

Aggression Justifies More Aggression?

- 1) “Well of course, as a libertarian I would ideally want the market to handle everything, but as long as government taxes, regulations and licensing make health care so expensive, we can’t give up Medicare and Medicaid!”
- 2) “Well of course, as a libertarian, ideally I oppose ‘gun control,’ but as long as there is the ‘war on drugs’ creating this gang violence, we can’t repeal those gun laws!”
- 3) “Well of course, as a libertarian, I don’t think people should need government permission to travel, but as long as the state funds and maintains the roads, we have to have a licensing system!”
- 4) “Well of course, as a libertarian, I would ideally oppose all forced redistribution of wealth, but we can’t do away with Social Security unless and until we repeal all the taxes and laws which make it so hard for the elderly to be self-sufficient!”
- 5) “Well of course, as a libertarian, I oppose all the random stops, searches, and interrogations, but as long as the government is doing its war-mongering around the world, we need such things to keep us safe!”
- 6) “Well of course, as a libertarian, I would ideally want there to be no borders, but as long as there is a welfare state, we need government agents using violence to keep people out!”

Moral of the story: You can try to justify pretty much *any* type of immoral state aggression by complaining about some *other* example of immoral state aggression, and then say that we *neeeeed* the one until the other is gone. Just know that, if you make such arguments, you are: a) unprincipled; b) immoral, and; c) a statist. You’re being scared, and using words like “realistic” and “practical” and “survival,” doesn’t change that.