

A Proposed Business Model for Defending Texan Ranchers

thelastbastille.wordpress.com/2015/04/20/a-proposed-business-model-for-defending-texan-ranchers/

[Castle doctrine](#) recognizes the [natural liberty](#) of home owners to forcibly defend themselves against burglars. An individual's right to contract is respected by the several American constitutions, such as the [Contract Clause](#) found under Article I § 10 cl. 1 of the federal constitution. If “we” Texans (or Americans, more generally) are to have any country at all, wouldn't it stand to reason that we freely associate with others in order to **collectively** defend “our” nation just as we **individually** defend our own homes?



Believe it or not, most of the [tejanos](#) I've met around the [Greater Austin](#) metro area tend to be either ranchers or entrepreneurs. In my private conversations with them over the years, the [tejanos](#) are not only very proud of their Hispanic ancestral lineage, but they are quite fearless in expressing the most heartfelt sentiments for Texas I've ever heard (which makes perfect sense in light of the fact that the [tejanos](#), by definition, are the original natives of Texas). When I commonly heard comments by many of them whenever they expressed an attitude towards the **illegal** immigrants that someone of a Germanic or Celtic ethnic ancestry would similarly have towards stereotypical “[trailer-trash](#),” it suddenly dawned on me as to why the [corporate media](#) only demonized those with any European heritage of bigotry – should any light be cast upon the [tejanos](#)' cultural perspectives on their “undocumented” distant cousins, then the entire mainstream media narrative against border security would completely fall apart at the seams for the blatant fraud that it is.

Whenever the patriot community mentions the importance of border security in their copious rhetoric, I regularly felt very conflicted. On the one hand, the patriots were quite accurate that the corporate media scourge they've endured over the years is deliberately unfair and maliciously false, yet, I couldn't reconcile this with their advocacy of trying to rescue what seemed to me to be a failed government program. Their collaboration with the [United States Border Patrol](#) (USBP) has not successfully halted the inflow of these “undocumented” aliens since [Manolo Ortiz told P.J. O'Rourke](#) that despite Border Patrol apprehending 128,000 [trespassers](#) in 1968, this figure jumped to 1,000,000 by 1984 ([oh-so-appropriately](#)). This indicates to me that so-called “federal law enforcement” has failed to emulate [the little hero of Haarlem](#) in

keeping back the flooding waves of these “undocumented workers” from invading Texas (much less America). Such grotesque failures do not bode well for the efficacy of government border security.

If border security is indeed nothing more nefarious than a failed government program, then what better solutions or options are available to help Texans (& Americans) stem the flow of invading trespassers? Surely, neither *tejanos* nor other Texans want to acquiesce to their property rights being violated, but this question revolves around how best to remedy these [common law offenses](#). Assuming that the federal government has abandoned Texas to the whims of Mexican nationals, then what can be done to best preserve the liberty and property of the Texan people?

I suggest that the American “southern border” be abandoned entirely, in favor of defending the ranchers whose private property directly abuts said “international border.” Let USBP flail around like fish out of water attempting to swim on the beach, and don’t shed a tear for them when they get killed by the drug cartels or thugs with facial tattoos. Much like the [city of Detroit’s bankruptcy](#), sometimes it’s tactically and/or strategically advantageous to regroup elsewhere whenever the probability of success can be increased by doing so. Should a few patriots still insist on defending borders instead of the ranchers directly, I would then suggest they focus on defending [natural borders](#), such as the [Nueces](#) or the [Rio Grande](#) rivers, rather than arbitrary lines on a map drawn by politicians.

Allow me to explain my proposed business model. Following the justifications made by Gustave de Molinari on behalf of [the private production of security services](#), I see no good reason for returning veterans and other entrepreneurs to not offer ranchers on the southern “border” genuine protection against trespassers. Alternatively, such security services could also be offered in the form of [mutual aid](#), which initially could be used to bring prices within an affordable range, but as with any truly competitive market that lacks government intervention, economists have observed that, over time, quality goes up while prices come down.

Regarding government intervention specifically, the idea here is that these *laissez-faire* security services would be operating **independently** of USBP, not in “cooperation” with them. Not only are they emblematic of a failed government program, but they appear all too comfortable to betray the trust of, or otherwise compromise the integrity of, the patriot faction. Consider for a moment Gary Hunt’s argument that [the patriots are aiding & abetting the federal government](#) whenever they’ve assisted in spotting and detaining trespassers in conjunction with USBP. Think about how [Kevin Massey was framed for the victimless crime](#) of being a “felon in possession of firearm” by USBP agents. Do these behaviors truly justify any real necessity to work “with” USBP for free, and at serious risk of losing either your liberty or your integrity?

Probably the best appeal of my proposed business model is that, as a single-item political issue, it could serve as the foundation for a [“cross-pollinating”](#) alliance between [the patriot and anarchist factions](#). Presuming that said anarchists in question are of the [propertarian variety](#), then it would be accurate to say that these anarchists and their patriot allies both value the sanctity of private property and *laissez-faire* free markets. Ethical compromises are unnecessary here, for my proposed business model is entirely consistent with both the [non-aggression principle](#), as well as the U.S. Constitution.

Since private defense of these ranchers would be a for-profit business, a word or two should be spent on finances. Although Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs) would be useful initially, I suspect that, long-term, the trend will evolve towards other forms of payment, such as specie, or even crypto-currencies. Controlling for the effects of inflation and debasement of FRNs would be the initial benefits of using free market money, despite the fact that such transactions might still be susceptible to taxation, unless [civilly disobedient moonlighting](#) becomes the norm. Membership fees, insurance packages, and/or security co-ops are but just a few of the ways security services could be made [subjectively](#) affordable.

Security services would entail a range of operations to protect the ranchers. Unlike the [“catch and release”](#)

habits of USBP, the goal of private security here would be deterrence, not detention. Organizational structures would be akin to [security teams](#) and/or [leaderless resistance](#) cells. Operational duties would entail patrols, guard duty, and even [mantrapping](#); all of which would be conducted as humanely as realistically possible for the benefit of the customer, not the trespassers. Initial attempts by the [Arizona Border Teams](#) and [Camp Lone Star](#) ought to be studied in order for lessons to be learned from their mistakes, as well as their successes.

Targeting must be absolutely precise, because civilian casualties and so-called “collateral damage” are the inevitable results of government, not free market security services. Intercepted aliens are considered to be neither “illegals” nor “undocumented workers,” but rather, as **trespassers**. They may take the form of either Mexican narcotics cartels or criminal subversives such as [La Raza](#) (the latter of whom publicly advocate for the implementation of the [Plan of San Diego](#)). Unfortunately, a sizable portion of these trespassers are neither of the first two types, and are therefore a third batch comprised of desperate Mexicans who could not acquire political refugee status, or [naturalize](#) legally, from either the [United States Citizenship and Immigration Services](#) or the [United States Department of State](#). As such, upon capture, they should only [be branded or tattooed as PNG \(*persona non grata*\) on the inside of one of their upper arms](#), about ½ inch in height, before being informally deported back to Mexico. Otherwise, trespassers will be surveilled and confronted based on the discretion of security personnel; however, anyone with tattoos on their face will be shot on sight.

Now, by this point, there will likely be a flurry of criticisms, which I am more than happy to address ahead of time. Anyone who accuses these [private defense agencies](#) (PDAs) of being mercenaries simply does not understand market dynamics. Also, these PDAs would not enjoy either the [limited liability](#) or [qualified immunity](#) protections that corporations and government police enjoy, respectively. What PDAs do enjoy is the right of contract, just like individuals whenever they decide to enter into a marriage. The employees of these PDAs would be totally and completely responsible for their own individual actions, and what better accountability can you really expect from the free market than this?

Other criticisms appear to revolve around the singular notion of “law enforcement.” For instance, the admonition to “just rely on Border Patrol to enforce the law” is spurious because not only is reform literally insane (especially in light of Massey and O’Rourke, as mentioned earlier), but also consider this is the exact same USBP that **failed** to halt [Operation Fast & Furious](#), which was conducted right under their noses by the (Orwellian titled) United States Department of Justice. Assertions that private Texan (or American) citizens “cannot enforce the law,” such as the [United States Code](#), are similarly ridiculous, because PDAs are not willfully enforcing *any* laws; in fact, if the PDAs are guilty of anything, it is that their entire business model implicitly challenges the legitimacy of the federal government itself. Claiming that the private production of security services are not legal is entirely bogus, for the [Ninth & Tenth Amendments](#) to the [United States Constitution of 1787](#) (in addition to the Contract Clause), as well as [Article I §§ 23 & 29](#) of the [Texas Constitution of 1876](#), say, respectively, that:

“The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

“Every citizen shall have the right to keep and bear arms in the lawful defense of himself or the State; but the Legislature shall have power, by law, to regulate the wearing of arms, with a view to prevent crime.”

“To guard against transgressions of the high powers herein delegated, we declare that everything in this ‘Bill of Rights’ is excepted out of the general powers of government, and shall forever remain inviolate, and all laws contrary thereto, or to the following provisions, shall be void.”

Furthermore, [chapter 9 of the Texas Penal Code](#) includes the “stand your ground” laws, which explicitly state under which circumstances force, even deadly force, may be used against criminals in defense of one’s own private property. Once government laws start agreeing with the non-aggression principle, then any statist groaning should be taken as evidence that such critics are just sore losers.

Critics who urge Texans to either sell or abandon their ranches along the southern border, instead of defending them, might as well be urging these ranchers to “move to Somalia.” This is completely inane, because not only would the very livelihood of these ranchers be eradicated, but I also doubt statisticians would be so quick to proffer such “advice” to those of Negro ancestry who live in [Highland Park, Michigan](#). If the inhabitants of Highland Park are moving heaven and earth [to rescue “their” municipal government from total collapse](#), then why should Texans abandon their ranches to flooding waves of trespassers?

Debunking the notion from some libertarians who argue that “defending the ranchers is self-defeating; therefore, it is much better to support the [coyotajes](#)” is something that must be done in order to address the common law offense of trespassing. Besides the fact that the *tejanos* told me they have nothing but loathing for the *coyotajes*, most *coyotajes* are not agorists, because they are not smuggling people across the border as a form of political protest or are otherwise trying to starve [the State](#); their only interest is to emulate their counterparts in Eastern Europe who fraudulently smuggle women only to exploit them *vis-à-vis* sex trafficking. Not only is smuggling not a justification for trespassing, but it’s actually anti-free market to suggest that customer abuse does not violate the non-aggression principle. What I am referring to here is the absurd notion that the depraved conditions Mexicans are smuggled in are even slightly humane. [Mala prohibita](#) smuggling of cannabis or “wanted fugitives” away from the grasp of the State is one thing, but the *male in se* of human trafficking and sex slavery blatantly violates the non-aggression principle, just as gun control or narcotics prohibition does.

I don’t care what any “[celebritarian](#)” pundits say to the contrary – abnormally high fees are not reflective of market demand, but rather of indentured servitude and corporatism. This is because the narcotics cartels, on behalf of the Mexican government, prohibit genuine market competition, which results in lower quality smuggling services and their hyperinflated prices. Rounding off this cacophony of statism is the fact that there are no [dispute resolution or multi-tiered arbitration services](#) offered at all!

Let me offer a competing business model for smuggling that does *not* conflict with the earlier model for property defense. If anything, libertarian smuggling ought to emulate the [underground railroads](#) of the past, with a respect for customers and services rendered in the spirit of mutual aid, or at least basic professionalism. Creature comfort transportation in some form is a must, with cushioned seats and ventilation at a bare minimum; for example, one [agorist bus service](#) currently operating in Detroit offers [free WiFi](#) to its customers. Support services like temporary employment, [alternate identification](#), English-language fluency tutors, safe houses, [police interrogation roleplay](#), and dispute resolution with multi-tiered arbitration should be sold to customers, which not only respects their human dignity, but also prevents their temptation to trespass and possibly be captured by a PDA who is simply defending their client’s private property.

What better publicity for libertarians can be had in this day and age than by offering private defense services to Texan ranchers? Not only would the patriots enjoy waltzing around openly carrying their rifles,

but the market anarchists should also enjoy the opportunity to empirically test their theoretical polemics for all the world to see. Calls by statist for government intervention (especially in the form of quarantines and forced vaccinations), because some of the trespassers are spreading diseases, would be halted. Unless statist critics would be sincerely willing to foot the bill for the [expatriation exit tax](#) incurred by any Texans who choose to leave America so they may have a ranch somewhere else that is *not* being overrun by trespassers, then they should leave their conspiracy theories about anyone who advocates defending Texans as being “xenophobic” or “racist” into the dustbin of political correctness and “[thought-crime](#)” where it belongs, alongside the failed ideas of communist dictatorships and fascist nightmares.

Should Texas be abandoned by America to Mexico, then Texans will leave America. Perhaps independence is the true answer, and if it were, it certainly wouldn't be the first time Texans successfully pulled off such an effort. One avenue this could take would be that of abolition, pursuant to [Article I § 2](#) of the Texas Constitution, which says that it is up to the good people of Texas whether or not to abolish “their” government. Of course, such successful action might incur the wrath of the federal government, who in the aftermath might consider post-government Texas as a federal territory, but I have faith that if such a condition were ever to come to pass, that the Texan people wouldn't hesitate to resist such encroachments against the public liberty by that enemy rebel government on the Potomac for very long. Remember this as Texans enjoy [San Jacinto Day](#) tomorrow, which celebrates Santa Anna's surrender to Sam Houston, thereby providing an end to the [Texas War for Independence of 1835](#) in favor of the victorious Texan resistance.