

Collectivist Authoritarians Can't Be Anarchists

Some supposed "anarchists" now argue that, as a result of being robbed by the political parasites, American taxpayers magically have some rightful collective ownership of the entire area now called "the United States," and therefore have the right to forcibly prevent anyone else from setting foot anywhere inside it (via "closed borders"). A few things about this argument:

- 1) It is "outcome-based" bullshit. It is the result of people wanting an excuse for state violence, and concocting and twisting an elaborate, perverted rationalization, like a lawyer making an argument for something he knows is bullshit. No one, starting from the fundamental principles of libertarianism, would even think of such a thing, much less pretend it is consistent or moral.
- 2) No, getting victimized by one person doesn't magically give you the right to victimize someone else.
- 3) No, getting robbed by politicians while you're living in Florida doesn't magically give you a say over who can set foot anywhere in the vast wilderness of Alaska. Politicians robbing you is not *why* Alaska (or anywhere else) exists. Someone in DC robbing someone in Florida doesn't magically give the robber *or* the robbed ownership of any of Alaska. No one has rightful ownership of unused and uninhabited land.
- 4) Those who argue this "collective ownership" BS never explain why *some* of the people in the collective have no right to decide who sets foot on their *own property*. How do some "taxpayers" get the right to tell *other* "taxpayers" that they are *not allowed* to invite "illegal" people onto their own property?
- 5) No, you don't get to use violence against an entire category of people based on your *guess* about what *some* of them *might* do in the future.
- 6) Why would nationality or citizenship have any relevance? You might as well claim that it's morally okay to forcibly evict *anyone* who doesn't pay "taxes" from the entire area known as "the United States." (But you probably won't, because then your argument would sound as ridiculous as it is.)
- 7) If you think that: a) one's place of birth, or; b) arbitrary lines made up by politicians, or; c) whether or not someone has the written permission of politicians to be somewhere, have *any effect* on when force is morally justified, then you are absolutely a *statist*.
- 8) Once again, to advocate *state* violence by *state* agents to enforce *state* laws about *state* borders makes you a wait for it STATIST! Duh.

What baffles me is why anyone who argues such collectivist authoritarian bullshit even wants to pretend to be an anarchist. It's like a "pacifist" explaining why he beat the crap out of someone, but is still a pacifist. Or a "vegan" explaining why he just ate a big steak, but is still a vegan. If you're gonna advocate state violence, aggression, and centralized, collectivist authoritarian control, then just accept and admit that you're a statist.