Why Open Borders?

Have you ever given serious thought as to why the Democrats, Left, and media are pushing so hard for open borders?

We've heard many stories about migrants not being allowed into the US. There are also stories of those migrants who have illegally crossed into the United States.

But are there many stories of illegal migrants who have become successful, contributing citizens? We are hard pushed to find such stories because there are very few such successes.

In a recent Internet search on "Why Open Borders," the links on the first three pages of the most popular search engines were mostly to liberal media articles, socialist organizations, and colleges and universities known for their liberalism. Scattered among the pages were about three links to websites expressing conservative viewpoints and questioning the reasoning for open borders.

Many reasons are given to support the open border concept. Among the top reasons given are:

1. Borders are a form of global apartheid
2. Borders produce violence but do not stop immigration
3. Borders promote nationalism and warfare
4. Having borders reinforce inequalities on a global scale
5. Borders are used keep people of color out of white peoples' countries
6. Borders contribute to the increasing poverty of women
7. Blaming migrants for low wages divides workers and creates a race to the bottom
8. Open borders would allow more migrants the ability to return home safely
9. Why punish the migrant?
10. One race, one world
11. To defend the border you must expand the power of the state
12. Open borders would make the world a richer place
13. Open borders would allow the best to enter our country
14. We can't have free movement for some and not for all
15. Capital, big business and the rich already have open borders – it's time to extend that to everyone
16. Open borders build international solidarity
17. Open borders saves money (policing and time spent on making decisions [gov't])
18. Open borders facilitate the workers movement to make the world a better place.

In his article, <u>What Would an Open-Borders World Actually Look Like?</u> John Washington (thenations.com) states, "There are strong ethical, environmental, and—more commonly—economic arguments for why an open-borders position makes sense. The first and perhaps best argument for open borders is that borders kill."

An often cited argument for open borders is that we are a nation build on undocumented workers. <u>The New Republic</u> magazine stated in 2019 that "For most of the US history, all immigrants were undocumented." This is an outright lie by a liberal rag. The US was founded in 1776. One hundred and six years later (1882) the first immigration law was passed by Congress. Since 1882, many additional laws and changes regarding immigration, documented and undocumented up to the present (2021) a 139 years later, have been made.

In 2019 PEW Research and other research organizations estimated that there were between 10.5 to 12 million undocumented persons in the US. Since the Covid-19 pandemic, that population sector is estimated at 14.5 million illegal aliens, an increase of 2.5 to 4.5 million people entering the US in less than 9 months.

Most of the reasons given above and elsewhere for open borders are based on philosophical or social argument. There are some economic arguments, however much of these, while sounding good, are essentially without any basis for argument.

To better understand the economic aspect of an increasing population of illegal aliens we need to look more closely at home.

Generally speaking businesses and governments have the same basic structure. The primary difference between the two is that in order to have revenue, businesses must sell some product or service. Government on the other hand gets its revenue through taxation.

If a business wants to grow it has to expand its product line or services, or sell more product or service accounts. Government can increase its revenue only by increasing taxes or by increasing its tax base by drawing more industry and/or people into its base.

Since increasing taxes is not a favorable option on the surface, governments carry out "economic development" programs to attract people and industry to the area. The problem is that the politicians mislead their constituents by say that so much revenue is achieved with these programs. They do not factor in the increased costs for the services (police, fire, EMS, school, road, etc.) the government provides. To pay for the increased need for these services, they automatically increase property, gas, and other

taxes, usually without touching sales tax which is the only tax that most communities vote on. In other words, the public is often charged additional taxes without their knowledge. This process is akin to buying an automobile where you are pushed into financing a loan that contains a lot of "hidden" fees unbeknownst to the buyer.

So let's look at an example. A large farm is sold to a developer. The developer plans to build 900 units on the land, but county residents complain that is too much. So after a lot of back and forth, the county commissioners approve 700 units (470 single-family units and 230 multi-family units). Since these are family units, expectations are that there will be 1,400 extra cars on the road.

According to **Eye On Housing**, the average number of school age children in new developments is 30.2 children per 100 single-family units and 45.2 children for multifamily units. This comes to about 246 children in the development. This number of children will require an additional 11 teachers for the school district. At an average salary of $50,684 per year, the total for 11 teachers comes to $557,524.

The estimated population for this development is 1,646 people. Based on this estimate 5 police officers, 2 firemen, 2 EMTs and 1 ambulance driver would have to be added to the country employee count. That is a total of 10 additional employees with an average salary of $48,500 or $484,000 per year.

The above costs come from property taxes with an average rate of .56%. For a $250,000 home this would come to about $1,402 per home or $981,400 for the development. This amount falls short of the need revenue by $60,124. It does not cover other expenses such as administration and other general government expenses, public safety, planning and economic development projects, environmental protection, human services, and cultural and recreation expenses. These expenses have to come from other resources than property taxes.

In essence government runs on a false assumption that if the population is increased, then there will be more than enough revenue to cover the remaining expenses. Since most communities do not have a "balanced budget" requirement where revenue and expenses are zeroed out, the government is left with raising "hidden" charges, sometimes ten or more times the actual cost for a particular item. Example: the cost of getting a certified photocopy of a birth certificate. In one state it is $40. The actual cost of the paper is about one cent, the time involved is usually no more than 15 minutes. The average salary of a state employee is $25.57 per hour. Fifteen minutes of an hour brings certificate cost to $6.40, not including facility overhead. Take out the overhead and the rest is gravy.

Now that we have a better understanding that the only way government produces revenue is through taxation and exorbitant service charges, we can also better understand the fallacy that "open borders makes economic sense" as touted by socialists.

There are four types of people who, legally or not, enter our country:
1. Professionals
2. Skilled labor
3. Unskilled labor
4. Criminals and terrorists

Currently the media reports that there are migrant caravans heading to the US. The media's and leftists' chosen name (migrant) for these caravans is very telling. The definition of migrant is a unique in that it has both a "dictionary" and social definition. Although not often used, "refugee" and "asylum seeker" are two other terms that have been used to define these caravans. From a dictionary viewpoint, these words mean:

- **Migrant:** any person moving across an international border and retuning to his/her habitual place of residence.
- **Immigrant:** a person who crosses an international border and becomes a permanent resident in another country via legal means.
- **Asylum seeker:** someone who is seeking international protection but whose claim for *refugee* status has not yet been determined. In contrast,
- **Refugee:** someone who has been recognized under the 1951 Convention relating to the status of refugees (typically someone who has been forced to flee his/her country because of persecution, war or violence).

The use of "migrant" is also important for its social definition. Migrants in the US are typically thought of as farm or unskilled labor and low income workers. An interesting perspective of the term is that socialists, while calling for a "classless society," refers to these people as a class, which indicate a contradiction in socialist thought.

Whether legal or illegal, migrants entering our country are granted the same, and in some instances better, services from the government than what our citizens receive. Migrants typically do not pay property taxes and may/may not pay income taxes. This is lost revenue for the governments that has to be made up for elsewhere.

The only taxes that criminals/terrorists pay are sales and gas taxes. It has been documented that this group of people also take advantage of government handouts.

When caught, and sent to prison or otherwise dealt with, they continue to feed off of government at our expense (taxes).

It is estimated that immigrant incomes are about 22% lower than those of their native counterparts. According to a <u>Sage Journals</u> publication, "*Immigration and Income Inequality in the American States*," limited education, lack of English skills, and other attributes put immigrants at a disadvantage in the labor market. Many immigrants tend to concentrate in low-wage occupations such as construction, seasonal agricultural work, meatpacking, yard service, gardening, and household work.

Income levels are equally lower for professional and skilled immigrants but the reasons may be different. In order to work their profession/skill, education courses and testing may be required. This group may have to fase employer and customer bias which indirectly lowers income levels.

The liberal left's desire for Open Borders is fraught with many problems that they have not fully thought through or even understand. They need to study and understand what "frictionless travel" will result in. Sweden, Germany, France, and Great Britain, opened their borders with little to no vetting of immigrants. Now these countries, in the midst of high sexual assaults and murders, increased gang and terrorists attacks, people being tortured, and bombing of institutions, are realizing their mistake for open borders.

In closing, to quote Robin Simcox, a Margaret Thatcher Fellow:

How much the millennial, modern American Left has thought through these issues is unclear. They should, because they are not just waging a war against today's conservatives. They are waging a war on America's past and its future, gambling that democracy can survive even without any sense of national loyalty.

History is not on their side. As the English philosopher Roger Scruton has [written](#), the nation state may not be the only answer to the problems of modern government. It is, however, "the only answer that has proved itself. We may feel tempted to experiment with other forms of political order. But experiments on this scale are dangerous, since nobody knows how to predict or to reverse the results of them."

So the open borders enthusiasts need a rethink. America is not a perfect nation, but it has done pretty well by its immigrants over the past couple of hundred years. "Everyone is Welcome Provided You Come Here Legally, Work Hard, and Stick to the Rules" is not the pithiest yard sign. It is, however, still a more sustainable ethos for a nation.