

Embarrassing Borderism Fail

I just read what *should* have been one of the most embarrassing justifications for borderism I've ever seen passed off as thought. I won't mention the particular thinker who squeezed it out.

It goes like this:

- People have property rights, including the right to invite or exclude whoever they choose onto, or from, their property.
- The State violates this right by prohibiting its full exercise by property owners.
- The State then substitutes its idea of collective property rights for actual individual property rights via "national borders".
- Therefore, the only way left to defend your property rights is by demanding the State enforce its "borders" even harder.

The 3 points are dead right. The conclusion doesn't logically follow.

He even tries to base his jumping off point (that people have property rights which they have a right to defend forcefully), correctly, on the "non-aggression principle", and then ignores how it invalidates his conclusion.

Apparently "collateral damage" is acceptable.

Apparently, there's no point in striking at the root when it's easier to make the State bigger and more powerful.

Apparently, only "immigrants" can trespass, vandalize, or steal (or, are the only ones you need to defend your property from)- there's no need to defend your property from US "citizens" or government employees.