

# Immoral Walls and Dishonest Manipulation

Sarcasm only works for *me* when you don't demonstrate dishonesty while attempting it.

I listen to Scott Adams' "periscopes" to keep an eye on what some of those on the pro-government side are thinking. He's right about half the time- when he isn't in his pro-government box, unable to see beyond its horizon. But sometimes it amazes me how dishonestly he frames an issue. I wonder if others notice.

Of course, since he is a trained hypnotist, it may be intentional on his part; an attempt to manipulate the opinions of his listeners. I don't criticize him for that- it's what I hope to do with my blog. But I hope to do it honestly, without deception. I am not trying to be sneaky about it.

A day or so ago he was mocking Nancy Pelosi's absurd contention that "walls are immoral".

I agree conditionally; walls are not, in and of themselves, immoral. Unless your particular morality is somehow anti-wall, which I seriously doubt. **Morals** being what they are ("situational ethics") I can see how someone *might* have a set of morals which doesn't allow for walls, but it's not likely. It's more likely to be political posturing.

The real question is whether or not walls are *ethical*. For simply being walls. The answer is: walls are ethically neutral.

You can almost always use *your own money/resources* to wall off *your own property* from adjacent property without any ethical problem.

Or you can help wall off "collective property" in the very rare cases where you have part-ownership in some *actual collective property* and there is **unanimous consent** to build and fund the wall.

There is an ethical problem if you wall off property which doesn't belong to you, or if you force others to pay for a wall they don't want to pay for.

If you wall off a neighbor's property a few doors down, you have unethically built a wall.

If you force someone to help pay for a wall around your own property, you have unethically built a wall.

You could say those particular walls, under those circumstances, are unethical walls. Probably even immoral walls.

"Government land"- dishonestly referred to as "public land" in the same way kinderprisons

are called “public schools”- is not yours to wall off. It isn’t true “collective property”, and there is not unanimous consent. Nor does it really belong to the government. Everything government claims it either stole from the rightful owner or bought (and maintains) with stolen or counterfeited money. A thief does not own the stolen goods he possesses, so government can not rightfully own *anything*. Any wall financed with stolen money is not an ethical wall.

A “border” wall fails on both accounts. No matter how “necessary” you believe it to be. It can not be done ethically under government.

You can sarcastically mock the truth, but the truth doesn’t change to suit your wishes. Not even if you are a president or Scott Adams.