

---

# West Coast Publishing

---

## LD Jan-Feb 2023 Open Borders File 1

**Edited by Jim Hanson**

Research Assistance by  
Tyler Durbin

Thanks for using our Policy, LD, Public Forum Evidence.

**Please don't share this material with anyone  
outside of your school**

including via print, email, dropbox, google drive, the web, etc.

*We're a small non-profit; please help us continue to provide our products.*

**Contact us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com)**

[www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)

# WEST COAST DEBATE

## LD

### Finding Arguments in this File

Use the table of contents on the next pages to find the evidence you need or the navigation bar on the left. We have tried to make the table of contents as easy to use as possible.

### Using the arguments in this File

We encourage you to be familiar with the evidence you use. Highlight (underline) the key lines you will use in the evidence. Cut evidence from our files, incorporate your and others' research and make new files. File the evidence so that you can easily retrieve it when you need it in debate rounds. Practice reading the evidence out-loud; Practice applying the arguments to your opponents' positions; Practice defending your evidence in rebuttal speeches.

### Use West Coast Evidence as a Beginning

We hope you enjoy our evidence files and find them useful. In saying this, we want to make a strong statement that we make when we coach and that we believe is vitally important to your success: **DO NOT USE THIS EVIDENCE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR OWN RESEARCH.** Instead, let it serve as a beginning. Let it inform you of important arguments, of how to tag and organize your arguments, and to offer citations for further research. Don't stagnate in these files--build upon them by doing your own research for updates, new strategies, and arguments that specifically apply to your opponents. In doing so, you'll use our evidence to become a better debater.

### Copying West Coast Evidence

Our policy gives you the freedom to use our evidence for educational purposes without violating our hard work.

- You may print and copy this evidence for those on your team.
- You may not electronically share nor distribute this evidence with anyone other than those on your team unless you very substantially change each page of material that you share.

For unusual situations, you can e-mail us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com) and seek our consent.

### Ordering West Coast Materials

1. Visit the West Coast Web Page at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)
2. E-mail us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com)
3. Fax us at 877-781-5058

Copyright 2020. West Coast Publishing. All Rights Reserved.

**Visit our web page!**

[www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)

***We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

**WEST COAST DEBATE** .....2

Justice requires open borders for human migration.....4

**Topic Overview** .....5

**Definitions** .....7

    Justice .....8

    Requires.....9

    Open Borders.....10

    Human Migration .....11

**Affirmative** .....12

    1AC.....13

    Extensions – Borders Deny Freedom and Maintain Inequality .....17

    A2 – Open Borders Hurts Local Economies .....18

    A2 – Open Borders is Utopian .....20

    A2 – Migration Causes Negative Social Issues.....21

**Negative** .....22

    1NC .....23

    Extensions – Hurts Economy .....26

    Extensions – Open Borders Dangerous .....27

    Extensions – Open Borders is Utopian .....28

    A2 – Open Borders Addresses Inequalities .....29

## **Justice requires open borders for human migration**

Watermark Sample

## Topic Overview

### Justice requires open borders for human migration

#### *What is justice?*

Justice is one of the central ideas of this resolution, and one that is very broad. Justice is a concept that is explored in philosophy, legal studies, and other humanities and social sciences, and thus lacks an established, singular definition or common understanding. Principles of shared conceptions of justice include concepts like fairness, as well as preventing and addressing harms to others. Ultimately, debaters must ask themselves, and their opponents, “justice for who?” In the sense of the resolitional wording, justice in this context will likely be informed by notions of ‘global justice’ that critically examines the role of historic and contemporary political and economic circumstances that have shaped the nations of the world today and their circumstances. From this, debaters can expect conversations about colonialism, capitalism, nationalism, international conflicts, and other phenomenal events that have shaped the world as it exists today. Debaters can benefit their respective side by engaging in definitional debates over what justice should mean in the context of the resolution, because what justice means should determine the answer to the question of whether or not open borders for human migration are a requirement.

#### *What are open borders?*

Open borders are the other prominent concept in the resolution, and less murky than the concept of justice. Based on the stipulated phrase following this one, we know open borders as a phrase concerning the free or unrestricted movement of people (and not goods, services, or animals for instance). Open borders can be conceptualized in different ways though. Borders, as they exist today and for hundreds of years, are the territorial boundaries of nation-states that marks when one territory governed by a particular political power begins and ends. Since multiple nation states exist and share similar political and national structures and understandings, nations typically respect each other’s borders as their independent, sovereign area in which they can politically, socially, and culturally regulate as they wish (though there have been wars in the past that contradict that notion). There are two common understandings of what open borders means today, and each carries its own assumptions and perspectives. One understanding of open borders is as a criticism of the perceived lack of enforcement or regulation of borders that exist and should be “un-open”. A heated political topic in the US and elsewhere around the world, this understanding of open borders believes borders are good and should be controlled and regulated to prevent open migration of people through them without a process, oversight, and limitations to an extent. This understanding is rooted in the principle that nations and their people are distinct culturally, ethnically, or otherwise, and too much change through migration of newcomers alters the fundamental elements of what makes up the nation in the first place. Another conceptualization of open borders is as a concept to critique borders and how they exist in the world today. This perspective can view borders as a manifestation of social exclusion and a tool to maintain global inequalities between different populations of people. Those who share this critique of borders may point out that borders, in a sense, are imaginary lines that were drawn through conquest and violence, some of which are not even stable and have changed directions even in modern history. Open borders, as a idea, is then an alternative way to conceptualize the world where borders need not exist. Because of the vast difference in the potential

***We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

understanding of what is meant when open borders is used as a phrase, it will be beneficial for debaters to define the phrase in a way that makes sense to their case and gives their arguments legitimacy.

### *Moral foundations and arguments*

The moral foundations for both sides of debates on this topic will depend upon each side's definition of justice and arguments on it. Affirmatives may be benefited by researching on philosophical explanations of social justice and global justice as concepts, and root their case around the justifications found in that literature base of justice as a concept. Negatives could benefit from researching more traditional conceptualizations of justice that view it as something sovereign nation states determine for themselves and is not necessarily universal. Because justice is often rooted in concepts of fairness, Affirmatives and Negatives will have to ask themselves: "fair for who?" Affirmatives will be benefited from highlighting the need for fairness for those seeking migration in the first place – people experiencing plights of violence, poverty, and lack of opportunity. Negatives will be benefited from highlighting that concepts of justice and fairness consider its own citizens first and that what's just and fair for local, native populations of a nation come prior to considerations for non-citizens.

### *Debating the resolution*

Beyond definitional arguments over what justice means in the debate, there are substantive areas for Affirmative and Negatives to explore. Affirmative debaters can make contentions about the harms of the contemporary world of nation-states and borders, but also the benefits of open, unrestricted human migration. On the latter, Affirmatives can draw upon research from economists that argue that unrestricted migration would improve global economic productivity and wealth generation. Negative debaters can make contentions about the political and philosophical justifications for nation states, borders, and sovereignty as well as make contentions about the consequences of unrestricted human migration. This could be about the economic harm local communities could face as a result of incoming people, or the cultural, social, and even political changes that could take place due to demographic changes. Debaters should remember the topic isn't just whether or not open borders are good or bad, but whether or not it is a requirement for justice. Thus, definitions as well as values and criterion will be essential elements to debaters success on this topic.

## Definitions

Watermark Sample

## Justice

### **Justice requires impartial and fair treatment and that no harm befalls another Legal Information Institute, no date**

"Justice," Legal Information Institute, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/justice>

Justice is the ethical, philosophical idea that people are to be treated impartially, fairly, properly, and reasonably by the law and by arbiters of the law, that laws are to ensure that no harm befalls another, and that, where harm is alleged, a remedial action is taken - both the accuser and the accused receive a morally right consequence merited by their actions (see: due process).

### **Notions of justice recognize differences among people in regards to different rights or treatment**

#### **Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, no date**

"Justice and Fairness," Santa Clara University, <https://www.scu.edu/ethics/ethics-resources/ethical-decision-making/justice-and-fairness/>

The most fundamental principle of justice—one that has been widely accepted since it was first defined by Aristotle more than two thousand years ago—is the principle that "equals should be treated equally and unequals unequally." In its contemporary form, this principle is sometimes expressed as follows: "Individuals should be treated the same, unless they differ in ways that are relevant to the situation in which they are involved."

Justice is one of the central terms of the resolution, and the element that divides the two sides of the debate. In a sense, debates on this topic aren't really about whether open borders are good or bad, but rather if they are a requirement for justice. Defining justice then, is probably the most important word to define for debates on this topic. The first definition contains a few elements, which Affirmative teams may leverage – that people receive fair and impartial treatment and that people don't experience harm. The second definition would be beneficial for Negative teams, because it highlights what justice means or what justice may look like may be different based upon people's differences, such as nationality or citizenship for instance.



## Requires

### Require is to claim by right or authority

#### Merriam Webster, no date

“Require,” Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/require>

to claim or ask for by right and authority

### Require involves necessity

#### Cambridge Dictionary, no date

“Require,” Cambridge Dictionary, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/require>

to need something or make something necessary

Requires is the verb of the resolution but has different ways it can be understood. The first definition could be used by Affirmatives that open borders for human migration is a claim my right, that presumably, would be a right that is necessary for justice. The second definition invokes necessity which can be used by Negatives to demonstrate instances where open borders are not necessary for justice to exist.

## Open Borders

### Open borders allow freedom of movement without restriction

Robert **Longley**, history and politics expert for Thought Co., 1 December **2022**

“Open Borders: Definition, Pros and Cons,” Thought Co., <https://www.thoughtco.com/open-borders-4684612>

Open borders policies allow people to move freely between countries or political jurisdictions with no restrictions. A country’s borders may be opened because its government either has no border control laws by choice or because it lacks the resources needed to enforce immigration control laws. The term “open borders” does not apply to the flow of goods and services or to the boundaries between privately owned properties. Within most countries, borders between political subdivisions like cities and states are typically open.

### Open borders allow people to enter and leave countries easily

**Cambridge Dictionary, no date**

“Open Border,” Cambridge Dictionary, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/open-border>

a situation in which goods and people can enter and leave a country easily

Open borders as a phrase are relatively agreed upon, but conceptualizations may differ. The first definition ties the concept of open borders to a freedom – to move across space without restriction. The second definition doesn’t dismiss the notion of borders as a material thing, but just implies that crossing them is easy to do.

## Human Migration

### Human migration is movement to another country for the purpose of temporary or permanent resettlement

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, **2004**

“The Case for Open Immigration,” in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390), <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

The migration of people is a problem in the modern world because that world is a world of states, and states guard (sometimes jealously) the right to determine who may settle within their borders. Immigration may be defined as the movement of a person or persons from one state into another for the purpose of temporary or permanent settlement (Kukathas, 2002).

### Migration is moving to another country or across an international border

#### International Organization of Migration, no date

“About Migration,” IOM, <https://www.iom.int/about-migration>

An umbrella term, not defined under international law, reflecting the common lay understanding of a person who moves away from his or her place of usual residence, whether within a country or across an international border, temporarily or permanently, and for a variety of reasons. The term includes a number of well-defined legal categories of people, such as migrant workers; persons whose particular types of movements are legally-defined, such as smuggled migrants; as well as those whose status or means of movement are not specifically defined under international law, such as international students.

Human migration is also a not very contested phrase. But, it specifies the purpose of open borders – to settle someplace different either temporarily or permanently.

## Affirmative

Watermark Sample

## 1AC

**In a world where global inequality is increasing, people's freedom of movement is more important than ever. Because of this, I stand resolved that: Justice requires open borders for human migration.**

### Observation 1: Resolutational Analysis

#### A. Definitions

**Justice requires impartial and fair treatment and that no harm befalls another**  
**Legal Information Institute, no date**

"Justice," Legal Information Institute, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/justice>

Justice is the ethical, philosophical idea that people are to be treated impartially, fairly, properly, and reasonably by the law and by arbiters of the law, that laws are to ensure that no harm befalls another, and that, where harm is alleged, a remedial action is taken - both the accuser and the accused receive a morally right consequence merited by their actions (see: due process).

**Open borders allow freedom of movement without restriction**

Robert Longley, history and politics expert for Thought Co., 1 December 2022

"Open Borders: Definition, Pros and Cons," Thought Co., <https://www.thoughtco.com/open-borders-4684612>

Open borders policies allow people to move freely between countries or political jurisdictions with no restrictions. A country's borders may be opened because its government either has no border control laws by choice or because it lacks the resources needed to enforce immigration control laws. The term "open borders" does not apply to the flow of goods and services or to the boundaries between privately owned properties. Within most countries, borders between political subdivisions like cities and states are typically open.

## **B. Value: Humanity. Open borders for human migration is necessary to improve conditions of life.**

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, **2004**

“The Case for Open Immigration,” in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390), <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

The second reason for favoring open borders is a principle of humanity. The great majority of the people of the world live in poverty, and for a significant number of them the most promising way of improving their condition is to move. This would remain true even if efforts to reduce trade barriers were successful, rich countries agreed to invest more in poorer ones, and much greater amounts of aid were made available to the developing world. For even if the general condition of a society were good, the situation of particular individuals would often be poor, and for some of them immigration would offer the best prospect of improving their condition. To say to such people that they are forbidden to cross a border in order to improve their condition is to say to them that it is justified that they be denied the opportunity to get out of poverty, or even destitution. And clearly there are many people who share this plight, for numerous illegal immigrants take substantial risks to move from one country to another – courting not only discomfort and even death by traveling under cover in dangerous conditions, but also punishment at the hands of the authorities if caught.

## **C. Criterion: Inclusion. Open borders negate the exclusionary nature of the modern state.**

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, **2004**

“The Case for Open Immigration,” in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390), <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

Immigration is a problem largely because of the nature of the modern state. Most states, and certainly all liberal democratic states, regard their people as “citizens” or “members” of the state. Membership is not standard, and the nature of membership has a substantial bearing on the rights that individuals have within a state. Full membership might amount to citizenship and include the right to vote and stand for public office. (Though it is worth noting that in the United States, for example, even full citizenship does not entitle a member to stand for the office of President if he or she was not born in the country.) “Permanent resident” status might give one the right to work and to change employer at will, and also to draw on health, education, and welfare services, but not provide security against deportation. Status as a “guest-worker” or temporary resident might provide fewer rights still. Modern states restrict immigration because they must manage access to the goods for which immigrants and natives would compete. Modern states are like clubs that are reluctant to accept new members unless they can be assured that they have more to gain by admitting people than they have by keeping them out.

## Observation 2: Open borders would allow people around the world to improve their living conditions through migration to inclusive destinations

### A. Where people are born is merely chance – people shouldn't be restricted for something they don't control

Zoey Poll, journalist for the New Yorker, 20 February 2020

"The Case for Open Borders," The New Yorker, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/annals-of-inquiry/the-case-for-open-borders>

Caplan argues that birthright citizenship is a lottery of opportunity—in an accompanying illustration, a gambler at an immigration slot machine hits the jackpot ("USA")—and other thinkers agree. Instead of invoking the metaphor of apartheid, the egalitarian political philosopher Joseph Carens suggests that our current system is a contemporary equivalent of feudalism: routine restrictions on mobility compound existing disadvantages, denying the global "peasantry" the resources to escape their position.

### B. The concept of borders themselves are exclusionary and reinforce global hierarchies

Harald Bauder, professor of geography in Canada, 5 December 2012

"Open Borders: A Utopia?," *Spatial Justice*, Volume 5, <https://www.jssj.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/JSSJ5-4-en.pdf>

National borders, in particular, have separated humanity into distinct communities, defining wage structures, access to welfare and standards of living. While borders are permeable to some privileged people, they are impermeable to most others. Migrants who cross national borders without permission are often criminalized and de-humanized, frequently lose their social, economic and political rights and, as a consequence, experience disproportionate exploitation and abuse (e.g. Anderson et al., 2009; Hess and Kasperek, 2010; Nevins, 2002). In this role, migrants have become a "structural necessity" (Cohen, 1987: 135) for the economies of industrialized countries and play a "tactical role" in the process of industrial restructuring (Delgado-Wise, 2004: 592). Empirical research in Europe and North-America has shown how migrants – in particular from the global South – supply a workforce rendered vulnerable through cross-border mobility restrictions and the associated enforcement practices (e.g. Bauder, 2006; de Haas, 2008; Sassen, 1994).

### **C. Those who reject open borders believe some people's well-being is more important than others**

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, **2004**

"The Case for Open Immigration," in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390), <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

Implicit in most arguments for closed borders or restricted immigration is an assumption that the good or well-being of the members of a polity should take precedence – to a significant degree, even if not absolutely – over the good of outsiders. From this perspective, that one of my fellow countrymen is harmed or made worse off is a weighty consideration when assessing any policy, in a way that the impact of that policy on foreigners is not. Defenders of this perspective may disagree about the extent to which the interests of outsiders should be discounted; and indeed some may hold that rich nations owe substantial obligations of justice to the world's poor. But they are agreed that something more is owed to one's own country and its people. And this justifies protecting one's nation from the impact of open or substantial immigration. (For contrasting views see Goodin, 1988; Miller, 1988.)

### **D. Denying the right to migration via open borders violates the principles of freedom and humanity**

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, **2004**

"The Case for Open Immigration," in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390), <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

A principle of humanity suggests that very good reasons must be offered to justify turning the disadvantaged away. It would be bad enough to meet such people with indifference and to deny them positive assistance. It would be even worse to deny them the opportunity to help themselves. To go to the length of denying one's fellow citizens the right to help those who are badly off, whether by employing them or by simply taking them in, seems even more difficult to justify – if, indeed, it is not entirely perverse. Not all people who look to move are poor or disadvantaged. Nor do all of them care about freedom. But if freedom and humanity are important and weighty values, the prima facie case for open borders is a strong one, since very substantial considerations will have to be adduced to warrant ignoring or repudiating them. I suggest that no such considerations are to be found. But to show this, it is necessary to look more closely at arguments that restrictions of immigration are defensible, and indeed desirable.



## Extensions – Borders Deny Freedom and Maintain Inequality

### The control of borders in the status quo denies people freedom in multiple ways

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, **2004**

“The Case for Open Immigration,” in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390),  
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

Several other considerations suggest that such reasons would have to be weighty indeed. First, to keep borders closed would mean to keep out people who would, as a consequence, lose not only the freedom to move but also the freedom they might be seeking in an attempt to flee unjust or tyrannical regimes. The effect of this is to deny people the freedom they would gain by leaving their societies and to diminish the incentive of tyrannical regimes to reform the conditions endured by their captive peoples. Second, closing borders means denying people the freedom to sell their labor, and denying others the freedom to buy it. Good reasons are needed to justify abridging this particular freedom, since to deny someone the liberty to exchange his labor is to deny him a very significant liberty. Third, and more generally, keeping borders closed would mean restricting people’s freedom to associate. It would require keeping apart people who wish to come together whether for love, or friendship, or for the sake of fulfilling important duties, such as caring for children or parents.

### Countries maintain their borders through violence – threats to deter migration prove this

Zoey **Poll**, journalist for the New Yorker, 20 February **2020**

“The Case for Open Borders,” The New Yorker, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/annals-of-inquiry/the-case-for-open-borders>

In the past decade, the government of Australia spent more than fifteen million dollars on an advertising campaign designed to deter prospective migrants. The multimedia effort, which has been lauded by President Trump, featured bold, red text—“no way: you will not make Australia home”—over images of dark, choppy seas. The Department of Homeland Security has distributed similar flyers at migrant shelters in Mexico, near the border: “The next time you try to cross the border without documents, you could end up a victim of the desert,” they warn. Canada has mounted billboards in Hungary to deter Roma asylum seekers; Germany has sponsored posters on the sides of Kabul buses; Norway has purchased Facebook ads targeted at young men from Afghanistan, Ethiopia, and Eritrea whose profiles indicate interest in “travelling” or “Europe.”

## A2 – Open Borders Hurts Local Economies

### Increased immigration benefits the economy overall, even if it lowers wages for the local population

Zoey **Poll**, journalist for the New Yorker, 20 February 2020

“The Case for Open Borders,” The New Yorker, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/annals-of-inquiry/the-case-for-open-borders>

Caplan concedes that, in countries like the U.S., wages could decrease for some native workers. But he argues that the influx of new consumers would stimulate the economy, and that many members of America’s working class would end up “managing and training new arrivals, not competing with them!” Big businesses are notably absent from Caplan’s list of beneficiaries, although they would profit from an expanded labor pool, too. Partly for this reason, Charles Koch has come out in favor of open borders. (In 2015, Bernie Sanders characterized the idea as “a Koch brothers proposal” designed to “bring in people who will work for two or three dollars an hour.”)

### Overall, unrestricted migration has a net benefit to the economy

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, 2004

“The Case for Open Immigration,” in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390), <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

In the end, the answer must be that they do not. But the reasons why are not as straightforward as might be anticipated. If our concern is the impact of migrants on the local market economy, one argument often advanced by economists is that, on balance, the net impact of immigrants is mildly positive. While immigrants do take jobs that might have gone to locals and drive down wages, while driving up some prices, they also have a positive impact on the economy. Migrants expand the size of the work-force and extend the division of labor, so society gains from the benefits this brings. As new consumers, they expand the size of the domestic market and help to lower prices for many goods. Measuring the precise impact of any cohort of immigrants is difficult; but the overall impact is, at best, positive and, at worst, only mildly negative – even with respect to employment. Moreover, the global effect of migration is positive, as it involves a movement of people from places where they are less productive and often unable to make a living to places where they are both more productive and better off – and in many cases no longer a burden on their societies.

## Restrictions on migration across borders has many costs

Robert **Longley**, history and politics expert for Thought Co., 1 December **2022**

“Open Borders: Definition, Pros and Cons,” Thought Co., <https://www.thoughtco.com/open-borders-4684612>

Controlling borders creates a financial drain on governments. For example, the United States budgeted \$1.6 billion for a new border wall along the Gulf of Mexico and \$210.5 million to hire Border Patrol Agents in 2019 alone. In addition, during 2018, the U.S. government spent \$3.0 billion—\$8.43 million per day—to detain undocumented immigrants. Throughout history, immigration has helped fuel the economies of many nations. In a phenomenon dubbed the “immigration surplus,” immigrants in the workforce increase a nation’s level of human capital, inevitably increasing production and raising its annual Gross Domestic Product. For example, immigrants increase the GDP of the United States by an estimated \$36 to \$72 billion per year.

## Open borders would increase economic growth

Zoey **Poll**, journalist for the New Yorker, 20 February **2020**

“The Case for Open Borders,” The New Yorker, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/annals-of-inquiry/the-case-for-open-borders>

The difference between Caplan’s world and our own is that Caplan presents immigrants not as threats—to low-skilled workers, to social services, to public culture—but as generators of wealth. Citing the work of the development economist Michael Clemens, Caplan claims that global freedom of movement would increase the gross world product by between fifty and a hundred and fifty per cent. The basic principle of his claim is that workers in poor countries are underutilized. (“How productive would you be in Haiti?” Caplan asks.) If people could travel as freely as commodities and capital do, they could produce “vastly more stuff,” insuring that “almost everyone ends up better off.” Restrictions on immigration, Caplan writes, are the equivalent of leaving “trillion-dollar bills on the sidewalk.”

## A2 – Open Borders is Utopian

### Open borders doesn't mean borders wouldn't exist – it just means freedom of movement

Zoey **Poll**, journalist for the New Yorker, 20 February 2020

“The Case for Open Borders,” The New Yorker, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/annals-of-inquiry/the-case-for-open-borders>

Opening the world's borders wouldn't mean abolishing them, Caplan explains. Countries could still issue passports and maintain territorial notions of belonging. But immigrants—perhaps after passing some sort of criminal background check—would be automatically accepted at all standard ports of entry. Governments would relinquish their exclusionary authority, so that anyone, regardless of citizenship, could “accept a job offer from a willing employer or rent an apartment from a willing landlord.”

### Open borders are not infeasible – open borders practically exist around the world

Harald **Baulder**, professor of geography in Canada, 5 December 2012

“Open Borders: A Utopia?,” *Spatial Justice*, Volume 5, <https://www.jssj.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/JSSJ5-4-en.pdf>

Furthermore, the argument can be made that the condition of open borders is already partially realized and therefore not utopian at all. For example, free mobility of people exists for the most part between the European countries that have signed the Shengen agreement. It also exists within most nation states, although political borders crisscross national territories at various sub-national scales.

## A2 – Migration Causes Negative Social Issues

### Cultural and ethnic change in countries as result of migration is not negative

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, **2004**

“The Case for Open Immigration,” in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390),  
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

It is also worth bearing in mind that many societies have experienced significant cultural or social transformations and not only survived but prospered. The United States in the nineteenth century welcomed immigrants from all over the world, incorporated large parts of what was once Mexico into its territory, overturned a three-century-old tradition of slavery and yet began the twentieth century a prosperous and vibrant democracy. Canada and Australia have seen their societies transformed by postwar immigration into multicultural polities, while continuing to enjoy economic growth and social stability. And the European Union continues to expand its membership by admitting states from Eastern Europe – and perhaps, eventually, Turkey – in a way that makes it possible for peoples from diverse ethnic, religious, and political traditions to move freely from one end of the continent to the other, without fearing a loss in prosperity; though there can be no doubt that this development will bring with it significant cultural changes to many of Europe’s communities.

## Negative

Watermark Sample

## 1NC

**If open borders allowed unrestricted migration, countries and nations would no longer be the same. Because of this, I oppose the proposition that: Justice requires open borders for human migration.**

### Observation 1: Resolutonal Analysis

#### **A. Value: Sovereignty. Control over borders and immigration is a key sovereign element to protect a nation's security and prosperity**

Lora **Ries**, director of the Heritage Foundation's Border Security and Immigration Center, 31 May **2022**  
"Biden Wants Blank Check to Fund Open Borders Immigration Priorities, The Heritage Foundation, <https://www.heritage.org/immigration/commentary/biden-wants-blank-check-fund-open-borders-immigration-priorities>

Our borders are wide open on many fronts, immigration enforcement officers are directed to process illegal aliens into the country, rather than detain and remove them, and the administration is intent on rewarding the masses with asylum, even though many are not eligible under the law. The Biden administration has lost all credibility regarding border security and immigration. Tragically, as a result, Americans are losing our sovereignty, our security, and our prosperity.

#### **B. Criterion: Reasonable restrictions of movement. Countries have a right to control entry of people into their borders**

Zoey **Poll**, journalist for the New Yorker, 20 February **2020**

"The Case for Open Borders," The New Yorker, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/annals-of-inquiry/the-case-for-open-borders>

Activists and observers have criticized the hostile tone of these ad campaigns. Still, the ads' underlying premise—that **governments have a right to control entry into their countries**—seems beyond dispute. Even immigration activists implicitly accept that it must be controlled: the movement to abolish U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, for example, speaks to the question of how American borders are policed, not to whether they ought to be policed in the first place.

## Observation 1: Open borders would fundamentally harm the national character of countries experiencing mass immigration

### Open borders sound admirable but do not work in practice – Europe shows this

Lora **Ries and** Rep. Peter **Hoekstra**, contributors to the Heritage Foundation, 21 April 2021

“Time for Joe Biden To Become a Realist on Border Crisis,” the Heritage Foundation,

<https://www.heritage.org/immigration/commentary/time-joe-biden-become-realist-border-crisis>

In 2015, after German chancellor Angela Merkel had issued a basically open invitation to any refugees from war-torn Syria, more than a million migrants from throughout the Middle East and Africa made their way to Europe. Almost four thousand died trying to reach Europe by sea. Many more were stranded in overcrowded refugee camps, mainly in Greece, under deplorable conditions. In both of these earlier cases, reality ultimately won out over open-borders ideology. In 2016, the European Union (with Angela Merkel as the primary mover) and Turkey reached a deal. In exchange for substantial EU financial assistance and other incentives, Turkey agreed to accept returns of illegal migrants from Greece—and stop them from going back to Europe.

### Open borders strains public resources in countries with high immigration rates

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, 2004

“The Case for Open Immigration,” in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390),

<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

Another important reason why immigration is a problem in liberal democratic states is that these states are, to varying degrees, welfare states. The state in such societies provides a range of benefits, including education, unemployment relief, retirement income, medical care, as well as numerous programs to serve particular interests. Immigrants are potential recipients of these services and benefits, and any state considering the level of immigration it will accept will have to consider how likely immigrants are to consume these benefits, how much they might consume, whether or not they are going to be able to finance the extra costs from the lifetime tax contributions of these immigrants, and what are the short-term implications of accepting immigrants who begin by consuming more in benefits than they pay in taxes. Consequently, such states are reluctant to accept immigrants who are infirm, or too old to contribute enough in taxes in their remaining working lives to cover the costs of medical care and retirement subsidies.



## **Controlled borders protect national security and economic health, which is necessary to protect the nation**

### **U.S. Department of State, no date**

"International Migration," U.S. Department of State, <https://www.state.gov/other-policy-issues/international-migration/>

Every nation has the sovereign right to control its borders; enact immigration laws and policies that protect and advance the interests of its citizens; and determine who may enter the country, how long they may stay, and the types of activities they can undertake. The illegal movement of people across international borders threatens national security and public safety, suppresses wages and strains public resources, and leaves immigrants themselves vulnerable to exploitation and abuse. It also undermines the rule of law by reducing citizens' faith in the ability of government to enforce the law. But well-managed, legal immigration can support national economic competitiveness and promote financial success and assimilation for newcomers.

## Extensions – Hurts Economy

### Too high of immigration has negative economic consequences

Chandran **Kukathas**, professor at the London School of Economics, **2004**

“The Case for Open Immigration,” in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (pp. 376-390),  
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/237298126.pdf>

It is sometimes argued that there are strong economic arguments for limiting immigration. There are two kinds of concern here. The first is about the impact of migrants on the local market economy: large numbers of people entering a society can change the balance of an economy, driving down wages or pushing up the prices of some goods such as real estate – to the disadvantage of many people in the native population. The second is about the impact of migrants on the cost and availability of goods and services supplied through the state: education, healthcare, welfare, and the publicly funded infrastructure of roads, parks, and other non-excludable goods. Do these concerns warrant closing borders to immigrants?

### Open border policies cost millions of dollars to process

Lora **Ries**, director of the Heritage Foundation’s Border Security and Immigration Center, 31 May **2022**

“Biden Wants Blank Check to Fund Open Borders Immigration Priorities, The Heritage Foundation,  
<https://www.heritage.org/immigration/commentary/biden-wants-blank-check-fund-open-borders-immigration-priorities>

The reason is simple. The Biden administration has opened our borders on three fronts, resulting in chaos and unmanageable numbers of asylum and refugee applications from the southern border, the Afghanistan evacuation, and a new offer to resettle up to 100,000 Ukrainian refugees. The administration then seeks even more appropriations (\$389 million) and an additional 1,558 staff for Citizenship and Immigration Services to reduce its application backlog. Applicants have already paid for those applications sitting in the more than 8.4 million pending-applications pile. Yet now, the Department of Homeland Security wants to be paid again to adjudicate the same cases. Meanwhile, the administration is rapidly increasing the backlog with its open-border policies and encouraging more illegal aliens to apply for asylum (free of charge) and taking on Afghan and Ukrainian applications (also free) as well. American taxpayers should not fund this request. Citizenship and Immigration Services must change its fee structure to charge for all types of applications to completely cover its adjudication costs. If an alien wants to apply for an immigration benefit, the alien should pay, not U.S. taxpayers. And with the backlog, the applicants already did pay.

## Extensions – Open Borders Dangerous

### Open borders increase drug trafficking and violent crime

Simon **Hankinson**, senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, 6 September **2022**

“It’s Time for Corporate Media To Tell the Truth About America’s Crime Problem,” the Heritage Foundation, <https://www.heritage.org/crime-and-justice/commentary/its-time-corporate-media-tell-the-truth-about-americas-crime-problem>

Thanks to President Joe Biden’s wide-open border policies, millions of illegal immigrants each year and thousands of pounds of illegal drugs every month are pouring into our country. Meanwhile, America’s big cities are being victimized by repeat offenders on an unimaginable scale. In New York City, leftist bail reform and see-no-evil “progressive” prosecutors have allowed a mere 10 (count ‘em, 10) offenders to commit over 485 crimes since 2020. Last week, a man was arrested for violently assaulting a New York City transit worker. It was his 41st arrest—the 40th was for sucker punching a woman on the street. Even New York Mayor Eric Adams says that releasing offenders with low or no bail is “destroying the fabric of our city.” What do the border and crime situations have in common? In both cases, the public’s right to know has been sacrificed to the “progressive” media’s desire not to offend.

### Drug cartels demonstrate that open borders are dangerous

Simon **Hankinson**, senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, 6 September **2022**

“It’s Time for Corporate Media To Tell the Truth About America’s Crime Problem,” the Heritage Foundation, <https://www.heritage.org/crime-and-justice/commentary/its-time-corporate-media-tell-the-truth-about-americas-crime-problem>

Similarly, if drug cartel operatives like Orozco-Sandoval are in the country illegally, the public deserves to know so they can weigh the risks and rewards of an immigration policy that admits hundreds of thousands of unvetted people. The cartel Orozco-Sandoval worked for is “one of the five most dangerous transnational criminal organizations in the world, responsible for trafficking many tons of cocaine, methamphetamine and fentanyl-laced heroin into the United States,” according to the Justice Department.

## Extensions – Open Borders is Utopian

### Open borders are politically infeasible

Harald **Baulder**, professor of geography in Canada, 5 December **2012**

“Open Borders: A Utopia?,” *Spatial Justice*, Volume 5, <https://www.jssj.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/JSSJ5-4-en.pdf>

Ironically, while borders tend not to be problematized in utopias that envision concrete alternative worlds, the imagination of open borders has been labeled “utopian”. This label reflects the intention by critics to dismiss the open-borders idea outright and not have to seriously engage with it. John Casey, for example, observes that “advocacy of a universal open border policy is seen at best as a policy-irrelevant chimera and utopia” (p. 15) and that “any discussion of open borders is dismissed as ‘pie in the sky’ utopias” (p. 42). As an example of the dismissive public attitude towards open borders, Casey (2009: 53) cites Canada’s ‘national’ newspaper, the Globe and Mail, which suggested that free cross-border labour mobility would be “a utopian madhouse, even crazier in concept than communism,” given the impact it would have on the economic structure and national imagination of the receiving countries. By calling an open-borders world utopian, it is depicted as an absurdity.

## A2 – Open Borders Addresses Inequalities

### Mass migration doesn't solve global issues and therefore open borders is not necessary for justice

Lora **Ries and** Rep. Peter **Hoekstra**, contributors to the Heritage Foundation, 21 April **2021**  
“Time for Joe Biden To Become a Realist on Border Crisis,” the Heritage Foundation,  
<https://www.heritage.org/immigration/commentary/time-joe-biden-become-realist-border-crisis>

Irving Kristol once said a conservative is “a liberal mugged by reality.” The reality is that mass migration into rich countries is not the solution to the tragically intractable problems in poor and war-torn countries. Less than three months after his inauguration, Biden is already being mugged by this reality, just as Merkel was in 2015. Let's hope he accepts the facts and does what Merkel did. A first step in the right direction would be restoring the common-sense Trump policies that he revoked. Yes, immigration remains a highly charged political issue on both sides of the Atlantic, with strong voices advocating everything from virtually open borders all the way to strict border enforcement and a reduction in legal immigration and refugee numbers. But reality dictates that every government that respects the rule of law must police its borders, get illegal immigration under control, and make and enforce an immigration policy that is in its national interest and acceptable to its citizens.

### Open borders separate families and result in inhumane conditions for incoming arrivals

Lora **Ries and** Rep. Peter **Hoekstra**, contributors to the Heritage Foundation, 21 April **2021**  
“Time for Joe Biden To Become a Realist on Border Crisis,” the Heritage Foundation,  
<https://www.heritage.org/immigration/commentary/time-joe-biden-become-realist-border-crisis>

Children are being dropped over the wall between the United States and Mexico. People are crowding into makeshift camps without adequate sanitary facilities. At least two individuals on the FBI's terrorism watch-list apprehended trying to cross the border. Hundreds of migrant families sleeping under a bridge. It's hard to overstate the crisis on America's southern border. But this is far from the only time something like this has happened. In 2014, the number of unaccompanied children arriving at the southern border, mainly from Central America, increased 80 percent over the previous year. Word had spread quickly that the Obama administration was pursuing a de facto policy of allowing unaccompanied children to remain in the U.S. Immigration laws were not being enforced, and non-Mexicans especially were hardly ever deported. Unaccompanied children were even less likely to be returned to their home countries.

## Open borders leads to multiple bad impacts

Robert Longley, history and politics expert for Thought Co., 1 December 2022

"Open Borders: Definition, Pros and Cons," Thought Co., <https://www.thoughtco.com/open-borders-4684612>

Some opponents of open borders argue that open borders lead to increased crime. According to data from the U.S. Department of Justice, undocumented immigrants made up 37% total population of federal prisoners as of 2019. In addition, U.S. border control officers seized nearly 4.5 million pounds of illegal narcotics at border crossings and ports of entry in 2018. Some opponents of open borders also argue that immigrants only contribute to economic growth if the taxes they pay exceed the costs they create. This happens only if a majority of immigrants attain higher income levels. Historically, opponents contend, many immigrants receive below-average incomes, thus creating a net drain on the economy. Large-scale immigration from poorer countries into richer countries can create a "brain drain" in the source country, where educated professionals leave their home country to live elsewhere, depriving their home countries of an educated workforce. For example, in 2010 more Ethiopian doctors were living in Chicago than there were living in all of Ethiopia itself.