

Twitter Thread by Imperator Philippus Arabus



Imperator Philippus Arabus
[@PhilippusArabus](#)



Immigration is inherently a biological question, whether you like it or not.

Nations are basically large extended families. We know this because you can find out your ethnic background with a DNA test.

Not many people talk about the expected outcome of mass migration.

We're given a lot of platitudes about diversity and inclusion, but what does this really mean in concrete terms?

Should host nations, like the Swedes or French, expect to live in perpetual segregation from imported newcomers?

Or is the expectation that one day they will fully intermix with the newcomers, and differences will disappear?

This raises more questions. If the intention is for differences to eventually disappear, what was the point of diversity, which we are told to value so highly?

At that point, there will be no more diversity. Diversity can only be maintained through segregation.

And if the endpoint is thorough intermixing, that naturally will result in visibly altered nations.

Especially when the native stock portion of a country may scarcely be 30% by century's end, as in the UK.

In other contexts, such outcomes might be labeled genocide.

And this is really the fundamental question I think any nation should ask about immigrants:

Would you be happy if every native child married an immigrant?

Are people happy taking ancient nations and diluting them beyond recognition with twice as many newcomers?

Many people will find such questions offensive or "racist," but this is the reality of what mass migration entails.

It's easy to be open-minded toward a tiny number of immigrants, but the numbers imply much different outcomes.