

By Excluding The Good Guys

One of the justifications most commonly used by borderists for property rights-violating, violent government “border security”, including theft-funded walls and such, is that it will make it harder for people to cross, and any “friction” applied to the process will reduce the total numbers of people crossing. As a result, they claim to believe this will reduce the total number of bad guys getting into America.

Theirs is a faulty argument.

As can be plainly demonstrated with drug prohibition.

Prohibition makes it harder and more dangerous to make and sell politically incorrect drugs. A clear result is that it severely restricts the number of honest “mom and pop” stores entering the drug market. This leaves the market (and yes, there *is* a market) open for the worst of the bad guys to be the main sellers and producers.

This is *not* an unforeseeable surprise. It is an inevitable result of adding “friction” to the drug market: more aggression and theft, more fraud and quality problems, and higher prices.

If border security makes it harder, in a similar way, for everyone who wants to get to America, won't it ensure that mainly bad guys, who are desperate enough to take the risks, will cross into America?

I think it does.

Who's going to have the stamina to try harder? The beaten down dad who just wants to get his kids to a safer, more prosperous place? Or the life-long archator who doesn't care who he stomps to get where he wants to go?

You can't *reasonably* justify more statism by pointing to the results of current statism.

Let people exercise their right of association, and protect their property rights (and band together to voluntarily, in unanimous consent, protect the property rights of others, including the property stolen by “taxation”) and the “problem” will shrivel away.