in splendid isolation from nature and its well-springs of energy.”<sup>33</sup>

## Grade School Libertarianism

The inability of open-border libertarians to deal rationally with macroeconomics can be demonstrated by their smug pronouncement that the U.S. economy is not a “fixed pie,” and that fact therefore disproves any claim that immigrants compete for jobs with native workers.<sup>34</sup> This reduces an incredibly complex and dynamic economy to puerile and utterly deficient analogy, and demonstrates how open-border libertarians fail to deal with even the simplest aspects of economic logic. At any point in time the economy *is* a fixed pie and the number and size of slices are also limited (jobs, capital), and many may be dealt a smaller piece or go hungry (wage depression, unemployment). What the fixed pie analogy misses is the point that jobs are created and jobs are lost, and the economy is not always growing, or at least growing commensurate with population.

The fact is that the United States experienced its greatest period of economic growth and widespread prosperity during a period of low immigration.<sup>35</sup> One could argue that there is only a correlation, not causation, between one and the other, but a reasonable person cannot dismiss this evidence out of hand, and it clearly shows that high levels of immigration are not needed to achieve economic growth. Widespread prosperity for American citizens and increased job opportunities for minorities have corresponded with low levels of immigration. This is what has happened, it is not a utopian fantasy of what will happen if America's borders are erased.

## Open Border Libertarians, Crony Capitalists, and Marxists of the World Unite!

Libertarians who support open borders fail to note the irony that their greatest allies in the immigration debate are those who are working to undermine the market economy, though for different reasons. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, representing the interests of large multi-national corporations, seeks to undermine the free market by passing regulations that favor corporations while hurting small business and preventing American workers from attaining any bargaining leverage. Actively pushing this agenda are the Cato Institute, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Americans for Tax Reform, and the Reason Foundation through its *Reason* magazine, who seek to give an ideological cover to corporatist policies by defending an unequivocally un-libertarian economic philosophy that today is commonly referred to as “crony capitalism.”

In their pursuit of a cheaper labor force for corporations, libertarian think tanks support legislation that will result in an economy rigged to heavily favor their corporate donors. They may be unaware, or choose to ignore, that the results of their efforts have been a greatly expanded federal government and conditions that undermine support among the public for free market economics. The Communist Party USA understands this, which is why it aligns itself with the defenders of open borders. Below are examples of communist support for mass immigration coupled with statements by open-border libertarians.

- “There are not a fixed number of jobs in our economy. The truth is immigrant workers and their families, like all other workers, create jobs at a rate corresponding to those they fill.”<sup>36</sup>
- “Immigration does not divide a fixed pie of wealth; it increases wealth, incomes, and job opportunities for everybody.”<sup>37</sup>
- “Immigrant workers are not getting a free ride. Like other workers, most immigrants pay the same federal, state and local taxes which finance our schools, health clinics and other public services.”
- “No, Immigrants Won’t Make Welfare State Bigger”<sup>38</sup>
- “Immigrant workers, alongside their native-born co-workers, generate fortunes for their employers in industries such as agribusiness, meatpacking, hotels, restaurants and construction.”

- “An additional 50,000 H1-B immigrant visas is the equivalent of a \$5.5 billion transfer of wealth from the citizens of foreign countries to the citizens of the United States.”<sup>39</sup>
- “Immigrants are not the cause of higher unemployment rates of African Americans and other U.S. minorities.”
- “Immigration is not the cause of today’s high unemployment rates.”<sup>40</sup>
- “If hard-working immigrants could have a legal way of coming here, the danger of terrorists entering secretly would be lessened.”
- “In the same way, we should keep our borders open to the free flow of people, but at the same time strengthen our ability to keep out those few who would menace the public.”<sup>41</sup>

When corporatists and communists sing the same tune on immigration, shouldn’t that give one pause to consider why?

### Are Immigrants Libertarians?

Most of the attention paid to the effect of immigration patterns focuses on Hispanics, who are 47 percent of the foreign-born population and represent 11 percent of eligible voters, and, if current immigration trends continue, will represent 16 percent of the electorate in 2030.<sup>42</sup> Political pundits who argue that the Republicans need to embrace amnesty and mass immigration in order to win over Hispanics have assumed that immigration policy is the *only* way to attract Hispanics and that Hispanics *only* vote on immigration, and that all Hispanics support amnesty and want massive increases in immigrant admissions.

Hispanics have voted in solid Democratic majorities going back to the 1972 election of Richard Nixon, who received 35 percent of the Hispanic vote in his decisive victory over George McGovern, who received 63 percent. Ronald Reagan won 37 percent of the Hispanic vote in 1980, but only 34 percent in 1984 when he won 49 out of 50 states in a landslide over Walter Mondale. In the 1988 election, two years after Reagan signed a blanket amnesty bill, Reagan’s vice-president, George H.W. Bush, received only 30 percent of the Hispanic vote in his victory over Michael Dukakis. In 2004, despite years of actively courting the Hispanic vote, George W. Bush won just 40 percent of the Hispanic vote to John Kerry’s 58 percent, while four years later, John McCain, who pushed for an amnesty of 12 million illegal aliens just one year before the general election, won 31 percent, only marginally better than Mitt Romney, who was dubbed “anti-immigrant” in the media, won in 2012.<sup>43</sup>

Hispanics (and immigrants in general) aren’t naturally endowed with certain particular political inclinations, but current immigration patterns and the composition of U.S. politics produces a particular outcome. If one accepts that Democratic candidates generally support increasing the power of the central government and that Republicans at least advance arguments in favor of more limited government, than one must also accept that immigrants are more predisposed to vote for expanded government and are not drawn to libertarian appeals. Mass immigration has favored and will continue to favor the Democratic Party, even if the Republican Party adopts the Democratic line on immigration.

This has been pointed out by, among others, FAIR, the Eagle Forum, Sean Trende of Real Clear Politics, and David Plouffe, President Obama's 2008 campaign manager.<sup>44</sup> Plouffe highlighted the absurdity of Republicans courting Hispanic immigrants by offering amnesty:

...the bigger problem they've got with Latinos isn't immigration. It's their economic policies and health care. The group that supported the president's health care bill the most? Latinos.<sup>45</sup>

According to the *Pew Research Hispanic Trends Project*, 75 percent of Hispanics favor a larger government which provides more social services, compared to just 41 percent of the general population.<sup>46</sup> In addition, with regard to political ideology, Hispanics are more likely to identify as political liberals than other U.S. residents, 30 percent to 21 percent. Pew also found that 55 percent of Hispanics have a negative view of capitalism and 44 percent have a favorable view of socialism.<sup>47</sup> Latino Decision, a public opinion research outfit, found that 83 percent of registered Hispanic voters favored tax increases, and 82 percent of Hispanic voters wanted a more activist government, while only 17 percent preferred the free market over government intervention.<sup>48</sup>

Further, the emphasis on Hispanics or Latinos as a monolithic group often misses the point that most immigrants from Latin American identify themselves by nationality. Thirty-seven percent of *native-born* Hispanics identify themselves as a nationality other than American, while over a quarter (28%) of third-or-higher generation children of Hispanic immigrants self-identify as something other than American. What ties together Hispanics is Spanish, and 82 percent of Hispanic adults say they speak Spanish and 95 percent said it was "important for future generations to continue to do so."<sup>49</sup> Just 21 percent of Hispanics describe themselves as American. Yet again, open-border libertarians ignore the inescapable realities of the world around us. Creating a situation where immigrants fail to assimilate, and feel no compunction to do so, will only lead to future conflicts between different peoples who have discovered they cannot abide living by each other's rules and norms. In essence, libertarianism can only exist in homogeneous societies in which everyone is culturally inclined to play by the same set of rules without those rules being imposed by governments.

## Conclusion

A libertarian who supports open borders must either ignore or attempt to obfuscate any and all externalities that arise from mass immigration, and deny the problems that would be exacerbated if restrictions were lifted. The arguments made in favor of unrestricted immigration are no more plausible than the contention that the earth is only six thousand years old, or that the pyramids were really built by space aliens. The logic of open-border libertarians is that, while there is no convincing evidence or historical example to support their position, this is only because it hasn't been effectively tried, much like Marxists argue that Communism has not failed, it has just never been correctly implemented.

By ignoring real world factors, open-border libertarians can create a dream world that suits their fancy. Their arguments have no economic, historical, or scientific basis. They believe that the factors that led

to America's being the preeminent economic superpower are immutable laws of the universe and not dependent upon historical contingencies. This prevents them from understanding that structural changes in the economy, like the ones we are now facing, require an approach that relies on more than just "growing the economy" by adding more people to the U.S. population through immigration.

---

<sup>1</sup> David Kestenbaum, "Three Ways To Totally Transform U.S. Immigration Policy," February 21, 2013, National Public Radio, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/money/2013/02/21/172501563/three-ways-to-totally-transform-u-s-immigration-policy>, accessed February 10, 2014.)

<sup>2</sup> Alex Nowrasteh, "The Founder's Immigration Policy," *The Huffington Post*, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alex-nowrasteh/the-founders-immigration-\\_b\\_1382311.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alex-nowrasteh/the-founders-immigration-_b_1382311.html), accessed February 10, 2014. In May 2014, Nowrasteh attacked FAIR by mischaracterizing our stand on legal immigration in a piece posted to the Townhall.com (<http://townhall.com/columnists/alexnowrasteh/2014/05/14/new-antiimmigration-pledge-violates-american-principles-n1838157/page/full>), borrowing liberally from his earlier Huffington article.

<sup>3</sup> Nowrasteh, "The Founder's Immigration Policy."

<sup>4</sup> "The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database: Assessing the Slave Trade, 1790-1820" <http://www.slavevoyages.org/tast/assessment/estimates.faces>, accessed May 6, 2014.

<sup>5</sup> For immigration numbers prior to 1820, see: Louis DeSipio and Rodolfo O. de la Garza, *Making Americans, Remaking America: Immigration and Immigration Policy* (New York: Westview Press, 1998, pp. 25-29; Allan L. Damon, "A look at the Record: The Facts Behind the Current Controversy Over Immigration," *American Heritage* vol. 33, no. 1 (December 1981) (<http://www.americanheritage.com/content/look-record>). When immigration to the U.S. began to reach substantial numbers, the federal government was compelled to establish a more uniform immigration system, and there began to be conflict between the state and federal laws, resulting in Supreme Court decision (notably *Henderson v. Mayor of the City of New York*) that established that federal immigration laws superseded state laws. Gerald Neumann, now at Harvard Law School, wrote in 1993 when he was a professor at the Columbia University School of Law, "Legal discussions of immigration regulation in the United States rest upon a myth. This pervasive myth asserts that the borders of the United States were legally open until the enactment of federal immigration legislation in the 1870s and 1880s.... [T]he borders were not legally open. Regulation of transborder movement of persons existed, primarily at the state level, but also supplemented by federal legislation. Some of this legislation is immediately recognizable as immigration law, while other legislation is less easily recognized because it applied to citizens of other states as well as foreign immigrants. Historians of immigration have not been wholly unaware of the existence of these laws, but in recent decades they have focused primary attention on the experience of the immigrants who arrived." Gerald L. Neumann, "The Lost Century Of American Immigration Law (1776-1875)," *Columbia Law Review* (December 1993): p. 2.

<sup>6</sup> The federal government did not even record immigration statistics until 1820, when 8,385 immigrants were admitted. Immigration did not exceed 100,000 until 1842, 53 years after the birth of the republic. Immigration remained at moderate levels until 1880, when America was undergoing rapid industrialization and factory owners preferred to import cheaper labor from Europe instead of hiring black Americans.

<sup>7</sup> Thomas E. Woods, Jr., "Founding Fathers were Immigration Skeptics," *Human Events*, July 20, 2007, <http://www.humanevents.com/2007/07/20/founding-fathers-were-immigration-skeptics/>, accessed February 10, 2014.

<sup>8</sup> Thomas Jefferson, "Query VIII: The number of its inhabitants?," in *Notes On Virginia*, 1787, <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/801/86007>, accessed March 15, 2014.

<sup>9</sup> "We Still Hold These Truths," Quotes Database, The Heritage Foundation website, <http://westillholdthesetruths.org/quotes/author/alexander-hamilton>, accessed March 15, 2014.

<sup>10</sup> Sam Tanenhaus and Jim Rutenberg, "Rand Paul's Mixed Heritage," *The New York Times*, January 25, 2014 (<http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/26/us/politics/rand-pauls-mixed-inheritance.html?hp&r=5>).

---

<sup>11</sup> Tanenhaus and Rutenberg, “Rand Paul’s Mixed Heritage,” *The New York Times*, January 25, 2014 ([http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/26/us/politics/rand-pauls-mixed-inheritance.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/26/us/politics/rand-pauls-mixed-inheritance.html?_r=0)).

<sup>12</sup> Walter Block, “Walter Block: How NYT Mischaracterized My Views on Slavery (And What I Tried To Do About It): Reply to the Scurrilous, Libelous, Venomous, Scandalous New York Times Smear Campaign,” *Economic Policy Journal*, <http://www.economicpolicyjournal.com/2014/01/walter-block-how-nyt-mischaracterized.html>, accessed April 8, 2014.

<sup>13</sup> Block, “How NYT Mischaracterized My Views on Slavery.”

<sup>14</sup> A view that has received praise from open-border acolytes is that of Bryan Caplan, an economist at George Mason University. Caplan’s main thesis is that if it is wrong to send your mother to Haiti to live in poverty, it is wrong to deny any Haitian the right to live and work in the United States. An “accident of birth,” according to Caplan, should not disqualify anyone from immigrating to the country of one’s choice. Caplan seems oblivious to the fact that being born is always an accident of time, place, and geography, and he cannot grasp the simple concept that most people learn at a young age: life is not fair. Unfairness is one of the defining characteristics of life. Caplan also contradicts himself by acknowledging that he favors his own family above non-family members, yet, according to his logic, it is unfair to do so because that would discriminate against a stranger because, by accident of birth, they were not born into his family. Though Caplan identifies himself as a libertarian, he espouses a crude Rawlsian position on distributive justice and reflective equilibrium. Taken in its totality, Caplan’s work is a convoluted yet unsophisticated attempt to excuse the exploitation of workers by unscrupulous employers, while at the same time assuming an air of moral superiority. See: Mark Krikorian, “Debating Open Borders at Reason,” *The Corner*, National Review Online, <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/378113/debating-open-borders-reason-mark-krikorian>, accessed May 16, 2014.

<sup>15</sup> Andrew Napolitano writing at reason.com claims that the God of the “Judeo-Christian tradition” guarantees an individual the right to migrate wherever one chooses. Putting aside the fact that there is no scriptural or theological basis in Christianity for such a claim, it raises the obvious question of how this pertains to those who are not part of the “Judeo-Christian tradition,” or who reject Christianity, which includes many libertarians. Andrew Napolitano, “Immigration Is a Natural Right: Nativism is the arch-enemy of the freedom to travel,” January 31, 2013, <http://reason.com/archives/2013/01/31/immigration-and-freedom>, accessed May 7, 2014.

<sup>16</sup> Murray N. Rothbard, “Nations by Consent: Decomposing the Nation-State,” *Journal of Libertarian Studies* vol. 11, no. 1 (Fall 1994): p. 7 ([http://mises.org/journals/jls/11\\_1/11\\_1\\_1.pdf](http://mises.org/journals/jls/11_1/11_1_1.pdf)).

<sup>17</sup> John Hospers, “A Libertarian Argument against Open Borders,” *Journal of Libertarian Studies* vol. 13, no. 2 (Summer 1998): p. 155 ([http://mises.org/journals/jls/13\\_2/13\\_2\\_3.pdf](http://mises.org/journals/jls/13_2/13_2_3.pdf)).

<sup>18</sup> Hans-Hermann Hoppe, a prominent anarcho-capitalist theorist, has claimed that any argument against libertarianism is inherently contradictory, and that the libertarian view of individual rights is the only rational position one can take. Many other libertarians have found Hoppe’s line or reasoning to be flawed. A good critique is “Hans-Hermann Hoppe’s Argumentation Ethics: A Critique of Libertarian Studies,” *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, vol. 20 no. 2 (Spring 2006): 53-64 ([http://www.hanshoppe.com/wp-content/uploads/publications/liberty\\_symposium.pdf](http://www.hanshoppe.com/wp-content/uploads/publications/liberty_symposium.pdf)). For Hoppe on immigration, see: Hans-Hermann Hoppe, “On Free Immigration and Forced Integration,” *LewRockwell.com*, <http://archive.lewrockwell.com/orig/hermann-hoppe1.html>, accessed May 15, 2014.

<sup>19</sup> Thomas Sowell, “Who ‘Needs’ Immigrant Labor?: You can’t have a real discussion about labor shortages without mentioning wages,” *National Review Online*, June 11, 2013, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/350684/who-needs-immigrant-labor-thomas-sowell>, accessed February 10, 2014.

<sup>20</sup> Thomas Sowell, “Who ‘Needs’ Immigrant Labor?”

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> Ilana Mercer, “The Work Open-border Libertarians Won’t Do,” *WND Commentary*, <http://www.wnd.com/2007/06/42090/>, accessed April 23, 2014.

<sup>23</sup> “Employment Status of the civilian population by sex, age, and disability status, not seasonally adjusted,” Table A-6, Bureau of Labor Statistics, <http://www.bls.gov/>; Heidi Shierholz and Lawrence Mishel, “A Decade of



---

Flat Wages: The Key Barrier to Shared Prosperity and a Rising Middle Class,” Economic Policy Institute, August 21, 2013 (<http://s1.epi.org/files/2013/BP365.pdf>).

<sup>24</sup> For a discussion of the failed recovery, see: Eric A. Ruark, “Out of the Shadows: Shining a Light on Immigration and the Plight of the American Worker,” FAIR Horizon Press, June 2013 (<http://www.fairus.org/publications/out-of-the-shadows>), and “Generation Jobless: The Unemployment Crisis of Millennials,” FAIR Horizon Press, February 2014 (<http://www.fairus.org/publications/generation-jobless>). Also see: Andrew Sum, et. al., “The Plummeting Labor Markets Fortunes of Teens and Young Adults,” The Brookings Institution, March 2014 (<http://www.brookings.edu/research/interactives/2014/labor-market-metro-areas-teens-young-adults>), and Steven A. Camarota and Karen Zeigler, “Still No Evidence of a Labor Shortage: Immigrant and native employment in the fourth quarter of 2013,” *Backgrounder*, Center for Immigration Studies, March 2014 (<http://www.cis.org/u6-measure-still-no-evidence-of-labor-shortage>).

<sup>25</sup> Steven A. Camarota, “Immigrants in the United States, 2010: A Profile of America’s Foreign-Born Population,” *Backgrounder*, Center for Immigration Studies, August 2012, p. 26. (<http://cis.org/2012-profile-of-americas-foreign-born-population#execsum>).

<sup>26</sup> Steven A. Camarota, “Immigrants in the United States, 2010,” p. 4.

<sup>27</sup> Leighton Ku and Brian Bruen, “The Use of Public Assistance Benefits by Citizens and Non-citizen Immigrants in the United States,” February 19, 2013 (<http://www.cato.org/publications/working-paper/use-public-assistance-benefits-citizens-non-citizen-immigrants-united>).

<sup>28</sup> A good critique is Steven A. Camarota, “The Cost of Cheap Labor: Policymakers should acknowledge that the less-educated earn less and so use welfare more,” National Review Online, February 27, 2013, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/341666/cost-cheap-labor-steven-camarota>, accessed April 22, 2014.

<sup>29</sup> Steven A. Camarota, “The Cost of Cheap Labor.”

<sup>30</sup> Ilya Somin, “Increased immigration is unlikely to increase the size of the welfare state,” *The Washington Post*, February 18, 2014, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2014/02/18/increased-immigration-is-unlikely-to-increase-the-size-of-the-welfare-state/>, accessed April 22, 2014.

<sup>31</sup> Herman E. Daly, “Economics in a Full World,” *Scientific American*, vol. 293, no. 3 (September 2005): pp. 100-107 ([http://steadystate.org/wp-content/uploads/Daly\\_SciAmerican\\_FullWorldEconomics%281%29.pdf](http://steadystate.org/wp-content/uploads/Daly_SciAmerican_FullWorldEconomics%281%29.pdf)).

<sup>32</sup> The current effects of immigration on employment levels and per capita GDP was projected by the Congressional Budget Office to continue if immigration were increased. See the CBO score of SB744, “S. 744: Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act,” Congressional Budget Office, June 2013 (<http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/s744.pdf>).

<sup>33</sup> M. Shahid Alam, “Economic Growth With Energy,” November 2006, [www.economics.neu.edu/papers/documents/06-003.pdf](http://www.economics.neu.edu/papers/documents/06-003.pdf), accessed April 10, 2014.

<sup>34</sup> Alain Sherter, “Can immigration speed the economic recovery?” CBS Moneywatch, September 12, 2013, <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/can-immigration-speed-the-economic-recovery/>, accessed April 10, 2014; Doug Bandow, “Immigration Benefits The U.S., So Let’s Legalize All Work,” *Forbes*, September 16, 2013, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/dougbandow/2013/09/16/immigration-benefits-the-u-s-so-lets-legalize-all-work/>, accessed April 23, 2014.

<sup>35</sup> Low Immigration and High Economic Growth, Federation for American Immigration Reform, <http://www.fairus.org/issue/low-immigration-and-high-economic-growth>, accessed April 23, 2014.

<sup>36</sup> “Immigration Myths vs. Facts: a look behind the anti-immigrant furor,” *People’s World*, April 10, 2013, <http://www.peoplesworld.org/immigration-myths-vs-facts-available-for-download/>, accessed April 23, 2014. The People’s World is a news site associated with the Communist Party USA and describes itself as the “direct descendant of the Daily Worker,” the newspaper published by the Communist Party USA from 1924 to 1986. The first quotation in each pairing comes from this document.

<sup>37</sup> Alex Nowrasteh, “Immigrants Did Not Take Your Job,” Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/immigrants-did-not-take-job>, accessed April 23, 2014.

<sup>38</sup> Alex Nowrasteh and Zachary Gochenour, “No, Immigrants Won’t Make Welfare State Bigger,” Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/no-immigrants-wont-make-welfare-state-bigger>, accessed April 23, 2014.

- 
- <sup>39</sup> Stephen Moore, “Immigration Reform Means More High-Tech Jobs, Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/immigration-reform-means-more-hightech-jobs>, accessed April 23, 2014.
- <sup>40</sup> Stuart Anderson, “Let’s Not Blame Immigrants for High Unemployment Rates,” Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/immigration-reform-bulletin/lets-not-blame-immigrants-high-unemployment-rates>, accessed April 23, 2014.
- <sup>41</sup> Daniel Griswold, “Don’t Blame Immigrants for Terrorism,” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/dont-blame-immigrants-terrorism>, accessed April 23, 2014.
- <sup>42</sup> Thom File, “The Diversifying Electorate— Voting Rates by Race and Hispanic Origin in 2012 (and Other Recent Elections),” U.S. Census Bureau, P20-568, May 2013, p. 5 ( <http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p20-568.pdf> ); Paul Taylor, Ana Gonzalez-Barrera, Jeffrey S. Passel, Mark Hugo Lopez, “An Awakened Giant: The Hispanic Electorate Is Likely to Double by 2030,” Pew Hispanic Center, November 14, 2012, p. 6 (<http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/11/14/an-awakened-giant-the-hispanic-electorate-is-likely-to-double-by-2030/>).
- <sup>43</sup> Mark Hugo Lopez and Paul Taylor, “Latino Voters in the 2012 Election,” *Pew Research Center*, November 7, 2012, <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/11/07/latino-voters-in-the-2012-election/>, accessed February 10, 2014. Reuben Navarrette, “Latinos won’t forget Romney’s ‘anti-immigrant’ talk,” CNN, January 21, 2012, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/01/31/opinion/navarrette-immigration-gop/index.html>, accessed May 8, 2014.
- <sup>44</sup> “Republicans Have an Immigration Problem—and Amnesty Won’t Solve It,” Federation for American Immigration Reform, October 24, 2013, <http://www.fairus.org/BlogRetrieve.aspx?PostID=1144070&A=SearchResult&SearchID=6286487&ObjectID=1144070&ObjectType=55>; “How Mass Legal Immigration Dooms a Conservative Republican Party,” *The Eagle Forum*, January 2014, <http://www.eagleforum.org/immigration.html>; Sean Trende, “The GOP and Hispanics: What the Future Holds,” *Real Clear Politics*, [http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/06/28/the\\_gop\\_and\\_hispanics\\_what\\_the\\_future\\_holds\\_119011.html](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/06/28/the_gop_and_hispanics_what_the_future_holds_119011.html).
- <sup>45</sup> Robert Draper, “Can the Republicans Be Saved From Obsolescence?,” *The New York Times*, February 14, 2013, [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/17/magazine/can-the-republicans-be-saved-from-obsolescence.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/17/magazine/can-the-republicans-be-saved-from-obsolescence.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0).
- <sup>46</sup> Paul Taylor, et. al., “When Labels Don’t Fit: Hispanics and Their Views of Identity, Pew Hispanic Center, April 4, 2012, p. 31( <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/04/04/v-politics-values-and-religion/>).
- <sup>47</sup> Andrew Kohut, “Little Change in Public’s Response to ‘Capitalism,’ ‘Socialism,’” Pew Research Center, December 28, 2011, p. 3 (<http://www.people-press.org/files/legacy-pdf/12-28-11%20Words%20release.pdf>).
- <sup>48</sup> Gary Segura and Shaun Bowler, “It’s True: Latinos are Liberals, and Other Important Matters,” *Latino Decision*, August 16, 2011, <http://www.latinodecisions.com/blog/2011/08/16/its-true-latinos-are-liberals-and-other-important-matters/>, accessed April 23, 2014.
- <sup>49</sup> Paul Taylor, et. al., “When Labels Don’t Fit,” p. 2.