

Laurent Wenjun Jiang

Prof. Natalie Peterkin

English 1C

July 25, 2020

### Why We Should Open Our Borders

Refugees, inequalities, economic instabilities...the fact that we are bombarded by news on those topics every day is proof that we live in a world with lots of problems, and many of us suffer as a consequence. Nations have tried a variety of solutions, but the reality has not improved. Yet there exists a single easy measure that could solve almost all of the problems mentioned above: an open-border policy. The current border and immigration practices, including border controls and detention centers, are unjustified and counterproductive. This paper discusses the refugee problem, the history of open-border policy, the refutations for the current border policies on philosophical and moral grounds, and the arguments why this open-border policy will work economically.

The first body paragraph gives background on the problem, opportunity, or situation.



Refugees are a problem of worldwide concern. Recently the biggest wave of refugees came from Syria, which witnessed an eight-year-long civil war. In an interview, a Syrian refugee expresses deep sorrows regarding the loss of her home: “My brothers, sisters, uncles, neighbors, streets, the bread ovens, schools, children going to schools ...we miss all of that, everything in Syria is precious to us” she says, with tears hovering in her eyes (Firpo). She also exposes the terrible living conditions there: “[W]e didn’t run away, Syria has become uninhabitable. Not even animals could live there. No power, no running water, no safety, and no

Moving refugee testimonies serve as evidence supporting the claim that their situation is one of great urgency.

security. You don't know who to fight...even when you lock yourself away, you're not safe...I was most scared of seeing my children die right in front of me" (Firpo). As heart-breaking as it sounds, we should also know that this is only the tip of the iceberg: Gerhard Hoffstaedter, an anthropologist at the University of Queensland, states that there are around 70 million displaced people in developing countries, which is the highest recorded number since the 1950s, causing the United Nations to call this world issue "a crisis." The leading nations in the world do not offer enough support to displaced people living in abject conditions. Refugees at the U.S.-Mexico border and in Southeast Asia and Australia are constantly kept in detention centers. Many nations do not comply with the provisions signed in the 1951 Refugee Convention and the succeeding 1967 Protocol; they treat the refugees only as those in passive need of simply humanitarian aids (Hoffstaedter). In this crisis, it is our common responsibility as members of an international community to help those who are in need.

This body paragraph starts with a definition argument to show that the current trend is new. This argument later becomes support for the idea that open borders are possible.

Historically, the large-scale control of the mobility of people is a relatively new phenomenon worldwide. In the modern era, border signifies "ever more restrictive immigration policies" at the same time grants "greater freedom of mobility to capital and commodities", as defined in the editorial "Why No Borders." This creates a contradictory ideology that could cause potential harm to those who need to migrate (Anderson, et al.). John Maynard Keynes dates the beginning of this process only back to World War I in the early 20th century. However, this trend did not become widespread until after World War II. According to a historical outline created by Christof Van Mol and Helga de Valk,

due to the booming in the industrial production in northwestern Europe in the 1950s, the local workers were increasingly educated and gradually became white-collar employees, leaving vacancies in blue-collar occupations (Mol and Valk). Thus, those countries started recruiting immigrants from other parts of Europe and even North Africa: for example, Germany and France started seasonal working programs to attract immigrants (Mol and Valk). Because of the lack of job opportunities in the other parts of Europe and North Africa and the need for workers in the industrializing countries in Northern and Western Europe, “international migration was generally viewed positively because of its economic benefits, from the perspective of both the sending and the receiving countries” (Mol and Valk). This early migration pattern within Europe provides the basic model for the European Union that builds on the fundamental ideology of the free movements of goods and human resources. In recent days, the European Union has become one of the biggest multinational organizations, which can also serve as a successful example of this open-border ideology, at least on a regional scale.

Borders do not satisfy the needs of contemporary societies. From both philosophical and moral perspectives, restrictive border policies are not justified. First of all, borders divide and subjugate people. The editorial “Why No Borders” describes the border as being “thoroughly ideological” (Anderson, et al.). The authors argue that because border policies try to categorize people into “desirable and non-desirable” according to their skills, race, or social status, etc., they thus create an interplay between “subjects and subjectivities,” placing people into

In this body paragraph, the author attempts to disprove the counterargument about a downside of open borders for local workers.

“new types of power relationship” (Anderson, et al.). This is what is identified as the ultimate cause of the divisions and inequalities between people.

Some fear that competition from immigrants would cause a reduction in the wages of local workers (Caplan). This is not an uncalled-for worry, but it is also a misunderstanding of the nature of the open-border policy. Nick Srnicek reasons that this kind of competition has already existed under the current trend of globalization, where workers in developed countries are already competing against those in developing countries that have cheaper labor. He argues, “Workers in rich countries are already losing, as companies eliminate good jobs and move their factories and offices elsewhere” (Srnicek). The border serves companies by making workers in the developing world stay where wages are low. Thus, “companies can freely exploit” cheap labor. In this sense, workers on both sides will be better off under an open-border policy (Srnicek). A recent study from the University of Wisconsin-Madison investigating the economic implications of immigration between rich and poor countries concluded that the benefits of an open-border policy far outweigh the cons and that “the real wage effects are small” (Kennan).

This part of the body paragraph could be seen as a limit and a rebuttal because the open border would need to be combined with changes to labor laws in order to avoid a possible bad effect.

Although an open border could lead to minor reductions in the wages of local workers in developed countries, there is a simple solution. Since the labor market follows the economic law of supply, work supply and wages are inversely related, meaning that the lower the supply of labor, the more wages rise. Nick Srnicek proposes, “a shortening of the workweek...would reduce the amount of work supplied, spread the work out more equally among everyone and give more

The author does not investigate how much time, money, and will an open border policy would need; the argument remains mostly theoretical because it doesn't address feasibility.

power to workers ... more free time to everyone” (Srnicek). Thus, although the open-border policy is not perfect, its downside is easy to address.

As an expatriate myself, I can truly relate to this type of thinking. Due to a variety of the political, economic, and social limitations that I came across in my home country, I was not able to achieve self-actualization. In pursuit of a better education and a more free living environment, I went abroad and finally arrived in this country a few years ago. It was not until then that I gained a vision of my future. Now I am working in hopes that one day the vision could become reality. Sometimes I cannot help wondering what could happen if I was not so lucky to be where I am today. But at the same time, I am also conscious of the fact that there

The conclusion humanizes the possible benefits of the proposed solution.

are also millions of people out there who cannot even conceive of what it is like to actualize their lives. I am sure that one of the mothers who escaped her war-torn home country with her family has the sole hope to witness her children growing up in a happy and free place, just like any mother in the world. I am sure that there is one little girl whose family fled her country in desperation who once studied so hard in school, dreaming of becoming the greatest scientist in the world. I am also sure that there is a young boy who survived persecutions and wishes to become a politician one day to make the world a better place for the downtrodden. Because of borders, these children can only dream of the things that many of us take for granted every day. We, as human beings, might be losing a great mother, great scientist, great politician, or just a great person who simply wishes for a better world. But everything could be otherwise. Change requires

nothing but a minimal effort. With open borders, we can help people achieve their dreams.

## Works Cited

- Hoffstaedter, Gerhard. "There Are 70 Million Refugees in the World. Here Are 5 Solutions to the Problem." *The Conversation*, 24 Mar. 2020, [theconversation.com/there-are-70-million-refugees-in-the-world-here-are-5-solutions-to-the-problem-118920](https://theconversation.com/there-are-70-million-refugees-in-the-world-here-are-5-solutions-to-the-problem-118920).
- Anderson, Sharma. "Editorial: Why No Borders?" *Refuge*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2009, pp.5+. Centre for Refugee Studies, York University. Accessed July 26, 2020.
- D, D. "Keynes, J. M., The economic consequences of the peace." *Ekonomisk tidskrift*, vol. 22, no. 1, Basil Blackwell Ltd., etc, Jan. 1920, p. 15-. Accessed July 26, 2020.
- Srnicek, Nick. "The US\$100 Trillion Case for Open Borders." *The Conversation*, 18 Feb. 2020, [theconversation.com/the-us-100-trillion-case-for-open-borders-72595](https://theconversation.com/the-us-100-trillion-case-for-open-borders-72595).
- Caplan, Bryan. "Why Should We Restrict Immigration?" *Cato Journal*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2012, pp. 5-24. *ProQuest*, <https://libris.mtsac.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libris.mtsac.edu/docview/921128626?accountid=12611>. Accessed July 26, 2020.
- Kennan, John. "Open Borders in the European Union and Beyond: Migration Flows and Labor Market Implications." NBER Working Paper Series, 2017, [www.nber.org/papers/w23048.pdf](http://www.nber.org/papers/w23048.pdf).
- Firpo, Matthew K., director. *Refuge*. 2016. The Refugee Project, [www.refugeproject.co/watch](http://www.refugeproject.co/watch).

Van Mol, Cristof, and Helga de Valk. "Migration and Immigrants in Europe: A Historical and Demographic Perspective." *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe*, edited by Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas and Rinus Penninx, 2016, IMISCOE Research Series, pp. 33-55.

*This sample essay was written by Laurent Wenjun Jiang and edited and annotated by Natalie Peterkin. Licensed under a CC BY-NC license.*

