



Ron Paul Moving to the Left on Immigration?

Williamson describes Paul, noted Libertarian and “godfather” of the Tea Party movement, as “until recently something of an immigration hawk — no amnesty, no birthright citizenship, no welfare benefits.” As with most attempts to pigeonhole Paul’s policy positions, the author of the NRO piece fails to grasp the legitimate source of Representative Paul’s seemingly disparate stances on the enumerated issues of immigration policy.



Assuming that Paul has experienced an electorally inspired “change of heart,” Williamson cites Paul’s former analysis of the issue as one requiring not only an economic but a cultural approach and then as evidence of his conversion to “the left,” he juxtaposes it with a quote from the Congressman’s new book, [Liberty Defined: 50 Essential Issues That Affect Our Freedom](#).

In the older statement cited by Williamson, Congressman Paul said, “We cannot continue to ignore the cultural aspects of immigration. We rightfully expect immigrants to show a sincere desire to become American citizens, speak English, and assimilate themselves culturally.... Today, however, some immigrants travel between countries frequently, enjoying the benefits of America but showing no desire to become Americans. Some even display hostility toward America and our ideals, joining the chorus of voices demanding that the United States become a multicultural society that rejects our own history. It is this cultural conflict that soon must be addressed, and the president’s amnesty proposal simply turns a blind eye to the problem.”

?Then, to buttress his conclusion, Williamson offers proof that something “has got into” Ron Paul as evinced by the words written in the new book. The proof offered by Williamson: the quotation of a single word (“superior”) used by Paul in [Liberty Defined](#) to praise the work ethic of many immigrants.

Perhaps the well-reasoned and nuanced attitude held by Congressman Paul would be revealed by reading the full quote in its proper context, that of anger felt by many Americans at the failure of immigrants to acclimate themselves to the American way of life.

Most immigrants do not come for handouts; rather, they come for survival reasons and have a work ethic superior to many of our own citizens who have grown dependent on welfare and unemployment benefits. This anger may reflect embarrassment as much as anything.

Perhaps I’m not as insightful on the issue as Williamson, but I don’t read those two statements as contradictory or as evidence that Ron Paul’s “objections to multiculturalism seem to be waning.”



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on May 27, 2011

?Without trying to square the two statements with the Constitution and Ron Paul's understanding thereof, Williamson prefers to stir up controversy among the Libertarian voting bloc.

Williamson asks: "What's got into Ron Paul? The best guess is: Gary Johnson."

?Gary Earl Johnson is the founder of a construction company and a former Governor of New Mexico. On April 21, 2011, Johnson [announced](#) his intention to seek the Republican nomination for President. Williamson, of course, identifies Johnson's candidacy as the seed of Ron Paul's alleged realignment on the topic of immigration. In snarky gossip tabloid style, Williamson comments, "He's [Johnson's] out to out-libertarian the libertarians' poster boy."

Johnson seems to have legitimate Libertarian bona fides. In fact, he was a featured presenter at the [Nullify Now!](#) tour stop in Phoenix, Arizona. Further, in an [article](#) published in April 2009 in *American Conservative* magazine, Bill Kauffman wrote, "He may take a shot at the Republican presidential nomination in 2012 as an antiwar, anti-Fed, pro-personal liberties, slash-government-spending candidate — in other words, a Ron Paul libertarian."

Well, that's proof enough that Johnson is a significant challenger to the success of Ron Paul's 2012 presidential campaign, right?

Does Johnson himself claim to be the man behind Ron Paul's migration on the immigration issue? According to the NRO piece:

?Johnson is not claiming credit for Representative Paul's new outlook. "Did he change his views?" he asks coolly [sic]. "Well, the thing about politics is that you end up changing the world a little bit when others recognize that what you're saying is a good thing."

So, he's not taking credit for Paul's "new" position, he is simply saying that unnamed "others" (more specific identification is not provided) might have changed their opinions upon hearing the good things Johnson is saying.

?There are areas in which Gary Johnson and Ron Paul agree.

Johnson talks like a pragmatist but is at heart more of a libertarian purist. Like Ron Paul, he's a vocal critic of U.S. military actions; unlike Ron Paul — and unlike most Republicans and most Americans — he favors almost no restriction on abortion.

Did Ron Paul adopt these views after reading Johnson's statements, as well?

Certainly not. Ron Paul has been a staunch constitutionalist and proponent of the core principles of Libertarianism for decades.

A more relevant question would be, is there any reason Williamson, working for the *National Review*, would wish to pit Libertarians against one another and frame the campaigns of Johnson and Paul as a "rivalry" and publish snarky, misleading comments from Johnson regarding Ron Paul, a man Johnson likely admires? Perhaps the answer to that question is the desire of *National Review* to maintain its prominent status as one of the official and tolerated mouthpieces of the "loyal opposition."

?More evidence of the divisive intent of the NRO piece is found in this statement reportedly made by Gary Johnson:

"People ask me, 'Aren't you just going to split the Ron Paul vote?'" Johnson says. "If I split on Paul's 7 percent, this isn't going anywhere. If it's splitting 40 percent, that's different. Forty percent is what it would take to win the primary."



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on May 27, 2011

All in all, the article published by National Review Online comes across as the first forays of a “false flag” mission to create an attitude of enmity where none exists. Libertarians, constitutionalists, and all friends of freedom should welcome as many voices advocating limited government as can make themselves heard.

The conclusion is that Williamson goes quote-mining in the hopes of presenting a gleaming golden nugget of controversy, when all that’s left glistening in the pan of his article is the worthless pyrite of pretense.

Photo of Ron Paul: AP Images



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.