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Proposal Review: The Moral Case for the Wall

Illegal immigration continues to be a huge problem in America. Because of the nature of their status it’s hard to know exactly how many there are, but the data suggests we have about 12 Million illegals already. The last two months have seen the largest spike in border crossings since the data began being collected in 2014. This year we’ve already apprehended more than all of last year combined. Virtually all people who get into America this way are criminals as they have broken a law to get here.

The author’s proposal is that we need a wall. Various objections are discussed such as “walls are immoral”, “most immigrants overstay visa’s”, and “the more immigrants the better”. Wall’s obviously aren’t immoral, in the same way that a fence is not immoral. Part of being free is that groups that come together get to decide on the rules for the “club”. Those rules include who can be a member and what it takes to get in. The author uses the example of a college admissions process. His example is that the “wall” admission requirements put it is much greater than any border wall. He argues that, as opposed to immigration, there has never been a student who snuck into a college took classes for 4 years and left with a degree. If someone did, you could rightly consider that unfair and that an injustice was done to you.

It’s true that most illegal immigrants overstay work visa’s, which some argue makes the wall pointless. The author disagrees. Imagine a scenario where your on a ship that’s taking in water. It’s not a massive amount, but it’s definitely enough to sink your ship given time. You propose that a cork be put in to slow the water, but your proposal is rejected. Your ship mates say that it’s a stupid waste of time because it won’t stop ALL the water just 40%. And besides, that cork is keeping the wine in the bottle so it’s already in use. It’s easy to see from this example that it’s obviously better to plug the hole and use the resource, even though it doesn’t fix everything. One step at a time though, right?

The author believes that it’s important to keep in perspective what we’re talking about and likens our country and the border to our homes. For example, if I have a guest who overstays and eats my food, it is a much different problem than strangers coming in and helping themselves. If there was a stranger coming into your house uninvited, would you just let them stay? Or would you call the police and have them arrested? What if it was a homeless family with a child? Can they stay in your master bedroom or will they have to take the couch? If we continue with this example and say that we have a problem with homeless people coming in, let’s build a fence around our house. Is that immoral? Do you lock your door at night? Why? What if a poor homeless guy wants to come over and stay the night. He’s not in fear for his life or anything, he just doesn’t want to sleep outside.

The author states that it if individuals wish to take in migrants and agree to be financially and legally responsible for them, they should be able to. His concern is that when you say “we” should fix the problem with tax money what’s really being said is “you”. It’s always easier to spend someone else’s money, time, and resources but if virtue is what you desire lead the way; no one’s stopping you.

Also addressed are the celebrities with lots of money and big fences around their houses saying we should have open borders. Those people have virtually zero contact with immigrants in that immigrants don’t compete for their housing or their jobs. Importing lots of poor people hurts the poor more than any other group, and that includes immigrants that are already here.

I generally agree with the premise. A physical barrier will stop some percent of people from crossing and will funnel the rest to check points where we can allocate resources for them. The more people who just asked to return for their court date in 6 months that are released into the country, the more will come. We can worry about tunnelers and “wall height” ladders after the wall is built. Finally, and I think most important really, is that this issue isn’t going to get solved unless we start somewhere. The wall is something that the next Democrat president won’t be able to unconstitutionally executive order away like what happened with DACA. I agree with the premise, but it’s an issue for congress and a wild overreach from the executive branch in a government that’s already amassed significantly more power than it was intended.

These are my thoughts more than a specific author. I’ve spent a significant amount of time taking in debates on the topic. Here are SOME sources.
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