

Lock Up Young Men for Safety

Allowing young men – let's say age 18 to 23 – to be free increases the crime rate, as young men commit a disproportionately high percentage of violent crimes. Doesn't that fact justify locking up all men between the ages of 18 and 23? If it would dramatically reduce violent crime, and therefore reduce overall aggression, wouldn't that mean that such an action constitutes moral defensive force?

I hope no one here is stupid enough to agree with that, but I'm dying to hear some "closed border" advocate explain how the rationale for that is different in principle from what is described above, since they make a nearly identical argument – i.e., "If letting people cross that arbitrary line increases crime, that means that violently stopping anyone from crossing must be justified."