

Against the Wall: Weaponizing Open Borders Against The State

By. Joshua D. Glawson

A staple of Donald Trump's presidential campaign was his promise to build a US-Mexico border wall and getting Mexico to pay for it. Other Republican and conservative politicians have also supported the idea of a physical border wall between the two countries while suggesting the US taxpayers should foot the bill for its construction. However, in both of these cases, the cost far exceeds that of just the initial cost of building the border wall. The cost to build such a wall not only includes the construction price for materials, transportation, and labor, but also the long-term negative consequences on a growing economy for all countries affected. Before examining the costs associated with such a massive undertaking, the reasons for constructing a nearly two thousand mile long border wall should be considered.

One of the main reasons for building a physical border wall between the US and Mexico argued is the increased risk of heinous crimes committed by illegal immigrants, also known as 'undocumented immigrants.' Some have speculated that current crime rates are already far too high in the United States. Proponents speculate that there are anywhere from 11 million to as high as 36 million illegal immigrants in the US, today. Advocates for the wall cite illegal immigrants' crime rates, not including the act of illegally crossing or extending their stay in the US, at nearly twice that of US citizens within the US. Those in favor of a wall will typically add anecdotal examples of illegal immigrants victimizing innocent people by robbing, raping or killing, in order to add

emotion to the argument. Advocates for the building of the wall say the number of illegal immigrants is concerning and astronomically high, while the crime rates of this population is *double* that of US-born citizens.

According to [a 2018 report from FactCheck](#), “There were 12.1 million immigrants living in the country illegally as of January 2014, according to [the most recent estimate from the Department of Homeland Security](#). The estimates from two independent groups are similar: The Pew Research Center [estimates](#) the number at 11.1 million in 2014, and the Center for Migration Studies [says](#) there were 11 million people in 2015 living in the U.S. illegally. That would be about 3.5 percent to 3.8 percent of the [total U.S. population in 2014](#).”

In 2018, [Michelangelo Landgrave and Alex Nowrasteh of the Cato Institute](#) studied the US Census Bureau’s American Community Survey report from 2016 for illegal, or undocumented, immigrants incarcerated in the US. According to their extensive research, “An estimated 1,955,951 native-born Americans, 117,994 illegal immigrants, and 43,618 legal immigrants were incarcerated in 2016. The incarceration rate for native-born Americans was 1,521 per 100,000, 800 per 100,000 for illegal immigrants, and 325 per 100,000 for legal immigrants in 2016. Illegal immigrants are 47 percent less likely to be incarcerated than citizens. Comparatively, legal immigrants are 78 percent less likely to be incarcerated than citizens. If native-born Americans were incarcerated at the same rate as illegal immigrants, about 930,000 fewer Americans would be incarcerated. Conversely, if natives were incarcerated at the same rate as legal immigrants, about 1.5 million fewer natives would be in adult correctional facilities. The ACS data includes

illegal immigrants incarcerated for immigration offenses and in ICE detention facilities. Removing the immigration offenders by subtracting the 13,000 convicted for immigration offenses and the 34,379 in ICE detention facilities on any given day lowers the illegal immigrant incarceration rate to 479 per 100,000.”

In an [earlier Cato report from 2017](#), it was also found that “both illegal immigrants and legal immigrants have incarceration rates far below those of native-born Americans—at 0.85 percent, 0.47 percent, and 1.53 percent, respectively. Excluding illegal immigrants who are incarcerated or in detention for immigration offenses lowers their incarceration rate to 0.5 percent of their population—within a smidge of legal immigrants.” If we consider either the numbers somewhere between 11 to 12 million illegal immigrants in the United States or the range, between, 22 million to 36 million, the double-crime-rate statistic of illegal immigrants does not add up.

Nowrasteh accurately points out, “No matter how you dice the numbers, a larger illegal immigrant population in the United States means that their incarceration rate is even lower than what we report. Without adjusting for age, a total illegal immigrant population of 22 million would lower their incarceration rate to 0.56 percent using Cato’s estimate of the size of the incarcerated illegal immigrant population. Using the higher (and sillier) 36 million illegal immigrant population estimate by Ann Coulter lowers their incarceration rate to 0.34 percent.”

So, if the number of illegal immigrants is not as high as has been declared, and the number of illegal immigrants put in jails or prisons for heinous crimes is not even 1%,

what else are advocates of the wall saying?

Proponents of the wall go beyond just their worry of the number of immigrants and the fear of heinous crimes- they will also cite that illegal immigrants will plunder from the welfare State, increase costs for education, create more traffic, increase the prison population, take advantage of the DREAM Act, and use up food and other resources for legal immigrants and citizens. According to the [Federation for American Immigration Reform](#), the total cost *burden* on US taxpayers is around \$116 billion USD per year. Of course, the vast Welfare State is already far beyond this amount in total, and these programs themselves are a growing burden for the US economy. Many on the political right point to the national debt and rightfully declare our need to end the Welfare State. However, those against the welfare State are often also the ones declaring the need for a wall to protect the US from outsiders who wish to leech off or benefit from, the tax-funded welfare system.

The fear that illegal aliens are infiltrating and using up resources is one of the hypocrisies of those that wish to construct the border wall. Those that advocate for the wall say that welfare is already a problem that needs to be cut back or completely ended, while simultaneously arguing for the construction of a border wall between the US and Mexico to prevent more people from gaining access to US welfare and public services. This suggests they are not actually against a system of welfare since they are attempting to fortify the country preventing outsiders from gaining access to it, while maintaining the welfare system for those legally residing in the US. Proponents of the wall declare the need for “social safety nets,” e.g. unemployment insurance, social security, Medicaid,

Medicare, disability insurance, government-sponsored healthcare plans, welfare for those *truly* in dire need, children and women services, etc., all while trying to declare that welfare is bad. Social Security is already destined to fail, so the Conservatives will be forced to either accept more immigrants into the system to keep their Socialist program, or they will have to force people to pay more for less, or end the whole thing. Comparing the Social Security problem with that of the wall, Conservatives are choosing to force people to pay more for less in both cases. By contrast, libertarians want to end welfare altogether.

It is worth noting that ‘welfare protections’ is the very thing many politicians and supporters of the wall will say is a growing problem in the US, i.e. the Socialistic welfare State, but then the same politicians will suggest we need a wall in order to keep others from gaining access to them. This essentially creates protection for the welfare State while perpetuating its existence and people’s dependency on it as policies that protect welfare and its variants sanctifies and justifies them. The wall and policies around it, will sanctify the welfare State as it sets it apart for select people to qualify for and have. While the wall and its proposed policies justifies the welfare State by declaring further divisions and qualifications for those applying for it. The wall would essentially create a larger internal welfare State for those that qualify. My hypothesis is that if the Conservatives and Republicans get their wall, the Democrats and Socialists will leverage for more welfare for those within the US due to the savings on welfare and socially provided services that was once given to illegal immigrants and their families in the US. As history has shown, government workers, labor unions, etc. will continue asking for the same

amount of money and more, and the President and Congress at the time of inevitable troubles and costs concerning the wall will want to appease voters and not lose jobs. So, they will vote to maintain and continue the welfare system as normal.

Currently, by allowing more illegal immigrants on the welfare system it will first push the welfare system to all-time highs in regards to spending, but will eventually deplete the entire welfare system because the burden would be far too heavy; this is true of every Socialist program. Nevertheless, the ultimate goal should be to dismantle and obliterate the welfare system in the US, merely preventing others from getting to it just ensures those that are already in the US have an opportunity to get it; and, with slowing numbers of legal migration from other countries, this reinforces and perpetuates the welfare State.

Consider the following: *Conservatives are complaining that illegal immigrants are coming for welfare and for the socially provided services which are supported by taxation, e.g. schools, hospitals, infrastructure, hospitals, etc. To build a wall on the Southern border is an attempt to fortify the welfare State from those that wish to come and plunder the already plundered, while not actually working to end the welfare State itself. For a politician to speak out against the welfare State, social security, tax funded structures for society, etc. is near political suicide, and an almost guarantee to not win their political race. So, these politicians are, in fact, prolonging the welfare State's existence before the inevitable crash. Equally so, a US-Mexico wall would slow the traffic in and out of the country at this Southern border, reaffirming that Conservatives in favor of the wall are not actually in favor of 'laissez faire.' To be 'laissez faire,' under the*

sociopolitical and economical understanding of the word, means that the State is separate from the economy; and the philosophy behind 'laissez faire' is that a free flow of information, exchanges, trade, etc. benefit the vast majority of people, while helping to establish peace through that peaceful and voluntary exchange.

Allowing open borders crashes the total State, the welfare State and the warfare State, because it is already unbalanced as it is already overextended. This could, of course, result in violence, heinous crimes, the downfall of the US currency; while breaking up the entire United States into either their original state autonomy with a Federal government overseeing it, or splintering the US into multiple countries rather than remaining as one. In either of these choices, Liberty has a much better chance of survival than under an oppressive State that wishes to continue warfare and welfare while funding it through the theft and redistribution of wealth. Open borders will shed light on the brokenness of the State, allow a free flow of ideas and other laissez faire concepts, and demonstrate the weakness and wrongness of the current system.

Although it is a chaotic idea in a somewhat tongue-in-cheek style of rhetoric, it is not that I wish the US to cease existing, rather that it returns to a position that is pro-Liberty. This can happen if both the political left and right were to end the welfare or warfare State, or we can vote to crash the entire thing by weaponizing open borders against the welfare and warfare State itself. We also have the option of getting more Liberty-minded individuals in philosophy, lecturing, teaching, debating, in business, in entertainment, in religious institutions, and in politics, and creating social changes through these as we continue to stand by patiently while the political left and right to do

what they do.

“You need walls and a door on your house, so should your country!”

Although conservatives and those on the right in general advocate for a physical border wall, they also erroneously compare the country to their own personal house and ownership. They will say things like, “You have to put a wall on your house,” or, “Every property needs a fence to protect it.” They will also compare the country to a single turtle with a shell, etc. The poor comparison is not only on collective property rights, which is the opposite of what Conservatives claim to adhere to, but also that the country’s borders are arbitrary as they have the potential to change and shift. This also leads us to the next point which is that a house is not only privately owned, but it has walls, a floor, and a roof. Going down the rabbit hole of argumentum ad absurdum in the Socratic method and rhetorical form, should we also go ahead and put a roof on the country? Are we still forcing people to pay for “our” property? What color will the paint be on both sides of the eye sore of a wall? Etc.

In fact, comparing the country of the United States to a house that needs protecting is a logical fallacy known as a [false equivalence](#), where two completely opposing arguments appear to be logically equivalent when in fact they are not. Someone walking across an arbitrary border is not necessarily a threat to your life, Liberty, or property. A person strolling into your home is much more of a risk to your life, Liberty, and property. Someone coming into the country illegally is most likely doing so to better their own life, and/or the lives of their family with them or in their country of origin.

These are typically desperate people that are just trying to do better for themselves and their loved ones, accepting relatively low paying jobs compared to other Americans, and adding to the value of the standard of living in the US. Their desperation does not suggest they are willing to hurt others for their own gains. Most illegal immigrants will try to keep their heads down and not accept many welfare services because they do not want to be found and sent back to where they come from.

People harming others and their property is an ongoing battle everywhere, not just via illegal immigrants. As it has been pointed out in this article, the numbers of criminals who are undocumented is very small compared to the rest of the US population. When people commit crimes, especially acts of theft, murder, rape, enslavement, etc. they are to be punished by the laws of that government, not the government from whence the criminal came. So, if people are coming to this country and committing criminal acts, beyond simply coming here, they will be put into our jails. This is unfortunate for everyone involved, but it beats sending them back to their country of origin and failing to uphold Justice.

It will not cost much to build a wall...

As [a report from Fox News](#) shows, “The proposed U.S.-Mexico border wall will reportedly cost at least \$21.6 billion” “House Speaker Paul Ryan said last month that the project could cost \$8 billion to \$14 billion. Trump had previously said the wall could cost \$12 billion.” “According to Reuters, the report lays out a three-pronged approach to get the wall completed. The phases include the construction of fences and walls covering

more than 1,200 miles and finishing by the end of 2020.”

The proposed \$21.6 billion is just the initial cost of constructing the wall, not including the long-term and negative impact it will have on the economy. As many people can attest, when a government says they will be doing construction for a certain cost within a certain amount of time, you can bet that the cost will be higher and the time to build it will take longer than expected, especially on such a grand scale as building a border wall between 1,200 miles and 1,954 miles. Of course, the continental border is also figurative in that these numbers do not include the maritime boundaries of 18 miles in the Pacific Ocean and 12 miles in the Gulf of Mexico. The wall, of course, would also not address the concern for the other [estimated 44% of illegal immigrants](#) who come from other countries aside from Mexico which does make up around 56%, especially the roughly 13% that come from Asian countries. It also does not address the number of illegal immigrants who fly or just overstay their initially legal trip to the US.

Additionally, the wall does not address the numbers of fake marriages in order to validate their becoming citizens, or a plethora of other ways to work around the system. Etc.

So, more patrols in the oceans and Gulf of Mexico will be required, along with more monitoring of travelers in and out of the US by automobile, planes and boats, and more government departments like ICE to ensure that people are leaving or not here illegally will be necessary to enforce all immigration laws and policies. This, of course, adds to the growing police State and creates a bigger government that Conservatives will pass off as necessary and legitimate in the name of protectionism, safety, security, national emergency, etc. This all goes beyond that the stipulated powers of the federal

government are intended to be limited as specified in Article 1, Section 8, of the US Constitution, anything more appeals to the arbitrary power of government to make any decision at any time as long as it is phrased with the aforementioned, meaning the Constitution is then a meaningless contract of sorts if its original intentions were to limit government itself as opposed to devising more ways of limiting ordinary people.

In contrast, as [written by Art Carden at Forbes](#), “A [2011 paper for the Center for Global Development](#) that was ultimately [published in the *Journal of Economic Perspectives*](#), Michael Clemens summarized the literature on immigration. He referred to the potential benefits of more open borders as ‘trillion-dollar bills on the sidewalk’” and pointed out that ‘the estimated gains [from dropping barriers to labor mobility] are often in the range of 50-150% of world GDP.’ The [World Bank reported that World GDP in 2011](#) was about \$70 trillion, which means dropping barriers to labor mobility could increase the size of the world economy by \$35-\$105 trillion dollars. That’s a lot of new wealth in the pockets of American residents and our potential foreign customers.” Of course, in 2017, that number was much higher with GDP (PPP) of world in 2017 is estimated at \$127 trillion USD according to the World Bank. This means, as of 2017, if we had a more open borders policy, 50% to 150% increase of world GDP would equal an astronomical amount creating more jobs, products, and opportunities for bettering conditions for all involved in a more laissez faire approach to borders and trade.

Border walls, much like tariffs and other bureaucratic red tape, restricts and limits people from entering a market where people are willing and desiring to exchange.

But, the Great Wall of China...

As overused as this statement is, one would think of people actually looking up the facts about the Great Wall of China before they make such a statement. It would also be an inaccurate comparison to compare Mexican and South Americans peacefully coming into the US to that of Mongols and other military powers who invaded China and other countries in order to rape, pillage, and control.

The completed Great Wall of China took around 2000 years to build. “[There are historical records](#) that suggested 300,000–500,000 soldiers were assigned to both build and guard the Qin Great Wall with the help of 400,000–500,000 conscripted [coerced] laborers. Other records suggest that up to 1.5 million men were used during the peak of Qin construction.” “The first complete Great Wall was linked together around 221 BC, and it is believed to have been built over a period of about 20 years. The Qin connected together and expanded walls already in place that were built by prior kingdoms.”

Additionally, although [the Great Wall of China](#) was “a useful deterrent against raids, at several points throughout its history the Great Wall failed to stop enemies, including in 1644 when the Manchu Qing marched through the gates of Shanhai Pass and replaced the most ardent of the wall-building dynasties, the Ming, as rulers of China.”

According to research by [Brook Larmer at Smithsonian Magazine](#), “From its origins under the first emperor in the third century B.C., the Great Wall has never been a single barrier, as early Western accounts claimed. Rather, it was an overlapping maze of ramparts and towers that was unified only during frenzied Ming dynasty construction,

beginning in the late 1300s. As a defense system, the wall ultimately failed, not because of intrinsic design flaws but because of the internal weaknesses—corruption, cowardice, infighting—of various imperial regimes.”

Devil’s advocate...?

Playing Devil’s advocate, we can see how [border walls](#) have worked in preventing people from getting in or out of the country as easily as without.

- The Sumerians’ Amorite wall worked for a while before being overtaken, but this was built around 21st Century B.C.
- The long walls of Athens helped stave off the Spartans and their allies, but due to loss at sea via their navy, Athens eventually fell to Spartan control and the walls were dismantled.
- The Great Wall of Gorgan, aka the Red Snake, in modern day Iran, was put up to most likely fight off the Hephthalite Huns and various enemies to their North.
- Hadrian’s Wall was started around 122 A.D. to protect Roman Britain from the Scots and Picts, along with others to their North. Due to its failure to keep out those in the North, the Roman Brits built the Antonine Wall further North, but it too failed within a few years.
- The Walls of Constantinople and the Theodosian Walls were built between the 300s A.D. and 400s A.D. and were eventually infiltrated by the Ottoman Turks in 1453.

- The Berlin Wall was erected in 1961 by the Soviet East Germans to separate the West Germans from the East Germans in Berlin. Of course, due to social pressures from outside countries and within German itself, the wall came down in 1989. Throughout the period of the wall's standing, people were still sneaking over to both sides.
- The Moroccan Western Sahara Wall began in 1980 and is surrounded with landmine fields and other traps in order to separate Morocco from the Polisario to the East.
- The walls of Cyprus, also known as the United Nations Buffer Zone, also known as the Green Line, also known as the Attila Line, began in 1964 and has since eased tensions between the Greeks and Turks. By 2003, traveling past the wall has been more relaxed.
- [The India-Pakistan](#) border wall was established between the two countries and the UN in 1949 as a buffer zone to prevent invasions of disputed land known as Kashmir. Of course, legal traveling between the countries is permissible through checkpoints and the Thar Express railway.
- The Turkey-Syria border wall was just completed in 2018. It is built with architecturally sound materials and reinforcement, along with technology to help monitor in unmanned areas.
- The Saudi-Yemen border wall was began in 2003 and ended in 2004 due to Saudi Arabia breaking a contractual agreement not to build a wall between the two countries in 2000. Saudi Arabia and the US have instead resorted to bombing

Yemen.

- The Bangladesh-India border wall has been an ongoing issue of Bangladeshis illegally immigrating to India and/or smuggling goods out of India. The wall has not really worked and there are various human rights concerns since the wall has been up.

In most of these cases, the walls have failed not because of the architectural design of the walls themselves, rather the philosophy and social pressures surrounding them. When comparing these walls to the proposed wall between the US and Mexico, we find that those in favor of its erection are viewing illegal immigrants from Mexico and South America as a military threat to that of the US. So, the walls can work to deter people, it is just not clear as to what extent or how long. There is no way to verify the effectiveness as that would be extrapolating. What can be shown is historical accounts on both sides, whether in favor or opposed to a border wall, along with the far reaches into the economy that such a wall would in fact cause economic harm for both sides.

Once it is demonstrated that significant economic harm will be caused by the wall, then the “problems” of illegal immigration from Mexico and South America will exasperate after erecting the US-Mexico border wall as it makes those wishing to come even more desperate than they already are. If a person is not only lacking significant education and decent amounts of money to help themselves and their families survive, but also the freedom of movement and an even starker future due to economic problems, there is no telling to what extent people will go in order to overcome their struggles. This would not justify any bad actions of initiating harm on others, violating a non-aggression

principle. Rather, this would be a prompted symptom of the US government initiating harm with the threat of aggression on those who are acting peacefully and voluntarily, i.e. Mexican and South American migrants and others in these regions.

If one wants to maintain the welfare and warfare State, without the risk of total economic failure from open borders adding to the influx of immigrants, closed borders are necessary in maintaining the country, with hopes of ridding the two, i.e. war and welfare. At this time, it is apparent that no one is going to end either of these. If the welfare and warfare State is continued on its own without open borders, the system will still fail nevertheless as they are already showing significant signs of overreaching and overspending. With open borders, it forces a more immediate change in internal and external relations, as the costs of welfare continue to rise, even without illegal immigration, and the overextended military and its costs are already a cost burden on tax payers. Open borders creates a faster response to the overspending and overreaching of government than fortification with border walls and stricter immigration policies, as borders lessen the amount of the burden felt. Without being able to accept the rewards and burdens, a market does not know how to appropriately respond to supply or demand. In either case, open borders or closed, debts will need to be paid and it is only a matter of time until total failure at the continued rate. Just how much time that will be, no one is able to yet answer.

Natural Law...

Natural Law Theory suggests that all human rights are either from a Creator, Nature, or Reason itself, as an extension of what it means to be human and/or a person. Positive Law Theory suggests that human rights originate from governments and social rules, thus they can be given or taken at the whim of the sovereign powers. Those in favor of border walls and strict immigration policies are, in fact, defending the concept of Positive Law Theory as opposed to Natural Law Theory because they are suggesting that freedom within the US can only be granted by the government through strict legal procedures.

The [1948 United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#), Article 13, declares, "A citizen of a state in which that citizen is present has the liberty to travel, reside in, and/or work in any part of the state where one pleases within the limits of respect for the liberty and rights of others. A citizen also has the right to leave any country, including his or her own, and to return to his or her country at any time." However, this does not mean the declaration allows for free migration between countries. Nevertheless, the underlying principles behind the freedom of movement is found in Natural Law, much like the philosophy of John Locke who was one of the most significant inspirations and influences for the US Declaration of Independence.

[According to Dr. Jane McAdam](#), who is the Director of the International Refugee and Migration Law project at the Gilbert and Tobin Centre of Public Law, "John Locke regarded leaving one's country as the means by which one could refuse consent to be part of a political community (since, in his view, governance required such consent). In Locke's view, the right to expatriate oneself was a manifestation of self-governance

and individual self-determination.”

We also see this subtle and not-so-subtle concept of Manifest Destiny throughout US history, as it was a part of the spirit of America and what us who we are today, both for the good and the bad.

Delving further into [John Locke's Two Treatises of Government](#), Locke specifies freedom of movement and migration in the following way:

“Since the Government has a direct jurisdiction only over the Land, and reaches the Possessor of it, (before he has actually incorporated himself in the Society) only as he dwells upon, and enjoys that: The Obligation any one is under, by Virtue of such Enjoyment, to submit to the Government, begins and ends with the Enjoyment; so that whenever the Owner, who has given nothing but such a tacit Consent to the Government, will, by Donation, Sale, or otherwise, quit the said Possession, he is at liberty to go and incorporate himself into any other Commonwealth, or to agree with others to begin a new one, in vacuis locis, in any part of the World, they can find free and unpossessed: Whereas he, that has once, by actual Agreement, and any express Declaration, given his Consent to be of any Commonwealth, is perpetually and indispensably obliged to be and remain unalterably a Subject to it, and can never be again in the liberty of the state of Nature; unless by any Calamity, the Government, he was under, comes to be dissolved; or else by some publick Act cuts him off from being any longer a Member of it.”

If the US government exists in order to protect life, Liberty, and property, someone’s peaceful, free, and voluntary action of migration to the US does nothing to

harm the US directly. If welfare and social services are denied to the persons illegally immigrating because they have not paid directly into the welfare system, we can surely find plenty of native-born Americans who fit the same description. If we are in agreement that the welfare State is bad, by its nature of coercion and theft through redistribution, then it does not matter who is getting the plunder- it only matters that the plundering is taking place in the first place and it needs to be ended. If it is a concern about the philosophy one brings with them as an illegal immigrant, that makes no difference than those already in the US that oppose all Western thought and philosophy of Liberty; it also makes no difference with those that come here legally with conflicting and opposing ideas in regards to the US.

The great thing about free markets is the constant exchange and study of ideas that uphold the good ideas and get rid of the bad ideas. Bad ideas have always, and will always, penetrate borders unless a coercive government turns to nearly complete isolationism as in North Korea and implements a screening process like that of the Thought Police. Of course, the US already forces legal immigrants to take an education course that goes through some US history and legal concepts, along with convincing those going through the process to pledge blind allegiance to the US and its flag.

More specific to the freedom of movement into the US, Judge Andrew Peter Napolitano made a prolific statement when [he said the following](#):

“The right to travel is an individual personal human right, long recognized under the natural law as immune from governmental interference. Of course, governments have

been interfering with this right for millennia. The Romans restricted the travel of Jews; Parliament restricted the travel of serfs; Congress restricted the travel of slaves; and starting in the late 19th century, the federal government has restricted the travel of non-Americans who want to come here and even the travel of those already here. All of these abominable restrictions of the right to travel are based not on any culpability of individuals, but rather on membership in the groups to which persons have belonged from birth.

The initial reasons for these immigration restrictions involved the different appearance and culture of those seeking to come here and the nativism of those running the government here. Somehow, the people who ran the government believed that they who were born here were superior persons and more worthy of American-style freedoms than those who sought to come here. This extols nativism.

Nativism is the arch-enemy of the freedom to travel, as its adherents believe they can use the coercive power of the government to impair the freedom of travel of persons who are unwanted not because of personal behavior, but solely on the basis of where they were born. Nativism teaches that we lack natural rights and enjoy only those rights the government permits us to exercise.

Yet, the freedom to travel is a fundamental natural right. This is not a novel view. In addition to Aquinas and Jefferson, it has been embraced by St. Augustine, John Locke, Thomas Paine, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Pope John Paul II and Justice Clarence Thomas. Our fundamental human rights are not conditioned or even conditionable on the

laws or traditions of the place where our mothers were physically located when we were born. They are not attenuated because our mothers were not in the United States at the moment of our births. Stated differently, we all possess natural rights, no more and no less than any others. All humans have the full panoply of freedom of choice in areas of personal behavior protected from governmental interference by the natural law, no matter where they were born.

Americans are not possessed of more natural rights than non-Americans; rather, we enjoy more opportunities to exercise those rights because the government is theoretically restrained by the Constitution, which explicitly recognizes the natural law. That recognition is articulated in the Ninth Amendment, which declares that the enumeration of certain rights in the Constitution shall not be used by the government as an excuse to deny or disparage other unnamed and unnamable rights retained by the people.”

In a work on the topic of [“Government By Choice,” Dr. Nicolas Maloberti](#) at the Independent Institute pointed out the following:

“According to Frederic Bastiat, ‘There remains now, and there will remain, only one way, which is, to enjoy the labor of others.’ The existence of government does not alter this reality. Although government might reduce the likelihood of private prédation, it also provides an organized, formidable mechanism of rent extraction. If the cost of exit is sufficiently high, predominantly selfish and rational individuals will take advantage of such a mechanism. Immigration barriers raise the cost of exit to such an extent that few individuals can afford to incur it. The state certainly becomes, in Bastiat’s words, ‘the

great fiction through which everybody endeavors to live at the expense of everybody else...’ ...If individual sovereignty is to be protected, the state's sovereignty over a particular territory should not include a prerogative to determine who is to inhabit it. I do not claim that there should be no borders or that anyone willing to entry a country should be allowed to do so. I claim, rather, that from a classical-liberal perspective there are no good reasons for preventing the entry of those who merely intend to advance their own well-being within the constraints imposed by respect for other people's rights.”

In closing, if we believe in the concepts of Liberty, freedom, and Natural Rights under the concept of negative Liberty, then those concepts are to apply to everyone equally, not just for Americans. If we believe in laissez faire open markets or free markets, then the same goes for the exchange with those outside of the US. If we believe a market of ideas and exchange should be voluntary, peaceful, and free, then we have no justification for policing the minds and hearts of those coming here as long as they are of voluntary, peaceful, and free intentions and actions. If we believe in Justice and equality for all, then someone merely coming to the US to make their lives better, for the good, are of marketable value for everyone here. If the concern one has in regards to people freely coming into the US is due to welfare, warfare, and public services, then that should be more of a concern with those things being insufficient as opposed to those people. With a truly free market, we are able to address more with less restrictions, while helping more people. Once enough people from other countries have fled their home countries that are lacking in sufficiently allowing freedom and Liberty, other countries will be *forced* to change due to *market pressures*, and the US will eventually, and naturally, find a

population equilibrium. The welfare State is destined to fail, and the only reason it continues is due to the fact that it is almost guaranteed political suicide to propose ending the programs and bureaucratic departments due to the majority's preconceived notions that they are somehow 'good' to have and force upon others. The warfare and military State will fail, as they all have throughout history, because the costs become over burdensome and the reasons for their existence becomes blatantly unjustifiable as the vast majority of wars are. By having border walls, we are only delaying the inevitable end of these systems, while slowly suffering the economic and marketplace hardships to come with it. By having more open borders, we may be able to allow the welfare and warfare State to collapse, having some hardships nearly immediately, but like a Band-Aid being ripped off it will hurt less than slowly tugging at it.