

Fr. Perozich comments —

Unchecked border crossings have failed to offer regulated immigration, but rather an invasion against which politicians have not served justice with charity.

The lack of regulation has endangered citizens, caused harm to border crossers, especially women who were violated and children who are unaccounted for by the lawlessness.

In 2016 I encouraged my parishioners to vote Catholic, and did comment on immigration in considerations for voting.

“A seventh is the importation of immigrants whose religious values are to eradicate every belief except those of their own prophet and god, and to impose this on America. An eighth slavery is the government cave in to allow anyone to come into the country, and to support them monetarily, in part adding to a debt of \$20 trillion, while paying Americans to sit home and not work, thus enslaving the soul of our own citizenry in depriving them of real work which sustains the immortal soul of a man and a woman.”

Louis Knuffke gives a reasoned response from the Catechism of the Catholic Church (which is a summary of other teachings) and from St. Thomas Aquinas.

I offer this so that readers have truth to offer when confronted by bishops, priests, and other open border agents.



[Louis Knuffke](#) on November 25, 2024



Catholic teaching on Immigration: integration and the common good

CV NEWS FEED // What do the Church and its great minds, such as St. Thomas Aquinas, teach on the political issue of immigration?

The Catechism of the Catholic Church provides a nuanced perspective on immigration, balancing the duty to welcome the stranger with the responsibility of governments to protect their citizens and promote the common good. Contrary to the perception that Catholic teaching demands an open-border policy, the Catechism outlines important qualifications for managing immigration.

Paragraph 2241 of the Catechism emphasizes that “the more prosperous nations are obliged, to the extent they are able, to welcome the foreigner in search of the security and the means of

livelihood which he cannot find in his country of origin.” However, this **welcome is not without limits. Nations are not required to accept an unlimited number of immigrants, especially if doing so imposes undue burdens on their citizens.** The text underscores that public authorities must ensure that natural rights are respected while balancing their **responsibility to protect their own populations and the common good of the country.**

Decisions regarding immigration policy fall properly to those who hold political authority, to whom the power to govern belongs by office, not to those in the Church’s hierarchy, who do not hold the office of governing a nation. **The Catechism underscores the rightful authority of those in political power to regulate immigration, stating, “Political authorities, for the sake of the common good for which they are responsible, may make the exercise of the right to immigrate subject to various juridical conditions.”**

Finally, the Catechism places **reciprocal obligations on immigrants, stating that they are obliged to “respect with gratitude the material and spiritual heritage of the country that receives them, to obey its laws and to assist in carrying civic burdens.”** Thus, immigration is not a unilateral or unconditional right but requires respect and obedience to the laws of the nation in question and an integration into that nation that is ordered toward the common good.

Similarly, St. Thomas Aquinas makes the common good the ultimate principle by which to judge whether and how immigrants should be allowed into a nation. In the *Summa Theologiae*, in the [Prima Secundae, Question 105, article 3](#), St. Thomas distinguishes between peaceful and hostile interactions with foreigners. “Man’s relations with foreigners are twofold: peaceful, and hostile,” he writes, asserting that **nations have the right to determine**

which immigrants benefit the common good for the country.

St. Thomas argues that states can reject those deemed harmful, such as criminals or enemies, to protect their citizens and society. He also affirms that immigration matters need to be regulated by law, ensuring a fair and ordered process.

St. Thomas recognizes three situations involving foreigners. First, he addresses travelers passing through a nation, asserting that they deserve kind treatment, citing Exodus 22:21: “Thou shalt not molest a stranger.” This divine directive, Aquinas says, reflects a duty of charity and respect toward those of good will, even when they were not permanent residents.

Second, St. Thomas discusses those who seek to stay temporarily, whom, he teaches, should also receive protection under the law and be treated with courtesy and respect, according to the virtue of justice.

Third, Aquinas considers foreigners who wish to settle permanently and obtain citizenship. He argues that such integration requires time, as immediate citizenship can lead to serious dangers for a nation.

“If foreigners were allowed to meddle with the affairs of a nation as soon as they settled down in its midst, many dangers might occur,” he warns. St. Thomas does not provide a specific time frame for integration but references Aristotle’s view that **assimilation can take two or three generations. This gradual process, Aquinas argues, ensures that immigrants fully embrace the culture and values of the nation, avoiding harm to its unity.**

Commenting on this principle in Aquinas, that integration usually takes several generations, in an article titled [“What Did Thomas Aquinas Say About Citizenship & Immigration?”](#) political

analyst Jerry Salyer notes that for St. Thomas, “only the descendants of new arrivals would be eligible for citizenship.”

“The reason for this seems to be that the Israelites understood true assimilation into a living community to be a profound, challenging process, one requiring not years, nor even decades, but generations,” Salyer wrote.

On the other hand, St. Thomas also allows for exceptions, citing the example of Achior from the Scripture (Judith 14:6), who was granted citizenship in Israel for his virtuous acts. However, these exceptions, he explains, were not arbitrary, but were granted on account of an extraordinary act that served the common good of the nation.

According to Aquinas, immigration should thus prioritize the unity of the nation and the common good. Integration, he teaches, must go beyond temporary benefits and aim at creating a cohesive society, so that immigrants embrace not only the privileges but also the responsibilities of citizenship, contributing to the common good they seek to enjoy.

If mass immigration either disrupts the unity of a society or overwhelms a nation’s ability to integrate newcomers, it will destroy the common good of that nation and is thereby unjust. In contrast, well ordered and proportionate immigration that follows the duly passed laws and ordinances of a nation, can enrich a society while maintaining cultural and social stability.

A balance between charity and justice must be sought, then, which has as its ultimate principle the common good of the nation. It is this very good which is sought by immigrants, the destruction of which serves neither citizen nor foreigner.