

# But Who Will Build The Libertarian Society? The Inconsistency of “Immigration Control”

A popular rationalization for “immigration control” is a coupling of the reality that the State currently “taxes” (forces/extorts) people to pay for “welfare,” roadways, etc., and the chance (which proponents claim is fact) that “immigrants” “will vote to take your freedoms away.” This carries the linguistic baggage of layer upon layer of delusion, but in the end it either boils down to the State being rightful owner of all property, or at least acting as if it were, and violently controlling everyone and their property.

They say “you can’t have ‘open borders and a welfare State, because immigrants will come and vote for more welfare, etc.” While this is a possibility– and only a possibility, not a guarantee – it does not justify “immigration control.” Two wrongs don’t make a right, as they say, and immigration control, just as “taxation,” is not consistent with liberty, libertarianism, anarchy, etc., period, due to the real-world implications of the enforcement of the concept.

As those who put forth this rationalization incorrectly apply the notion of property rights and ownership to political borders, they end up implying State (or other) control of all property they perceive to be the “country.”

Property changes hands through one of several ways: trade, gift, or theft. This includes housing, real estate, etc.

“Immigration,” more properly migration, is the movement (and generally in these discussions, settlement) of humans from one part of the area, or world, to another. In order to move and then settle, they must have property, and shelter, of some kind, or at least would probably prefer to. This would entail either “rugged” homesteading, or trade/purchase (or theft, but we will assume that is not the case).

In the case of migration you would have one human moving, and seeking to purchase property, such as a home, from another. This entire possibility, at least in theory, is cut off at the “border,” essentially, by an imposing third party, the State, in the same manner a State forces itself into all interactions and transactions, since the “immigrant” is “not allowed” to “enter the country” without “Government” permission, and the house is said to reside “within” or “upon” their “jurisdiction” (property).

There is no fundamental difference in concept or action, and the fact that the State already robs you does not justify or change that “immigration control” is the State simply forcing it’s guns into what would otherwise be voluntary trade.

Clearly if the State has the right to regulate immigration, this implies they are the rightful owners of all property withing or upon the physical geographical location which the State claims is it's "jurisdiction." Interestingly, many advocates who espouse this rationalization do not make an ethical or moral argument about it. In fact they will often admit immigration control is illegitimate, but then go on to rationalize and advocate it anyway, as some sort of "pragmatic tactic" based on their worry about "leftist voting immigrants."

This is, however, a cherry-picking, self-defeating position. An action either violates the non-aggression principle, or does not. To advocate an admittedly illegitimate action in response to another illegitimate action is to compromise one's self-professed principles is absurd, and to attempt to tie either of them in a context of libertarianism is outright insane.

Those who have realized there is no actual difference between "taxation" and "theft-" that "taxation" does not exist, only theft- can more clearly express their position by removing the political propaganda terms, such as "country," "immigration," etc.:

"Some guys are robbing me. Those guys need to keep people who want them to rob me, away from me, by telling them they can't come around here."

As usual, when expressed in plain, straightforward English in a manner describing the actual claims or actions, this belief, like all belief in "Government," is absolutely insane.

—

Another interesting twist to this belief is that some individuals say they would be fine with "open borders" in "ancapistan," but not now, with the "welfare state," and the possibility of increased "taxation."

If a person is concerned with the possibility of "immigrants" coming "here" and voting for "bigger government," why would they ever advocate "open / no borders" period? Regardless of the current application of particular State policy, what would stop people from coming "here" and "voting for more government," or just outright robbing you without pretending to be legitimate?

Anarchy is not a guarantee you won't get robbed. "Immigration control" is inconsistent with liberty no matter what "world" we "live in," regardless of one's assumptions regarding possible future crimes.

Redblood Blackflag