

“Enforce the Existing Laws”

Bad arguments don't help your side.

For example:

“Why is enforcement of existing immigration laws, laws which have been a standard for decades, such a divisive issue? Most countries in the world have stringent immigration laws, why is it that America is not allowed to enforce similar laws? Why does the Left in particular consider the removal of illegal immigrants representative of ‘racism’ or ‘fascism?’ I realize they are mostly insane, but I would just like to hear one valid and practical argument from them as to why the U.S. specifically should be saddled with wide open borders and why American conservatives in particular are racist merely for demanding that the current laws be followed?” ~ Brandon Smith

Let's substitute one Big Government lust, “control” of guns, for “control” of “borders”:

“Why is enforcement of existing gun laws, laws which have been a standard for decades, such a divisive issue? Most countries in the world have stringent gun laws, why is it that America is not allowed to enforce similar laws? Why does the Right in particular consider the removal of illegal guns representative of ‘tyranny’ or ‘socialism?’ I realize they are mostly insane, but I would just like to hear one valid and practical argument from them as to why the U.S. specifically should be saddled with easy access to guns and why American progressives in particular are tyrants merely for demanding that the current laws be followed?”

Because “laws” that are wrong, are *wrong*. Even if you believe they are “necessary.” Even if bad guys would take advantage of the situation if the “law” didn't exist or wasn't enforced.

Even if you believe the Constitution has any “authority,” whatever isn’t specifically permitted for government to do is expressly forbidden. Nowhere in the Constitution is “immigration control” permitted, so it is an illegal act by the federal government to “control immigration.”

Now, government is also similarly forbidden to *import* “refugees” or otherwise bring people into America, so that’s not the issue at hand.

Yes, the Second Amendment specifically places guns beyond the (legal) reach of “laws,” but it was unnecessary to do this, since that power wasn’t mentioned anyway (and it would have been a rights violation even if the Constitution allowed it)—and the Second Amendment has been utterly powerless against the will of the bullies in Congress and the BATFEces to just go ahead and do what they want.

Whether “immigration” (not a real thing anyway) is a good idea or not, the argument made by Mr. Smith above simply doesn’t hold water. It’s a purely statist argument, and as such, is nonsense.