

Lecture 2

2.1 Seating Chart

Good morning to anyone joining us today who was not here before. Are you new to the class this week? Just one of you? Okay. Last week we went over the syllabus and class materials, so I won't do that again. Just make sure that you can access e-learning. The syllabus is there, the handbook is there, the readings are all there, so check out that stuff. The thing to read is the syllabus. If you have any questions after you read the syllabus, just let me know.

All right, anyway, today we'll start the class by making a seating chart. So I'll get your names, your majors, where you come from, and if you would like to change your seat, I would suggest doing it now. Luckily, this class seems pretty small, which is great, but I'll ask you to kind of stay in roughly the same seat in future classes as you are in today. After that, we will go over the basic contents of an essay. I'll kind of do an overview of everything you would see in an essay—just do that quickly. And after the break, we will talk about the reading for today, which is *The Case for Getting Rid of Borders Completely* by Alex Tabarrok.

So tell me your name, or, you know, tell your classmates your name. Some of you I've met before—I know your names—but introduce yourself to the class. Just tell me what you want me to call you. An English name is fine. My name is Patrick—my friends call me Patrick, sometimes they call me Paddy if we're in Ireland. So any name is fine if you want to use a nickname or an English name. If you want to use your Chinese name, just remember to tell me what you want me to call you. You don't need to give me your full name, like "you can call me Xiao Wang" or "you can call me Da Wang", whatever you want me to call you.

Tell me your major. When I was a college student, I studied history. You don't need to be too detailed. Some students have very complex majors. You can just say, "I study electrical engineering," or "I study engineering," or "I study medicine." You don't need to say, "I study eight-year preventative clinical medicine," or something like that.

Tell me your hometown—where do you call home? I know some Chinese people have two hometowns, right? Your parents came from Qingdao, and you grew up in Shanghai—just whatever you call home, that's fine. My hometown is Aberdeen. I don't know if you've heard of Aberdeen before. It's a small city in the north of Scotland. All right, so that's the information I'll ask you to give me, and anything else you'd like to include. This is a small class, so if there's anything else you'd like to tell your classmates about yourself, that's great.

- **Me:** My name is Yong Cuiyang, you can simply call me Yong. I came from Wuhu in Anhui province. I major in Artificial Intelligence at the the School of Data Science.
- **Mr. Thame:** I've been to Anhui before—I went to 合肥 and 屯溪, and I climbed 黄山, but I didn't visit 芜湖 before.

All right, so that's everyone's name. I'll pass this around—if you can just please write your student number under your name for me, that way I can reference you with the class roster so that when I'm grading, I know who is who. And if I've spelled your name wrong, or any of the other details are wrong, just correct it for me as I call out the correct information. All right, while everyone's doing that, I'd like you to kind of group up. I suppose in this class we can have three or four groups of students.

2.2 Structure of An Essay

We'll start by talking about essay parts. Those of you who have taken Public Speaking with me before should know some of these— a speech and an essay have many similarities, but there are things in an essay that you wouldn't see in a speech.

Think about the introduction—what would you expect to see in the introduction of an essay? What might you see after the introduction? What might you see in the main body of the essay? What might you see after the body, and of course, in the conclusion? The three big things: introduction, body, and conclusion. What are the parts that you would expect to see within those sections of an essay? Don't worry about naming everything—just give me as many examples as you can, and if you can explain them as well, that would be great. I'll give you about five minutes. While everyone's filling out the seating chart form, talk to your partners and tell me what are the different parts that you would see within these sections of an essay. Go ahead.

(FIVE MINUTES LATER...)

2.2.1 Introduction

So just briefly and basically, let's start with the **introduction**. What would you expect to see in an introduction? We might say context and the main idea, which is a type of claim. That's something we'll talk about today: a claim. But the main idea is the big claim that the whole essay will focus on.

What a **hook** is for? Hook is what makes the reader interested in the whole passage. So you want just one sentence that is attractive to the reader so that they will keep reading. It could be a joke, it could be a fact, it could be a quote—just something that gets the reader interested. I would say don't ask a question. Usually, you see that in speeches—people start a speech by asking a question—but in an essay, it's kind of weird to write a question because no one can answer that question.

- A good example, I think, is this essay *Kill the Language Requirement*. He opens the essay by saying, "When Yale was founded, students were supposed to speak only in Latin, even in dorms." Is that surprising? When Yale was founded, students were only allowed to speak Latin. I think that's quite surprising. I didn't know that before I read that essay. But why would Yale, an American university, require students to only speak Latin and not English?
- Another example might be what you can see in today's essay. He says, to paraphrase Rousseau—do you guys know "paraphrase"? It's kind of like quoting, but maybe you've changed the words slightly, not a direct quote.
- Or this is a good example: the author tells a little story. This 14-year-old boy in Kentucky—he'd never fired a gun before. He stole a pistol. He brought it to school. He fired eight shots at a high school prayer group, and he hit eight of the children. Right? So it's a terrible, shocking story. And when you read that, you probably wonder why. You want to know more about it, right? So you can tell a little story. In a short essay, you don't have much time to tell a long story. In a longer essay, you can.

Always try to have a hook in every essay that you write. Try to have a hook. In the handbook, I give an example: "In the 1960s in America, only 15 percent of American college students got an A grade in any class. Today, A is the most common grade for college students in America—more than 50 percent get an A grade." Is that surprising? A little bit. Or if I said, "Today, there are more English speakers in China than there are in England." Right? This comparison might be a little bit surprising when you hear it. So, some kind of hook.

The problem I usually see is that students get confused between the hook and the context. The **context** is just telling us what the topic is and why we are talking about it. The hook should be something striking. So one of the very common problems I usually see in the first essay is a weak hook. Try to have something that grabs attention for the audience.

The **main idea**—we'll talk about that next week. So try to read the handbook, Parts 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3—that's pages 2 to 8 in the handbook. You can get the handbook on e-learning. Okay? Try to understand what I mean by "clear SODA." Okay? That's what we'll talk about next week. I know that doesn't mean anything to you now, but it stands for **Significant, Original, Debatable, Attractive**. These are the criteria for the main idea that I will give you. Anyway, the main idea—it's a claim, and I think we mentioned this last week. You can have **policy**, you can have **value**, you can have **fact**.

- Did you know the meaning of *policy*? Policy means something we should do, okay? Can you give an example of a policy at Fudan? Yeah—only 30% of students can get an A grade. Yes, if I said, "Fudan should abolish the 30% A rule so that 100% of students could get an A grade," that would be a *policy argument*. Another policy would be—you know, you must have a card to enter Fudan, right? You can't just walk into Fudan University. That's a policy. No 共享单车 are allowed on campus, right? Can you think of a Shanghai city policy? Yeah, garbage classification would be a good example. Definitely good. Or, you know, even a law at the national level could be a policy.
- *Value* is usually about saying things like what you should do personally, right? Like if I say, "You should go to bed before 10 o'clock." That's not really policy, because it would be crazy to say the government should force you to go to bed by 10 o'clock. Well, maybe—I guess at Fudan, the dorm might turn off the lights, right? No? They don't? Okay. But in many schools, the school will turn off the lights, right? But if I say, "You should get a part-time job," or "You should go to bed before midnight," or "You should take English Essay Composition," those would be *values* arguments.
- *Fact*—in this class, it's usually about the future. It's like saying something is going to happen in the future one day.

So, if you look at today's essay, *A Case for Getting Rid of Borders*, often you can find the main idea as the last sentence of the first paragraph. He says, "All people should be free to move about the Earth uncaged by the arbitrary lines known as borders." Is that policy, value, or fact? It's policy. So he's saying we should take away borders—there shouldn't be borders.

So for your first essay, you must do *policy*. For your second essay, you can choose—you can do policy, value, or fact. If we look at this one, *Where Are they*, the author says, "I hope that our Mars probes discover nothing. It would be good news if we find Mars to be completely sterile. Dead rocks and lifeless sands would lift my spirit." Is that policy, value, or fact? What do you think—policy, value, or fact?

I think you can tell by looking at the word "would". You can say it's *value*, right? "It would be good news," right? Because that's up to you whether you think something is good or bad—that's a values judgment. If I said, "It would be good news if 上海交通大学 became higher ranked than Fudan University," am I wrong? No, it's just an opinion. It's just a value judgment, right? But most of you would probably disagree.

For example, if you look at this one, *Teaching Kids to Kill*, the author says, "Where does a 12-year-old boy who never fired a gun get the skill and the will to kill? Video games and media violence." That one, obviously, is *fact*. Right, he is saying that video games cause violence in children.

Anyway, that's pretty much what you'd see in an introduction.

2.2.2 Body

Anything else you might see in the *body*, then? What would you see in the body?

Topic sentences, good. In fact, in this class, I often just call them *claims*, yes—but to distinguish them from the main idea, they're topic sentences. Anything else? Good, **evidence** and **analysis**. So you have *T-E-A*—topic sentence, evidence, analysis—in the body. Some teachers will say *MEAT*, which is *Main idea, Evidence, Analysis, Transition*. All right, so these are kind of the basic building blocks. And these are the things that, from weeks 4 to week 7, we're going to talk about—how to do each of these basic building blocks of writing an essay.

These are also *claims*, and usually, they are *fact* or *value*. *Policy* can really only be the main idea; in the body, you'll mostly have fact or value claims. My metaphor for an essay is a *stool*. You have your main idea as the seat that you're going to sit on. If your stool has one leg, it's going to fall over. If it only has two legs, it's going to fall over. If your stool has three legs, now it will be stable.

Okay, so in a short essay—like the one we're going to read today—you need to have three different types of supporting claims to support your main idea: a value, a fact, and what I say is **would, should, and but**. If I want you to support something, what could I tell you to make you support me? Yeah, benefits, right? So this is kind of like the *would* part, right? "If we do this thing, it would bring us something good." So this is some kind of material benefit—something we can measure, something we can see, and something we can experience.

So if I say, "We should abolish the 30% A rule at Fudan," what would that do? Well, maybe you could say that it's a benefit because we could get a higher GPA. To me, that's kind of like what you would say in the *conclusion*, isn't it? You know, that's the kind of end part. But what's the thing that would benefit us all? From a general perspective—not from a student's perspective—why would it be good to abolish the 30% A rule?

I could argue that it would improve the quality of students' work. It would make students work more efficiently. It would reduce anxiety. It would reduce stress, and by reducing stress, students could learn more and be more productive. Put your hand up if you *don't* want students to be more productive. Who wants students to be *less* productive? Everybody wants more productivity. So if I promise you this outcome, you might support my main idea. This is something good that we all want.

If I said, "We should tear down the gates and let anybody who wants to enter Fudan enter Fudan," what would that do? What benefit might there be? Fire all the guards, open the gates, and let the campus be free for every citizen of Shanghai to enjoy. You don't like that idea, right? What would it provide? What would it do? Yeah, we all want Fudan to be a better learning environment. Actually, I guess that wouldn't be my first thought, but yeah, you could argue that. I don't know, maybe you could say this would mean Fudan would have more money. This would raise more money for Fudan, right? Because people who come in would spend money in the canteens and the shops and so on, right? And this would be a benefit for Fudan, right? Maybe you don't think so, but you could argue that. Tourists usually bring money, right?

If you think about *should*, this is kind of like *values*, right? And I could say something like, "Colleges should be available to members of the public." Colleges are funded by taxpayers, and therefore taxpayers should be free to enter the campus, right? If you pay for something with your taxes, you should be able to use that thing, right? So that's kind of like the *values* side of it.

But is when you say the other side—"My opponents would say I am wrong." Right? If we open the gates, why might that be a bad idea? Yeah, maybe the campus would be overcrowded, maybe the class would get disrupted. You might get people walking into classrooms and interrupting the teachers, making noise outside, and so on and so on, right? You don't just say, "My opponents would say I'm wrong." You say, "However, the school could find other ways of dealing with that problem." Right? There are other ways—we don't need to close the gates. We could have warning signs on the doors. We could tell the visitors about the rules of campus, and so on, right?

So *would*, *should*, and *but*.

Can anyone think of other examples? What things do we all want? If I was going to try to become president or prime minister of my country, what could I promise people that they all want? Yeah, so everybody wants some economic benefits, right? If I say, "I will improve the economy, make GDP go up, and you will all have more money. I will make unemployment go down. I will make inflation go down. I will increase retirement benefits." All right, people usually want more money. So by promising better economic conditions, people will support you.

Anything else? Yeah, lower crime rate. Nobody wants more crime. Does anyone want more crime? Everybody wants lower crime, right? So if I say, "Vote for me, I will send criminals to jail for longer. I will build more prisons. I will make new laws that make society safer," people would support that.

Any more? Yeah, public health. Absolutely. If I say, "Vote for me—you'll have better access to hospitals, healthier children, healthier meals at school," whatever—it's popular. Public health is always popular. No one is going to say, "I want shorter life expectancy. I want more disease." Everyone wants less disease. I guess the environment is another big one. Nobody wants dirty air or dirty water; everybody wants green, clean environmental living.

Anything else? Yeah, education—people want more access to education, better quality education. So these are the kinds of things you would think of with the *would*. Did anyone notice in today's essay—what is the *would* in today's essay? Yeah, he's talking about money, he's talking about the economy, which is probably the big one for most people, I think.

When we talk about *should*, you know, what's the right thing to do, what's the wrong thing to do, how should we treat people, what should governments do, what should citizens do, what are the rights and duties of people—can you think of any examples? If I say Fudan—Fudan should do what? What is it Fudan's responsibility to do? I mean, obviously educate students, but yeah, a good example would be Fudan should keep you safe. Do you agree? Fudan should protect you, and therefore, we shouldn't open the gates, so the crazy people can not get in and harm you. Fudan should keep you safe. Is that right or wrong? Not necessarily either—it's just a belief. Right? If I say, "A university should not have the responsibility to protect students' safety," am I wrong? No, I just have different values than you do. Yeah, I think at Fudan, if you went out and got drunk and fell over and ended up in the hospital, your parents would probably call the school and complain, "How did you let my darling boy go out and hurt himself?" Right? But I think at my college, if a student went out, drank too much, fell over, and ended up in the hospital, the parents would call the student and say, "You idiot, what did you do that for?" Right? So we have different values about what a school should be for.

You know, as a citizen, what is my responsibility? People should do what? Yeah, so people should pay tax, should contribute to society, for example. Yeah, this would be something that 99% of people agree on—that people should pay taxes. And *but* can be *should* or *would*, it doesn't matter—whichever one you think is the strongest argument.

Yeah, we'll talk a little bit about evidence and analysis when you look at today's essay. Anything else you might see in the body of an essay besides claims, evidence, and analysis? Yeah, transitions. I don't normally teach transitions that much. We'll see an example in today's essay, and if you want to filter findings, I would normally say transition is more important if you're giving a speech. Because I think in an essay it's very obvious what you're doing—you can read it. You know, often in a speech you'd say, "Now that we've talked about this thing, let's move on and talk about that thing." But in an essay, it's usually quite obvious.

Yeah, you might see **comparisons** sometimes, and you might see an **extended example**. Sometimes the author will tell a little story, and that is to demonstrate something or make the essay more interesting. So look out for these things. When you're reading the essay, you will always see these things in the introduction—you probably don't need to mark those. The introduction is always the first paragraph. But when you're reading the body of the essay, try to highlight what the author is doing. You know, if you can, write next to the paragraph—"Here is evidence," "Here's the claim," "Here's the example," "Here's a comparison." This will help you understand the essay better—just pointing these things out.

2.2.3 Conclusion

When you're reviewing the conclusion, you would say again, "These are the reasons why we should do this." What else should you do in the conclusion? Yeah, **significance**. You know, what's the bigger picture? A good metaphor for that is your "I have a dream" moment, right? So in the body, you're giving your claim. You go from the main idea to the thing that we all want—to the value that we support, right? And then in the conclusion, you go to the significance—you say, "I want racial equality, and I have a dream that in the future we all live together in happiness and harmony."

Don't actually say "I have a dream"—it's very cliché, only Martin Luther King can say that—but I mean, you can think of it that way. It's the bigger promise that the reader is getting. Today's essay is a great example of doing that.

2.2.4 Framing

All right, a couple more things. Does anyone think of anything else to add here? So, between the introduction and the body, you sometimes see what I call **framing**, that's just anything that you do before arguing. I think framing is the thing that confuses students the most in this class. I still get students in week eight or nine coming and asking me, "I don't understand framing. What is framing?" But framing is anything you do before you make your argument.

So it could be pointing out background information, it could be telling something about yourself or your own position—it could be whatever. Right? I'll show you a couple of good examples of framing. In this essay, *In Defense of Prejudice*, the author argues that the last thing society should do is eradicate racism and other forms of prejudice. That's his main idea. He says we should *not* try to get rid of racism—we should leave it alone. And then in his framing, he says, "I am not a racist." That's important, yeah, because when you read that, maybe you would think he *is* a racist, right?

Another good example is this one called *The United States Doesn't Spend Enough on Its Military*, right? Very controversial argument, I think. And he says that the United States does not spend enough on its military. "The longer we go without increasing military expenditure, the more dangerous the world is likely to become." What framing might you give for that? What might you say before the argument? Well, firstly, he says, "The US already spends a lot on its military." Right? So he says, "I know what you're thinking: we already spend a lot. However, we still need to spend more." He also says, "I am not a warmonger. I do not support war. I simply support spending more on the US military." All right, so that's a good example in this essay of framing.

Another good example of framing—back to this essay. He says, literally down here, "Before arguing," so we know it's framing because he says "before arguing." He uses that wording there. And he says, "I should define my litmus test for a college mandate: Yale should require students to do something only if Yale knows that something will be the best use of each student's time." So he's setting his criteria. This is how we should judge whether something is good or bad—it's whether it's the best use of students' time.

So anyway, those are a few examples of framing. Don't worry if you don't fully understand it yet, because we'll see many examples and we'll practice doing it in the future.

2.2.5 Further Analysis

The last thing is *further analysis*. So maybe you've made your arguments, and before you give your conclusion, you want to discuss things a little bit more. Usually, you see that with a *fact* essay.

So a good example is this one. In this essay, *Economic Possibilities for Our Grandchildren*, John Maynard Keynes argues that by the year 2030, machines will do our jobs—we won't go to work. And towards the end of the essay, he says, "Will this be a benefit?" So this is further analysis.

If I argue that five years from now, machines will do our jobs and humans won't go to work—now that I've convinced you that this will happen—will this be a benefit? Will this be good, or will this be bad? If machines took our jobs, would it be good or bad? What do you think? If machines took our jobs, would it be good, or would it be bad?

So on the one hand, it might be good because our lives will get better, since we won't have to do jobs we hate. On the other hand, it could be bad because maybe our lives will become boring and meaningless without work, right? So he discusses both sides. **Often, further analysis is about discussing both sides.**

One more example is this one, *Teaching Kids to Kill*. He argues that video games and media violence are teaching children to be violent. And then he shows *how* they are teaching kids to be violent. In his further analysis at the end, he says, "What should we do?" So he gives the policy at the end of the essay. He says we should ban violent media for children, we should punish companies, and we should educate parents. He says we should treat violent media the same way that we treat smoking tobacco—that is, make it hard to get and punish people who use or promote it.

Anyway, those are all the different things you might see in an essay. Don't worry if you're not clear about what every single one of those means. We will come to each one in its own individual class in the following weeks. By about week 12, you should fully understand what all of these things are.

If you want to read ahead, the handbook has chapters on all of these different parts. Okay? So check it out if you're wondering: what is framing, what is further analysis, how do I use comparisons, how do I use extended examples—all that stuff is covered in the handbook, with examples too.

And each of the essays, the class readings that we have for this class—they don't all cover *all* of these things, but each one is a good example of *some* of these things. So you can read ahead and look at the class readings. We'll do our first one today, *The Case for Getting Rid of Borders Completely*.

Any questions at all? Okay, so take a break.

2.3 Class Reading

Today's essay, *The Case for Getting Rid of Borders Completely*, is by Alex Tabarrok. Always try to have a title for your essay. It doesn't have to be a great title. I recommend writing the essay first and then thinking of a title after you've written it—something that sums up the essay.

And the author—when we read class essays, check out the author. Who are they? Are they famous? Are they well known? Did anyone look up today's author? Who is Alex Tabarrok? Does it matter who the author is, I suppose? Should we care who they are? If it were anonymous, would that be better? Why should we care who the author is? Yeah, it gives you an insight to his motivation. Does Alex Tabarrok have a motivation to talk about this subject? Yeah, his parents were from Iran—you know, in the Middle East, Iran—and they moved to Canada before moving to the United States. So he has personal family experience of immigration. I guess it's not surprising that he writes about immigration.

His job, however, is the more important thing. He's a professor of economics. Alex Tabarrok is a professor of economics at George Mason University. He's also given TED Talks—if you look for him online, you can find him giving TED Talks. Why is it important that he's a professor of economics? Because it's credible, right? We can trust what he says about economics. If I said something about economics, you shouldn't trust me, because I'm not an economist. But he *is* an economist. So when he says this economic thing or that economic thing, you can believe him—he's an expert.

So usually my first question in every class where we do a reading will be: who is the author, and what are they known for? And sometimes, if the essay is about certain topics related to your major, I'll say, you know, you study psychology—what do you think about teaching kids to kill? You study economics—what do you think about John Maynard Keynes? Or whatever your major is.

Anyway, we've looked at his introduction. We've looked at his hook, his context, and his main idea. So, "All people should be free to move about the earth, unconstrained by the arbitrary lines known as borders." Have you ever heard anyone argue that before? I don't think it's a common argument. Is immigration a hot topic? What's happened recently that makes immigration a hot topic? I don't know if you guys ever read the English news—from Britain or America, the British news or the American news. But did anyone see what happened this week in Britain? So, last weekend there was a march—people waving signs, thousands of people marching through London against immigration, right? That was a big, big thing. Do you know what else happened? We had a visitor in Britain this week. Do you know who? Donald Trump. Donald Trump came to Britain this week. And yesterday—the news headlines this morning when I woke up—what did Donald Trump say to the British people? He said, "You should use the military to stop immigrants." That's what he said in Britain yesterday. He said, "You should send the Navy to stop them from coming into your

country." So this is always big news. And even just now, we're talking about it. Like I said last time, I don't think people in China care very much about this, do they? It's not a big hot topic in China.

But in his framing here, he says, "Not every place in the world is equally well suited to mass economic activity." So he's pointing out some fundamental background information—not every place in the world is well suited to mass economic activity. Some countries are very lucky—it's easy to get rich. Some countries are very unlucky—it's very hard to get rich. There's no geography major at Fudan, right? Can't study geography. I wonder why. 😊 It's kind of a common subject, but anyway, can you think of a country that is very well suited to mass economic activity? Which countries are just naturally lucky?

Would you say America? America is very good for trade. If you want to be a trading country, America's great for that. Yeah—two big oceans, long coastlines. And most of America is pretty flat, so it's easy to transport things. And there are lots of rivers for transport, too. America is very lucky—it's easy for America to get rich. And also oil, natural resources.

So by those standards, would you say China is a lucky country? 😊 I mean, China's got a big, long Pacific coastline and the South China Sea coastline, so pretty good for trade, isn't it? China's got two massive rivers—pretty good for agriculture. Yeah, there are some downsides as well. The Mississippi doesn't kill thousands of people, but you know, the Yellow River often floods and drowns a lot of people, doesn't it?

Would you say Britain is a lucky country? I mean, I don't think it's surprising that Britain got rich, is it? You know, Britain is in a very good climate—not very hot, not very cold—surrounded by ocean, so it's difficult to invade Britain. Lots of rivers, lots of coal, next to Europe, next to the Atlantic Ocean, right? Yeah, I think Britain is pretty lucky.

But which country would you say is really *not* lucky? Which country just could never have a chance? Yeah, Mongolia. What's wrong with Mongolia? It's surrounded by Russia and China, so its neighbors are much bigger and more powerful than it. And also, it doesn't have a coast. If you want to export from Mongolia, you have to go by land—and geographers will tell you that's one of the worst things for a country. If you don't have a coast, if you don't have access to the sea, you're *landlocked*—and that's really bad. Landlocked countries usually don't get rich. Although, you know, Switzerland is landlocked and very wealthy. But usually, being landlocked isn't very good. Maybe a country like Chad? It's right in the middle of Africa. 80% of Chad is desert. It's very, very hot. You cannot farm in Chad. There are lots of tropical diseases and so on. It's a really bad geography.

So countries are kind of like people. If you're born really smart, and your family is rich, and you live in a good city, you're probably going to have a successful life, right? Countries are the same thing—you can get really lucky, or you can get really unlucky. So why does he say this? What's the reason for putting this in the framing of his essay? He's basically saying, we shouldn't judge people because of where they were born. It's not their fault—you're lucky or you're unlucky, right? You know, can I be proud of my country? What did I do to make my country great? Nothing, right? I'm just lucky that I was born in Western Europe in the 20th century, right? We are just lucky where we're born, and countries are also lucky where they are in the world.

He says that most immigrants only want to make a better life by moving to places with better economic opportunities. So he's saying immigrants—they're not criminals, they're not trying to change those countries. These are just normal people who want to make a better life. So these are some background facts he points out as part of his writing. All right.

So he starts by giving us his economic arguments. Tell me, what are his claims? You know, I know they're economic, but specifically—what does he promise us? How is the economy going to benefit by getting rid of borders? And also, how? What is the analysis—how does it work? Why would opening borders give us these economic benefits? So what are they, and how would it work? And as before, talk to your group partners and try to explain it. What are his economic arguments, and how would they help?

(FIVE MINUTES LATER...)

All right then. So firstly, what are his claims? Open borders would what?

Did anyone—what does he promise this would do? How about you guys at the back? Cici, Zen or Yong? 😊

Very good, yeah, he does—he says the world with open borders would **double world GDP**. Great. Any others? There's two more. I mean, again, we would all want that, right? Everybody says yes. If I said, "I will give you something that will double world GDP," nobody would say, "I don't want that." Everyone wants that, right?

What else? It would **reduce poverty**. Again, who wants more poverty, right? Everyone wants poverty reduced. Is that a high priority—less poverty? I think most governments make it a high priority, don't they? I often hear it when I watch the news, right? "This country has a high poverty rate," and then the government is in trouble because they need to lower the poverty rate.

And yeah, you said another thing there—yeah, it would also **boost the labor force**—it would benefit local people as well as the immigrants themselves, right? So these are three good things to happen—new skills, less poverty, and a stronger economy.

But how would it double world GDP—that's the question. What would actually be the mechanism to make that happen? Yeah, they can add to their economic value. Yeah, he doesn't go into too much detail here. He's not writing this essay for other economists—he's an economist, but he's writing it for a general audience, general readers, right? But yeah, if we did go into it, how would letting immigrants move to rich countries make the whole world richer? It's about **productivity**, right? If I work in Africa, for example, maybe I don't have access to the same productivity enhancements as I would in, say, Germany. Why is a German factory much more productive than, say, a Nigerian factory? Is it because Germans are hardworking and Nigerians are not? You might say that, but that's—that's a racist claim. What's the real reason for it? Yeah, it's **technology**, right? The German factory has better technology and also better conditions. For example, the power is not going to go out in the German factory, but in the Nigerian factory, the power probably goes on and off all day long, right? The roads are good in Germany—the delivery is going to arrive on time, right? The public transport is good in Germany—the workers are going to arrive on time. The healthcare is better in Germany—they're going to be sick less often. The childcare is better in Germany—they don't have to stay at home and look after their children, right? There are many reasons that make German society more productive than, say, Nigerian society. So by moving workers to more productive environments, you can **leverage this productivity advantage**, and everybody gets richer. So that's how it works.

What about this one—**the new skills**? Have you guys heard of *comparative advantage* before? So it's the idea that if *you* do what you're best at, and *I* do what I'm best at—and you don't do what I do, and I don't do what you do—we just each do the thing we're best at, then we all produce more together, right? The example that's always used is: imagine **wool** and **wine**, right? So England produces more wool than it produces wine, right? Portugal produces even more wool *and* even more wine, right? This is England; this is Portugal. What should England produce, and what should Portugal produce? Yeah, Portugal's comparative advantage is **wine**, and England's comparative advantage is **wool**—even if it's not an absolute advantage. If Portugal produces wine and England

produces wool, then overall we have *more stuff*, right? Portugal shouldn't produce wool because it's better at producing wine, and England shouldn't produce wine because it's better at producing wool. So overall, we have more wool and more wine. All right, that's **comparative advantage**. And he says, "The immigrant who mows the lawn of the nuclear physicist helps to unlock the secrets of the universe." So if I'm a nuclear physicist and I'm doing nuclear physics, and I think, "Oh no, I have to go outside and look after my garden"—actually, no, I don't. There's an immigrant who will look after my garden so I can focus all my talent on nuclear physics, and the immigrant can do the gardening. Now we have more productivity, right? So that's the mechanism. That's the analysis. That's how immigration will boost the economy.

Do you agree with him? Assuming he's right, does that make you support the main idea? If I could say for sure we will have double world GDP, much less poverty, and better skills for the economy—everyone's going to be richer with this—would you support it? Yeah, you would say, "Great, no more borders, let's let people move freely about the earth." Would anyone be against it? What happens if we have too many immigrants? Economic collapse? Do you think it could actually destroy the economy? Hold that thought—we'll come back to disagreements at the end.

Just moving on, then he says, to justify—so this is the *should* part. Why is it the right thing to do? So he gives this paragraph here. This is the transition: he's moving from the impact to the value argument here. Can anyone summarize this paragraph? He is saying we should or should not—he doesn't actually use the word *should* here. But if you summarize that paragraph in one sentence, what is he saying? If you can make the sentence with a *should*, he is saying we should not treat people differently because of where they were born. Right—it is wrong to treat people differently because of where they are born. I think that's what he's saying. That would be the claim, if you made the claim simple.

Do you agree? If I said I should treat you differently because of your gender, you would say, "You awful man." 🙄 If I said I should treat you differently because of your religion, you would say, "How awful," right? But if I said I should treat you differently because of which country you come from, most people think, "Yeah, that's fine." We do that all the time, right? He says we should not do that. It's morally wrong.

He gives some moral frameworks. Don't worry—this is not a moral philosophy class, so we're not going to go into too much detail about it. But I think these are some good examples, right? You can look to these when you are thinking of your own values arguments for your essays. You can think about some of these. So he mentions utilitarianism. Does anyone know what utilitarianism is? I know what you do—can you explain it? What does it evaluate? It's like doing a math. You know the trolley car dilemma: should I pull the lever? The trolley car is going to hit five men. If I pull the lever, it will hit one man, right? A utilitarian would say, "Yes, pull the lever," because the difference is four—five against one, the difference is four—so pulling the lever is the right thing to do. But what if I say—let's chop him up and take his heart and give it to one sick man, take his lung and give it to one sick man, take his kidneys and give them to two sick men, take his liver and give it to another sick man. We could save five lives if we chop him up. Is that the right thing to do? No. So utilitarianism isn't the only way we think about morality, right?

Libertarian—does anyone know it? Libertarian. Basically, yeah, if I don't hurt other people, I should be free to do what I like, right? If I want to eat KFC and McDonald's every day and drink 白酒 every day, that's my choice, right? And if I get big and fat, then that's my personal choice. You don't have any responsibility for my health, right? So it's my personal choice. But yeah—can I sell my kidney? No. Why not? If he wants to buy my kidney and I want to sell my kidney, why shouldn't we be free to make that deal, right? There's some morality there too. But libertarians would say, I should be free—if I want to sell my kidney, I should be free; if I want to inject myself with heroin, who am I

hurting? Only myself, right? So should I be free to inject myself with heroin? Why not? Yeah, but I can eat KFC and drink baijiu and smoke cigarettes if I want to, right? That will hurt my health too, so why can I not inject myself with heroin? Again, there are other concerns here, right? The libertarians would say, generally, if it doesn't hurt someone, then people should be free to do it.

Egalitarian—equality. Yeah, basically, it doesn't matter who you are, everyone's a human, everyone's a person, no matter your race, your gender, your religion. This one's maybe one you've never heard of—Rawls. Although again, if you've taken my debating class, we cover Rawls, but forget that. Normally, when I take my belief, my argument, it's often related to who I am, right? And same with you. If I said, what is the greatest country in the world, probably most of you would not say, "Brazil" or "Italy," right? Because you don't really sit down and look at all the countries and think, "Okay, after carefully considering all the factors, I personally think that Cyprus is the greatest country in the world," right? Most people think, "My country is the greatest country in the world," why? Because you're from that country, right? 😊

If I hear someone saying, "I support lower taxes," we could probably guess they are rich. If someone says, "I'm a communist," I might think they are poor. If someone says, "I support rights for racial minorities," I think they probably are a racial minority, right? If someone says, "I support rights for gay people," I think, well, that person might be gay, right? Often what we believe in depends on who we are. But Rawls said, imagine if you don't know who you are going to be—you could be anybody in this society. Now, how would you think about policy? Should our policy discriminate against disabled people? "Oh, I'm not disabled, so I don't care." But you *could* be disabled. Maybe now you do care, right? Anyway, if you're not sure what that means, ask Deepseek, but it's a very popular kind of philosophical point of view.

Christian—I wouldn't encourage you guys to use religion to justify your arguments for this class, but in this essay, who is probably reading this essay? Who is he writing for? 🙄 You know, it's an American magazine, right? If I was trying to persuade Americans, I would also say, "Jesus said do this," right? "The Bible says do that." So what does Christianity say about this topic? It says, treat others as you would like to be treated; don't do to others what you don't want to happen to you, right? But, you know, is Christianity a good moral philosophy? If you look at the Bible, there's all kinds of crazy stuff in there, right? The Bible says you should not shave. The Bible says you should not eat shellfish. The Bible says all kinds of crazy stuff, right? The Bible says slavery is okay—you should own slaves. So generally speaking, I wouldn't say Christianity is a good moral perspective.

All right, so *would* is economic, *should* is moral. Finally, *but*. He says—do you guys know the Universal Declaration of Human Rights? Do you know it? It's the most important document—it sets out the fundamental rights that all people should have in every country. In the Human Rights Declaration, it says that people only have freedom of movement *within* the borders of each state, right? So this is not a universal right given at the United Nations to everybody—you only have the freedom of movement within your own country. You do not have the right to move freely to other countries. 🙄 So that's his *but*, right? "My opponents would say this." However, he argues that human rights do not stop at the border. He says we treat governments that don't let their people *leave* as bad governments, and he says in the future, we will do the same for countries that don't let people *enter* their country. Can you think of any countries that don't let their people leave? North Korea, Eritrea in Africa—I think these are the two famous examples.

In the conclusion, he reviews his points. He says closed borders are one of the world's greatest moral failings—that's this point here. And he says the opening of borders is the greatest economic opportunity—that was his first argument, right? And then he gives his "I have a dream." 😊 He's promising us a world that is unafraid of itself. Right, that's his *I have a dream*. He points out that the grandest moral revolutions in history—the abolition of slavery, religious freedom, rights of

women—at the time, those were all things that people said, "We can't do that, it's too weird, too radical." But when we did them, they proved to be a benefit. He says when we do *this*, it will be the same thing, right? We can have a better world.

So, do you agree? Do you find that persuasive? Yeah, if this did actually happen, you wouldn't see a lot of people moving from, you know, Spain to Africa, but you would probably see a lot of people moving from Africa to Spain. It would kind of be from the south to the north, generally speaking. And then those places would become worse to live in because they're overcrowded. So everyone would go to, like he says, the places that are suited to mass economic activity and leave behind those places that aren't. Why would that be a bad thing, though? Wouldn't we then all just—doesn't that connect to the previous point? We would have more money and be richer and more prosperous.

Like, a good example might be Shanghai, right? Shanghai is China's richest city, or China's biggest economy is Shanghai, right? And so many people come from other parts of China into Shanghai. What happens to Shanghai when people come into Shanghai? You know, the house price goes up and up and up and up. But people are much richer in Shanghai, right? I think life in Shanghai is very good because, you know, if you want to order some food, it's so easy to do because workers come from all over China to work in Shanghai. If I want to get a Didi, I can get one right away because there's always a worker available to drive me somewhere else. 😊 Like, Shanghai is a very convenient economy because many people want to come here. In my hometown, there is no Didi. There is no 美团 or 饿了么. You know, I have to drive the car myself to the supermarket and buy stuff and bring it home. Don't you think Shanghai is a very good, convenient place to live thanks to immigration from other parts of China? Although you could argue, well, I wouldn't like to be the 美团 driver or the 滴滴 driver.

Wouldn't the free market deal with the problem of limited resources? If there are too many people coming in and the value goes down, then some of those people will leave, and you'll get an equilibrium. In a way, it balances out. It's the invisible hand, right? Don't worry, I'm not saying you're wrong and I'm right. I'm just trying to give you an argument. Did you guys—do you support the essay? 😊

Yeah, culture might be a big thing he didn't mention in the essay, right? Yes, can you think of any examples? Crime caused by immigrants? Yeah, absolutely, although I would say be careful, because often you tend to see these single examples, right? And if what you look at is a single example, it looks really bad. But if you look at the data, then it's maybe not as bad as the example. You know, a good example of this is in China. When a teenager commits a serious crime, people always go crazy about it, right? You know, do you remember those guys in Handan? Those three boys—they killed a classmate, right? And all my students want to write essays like, "Oh my God, teenagers need to be punished like adults because this is so serious." That's the example of those three boys in 邯郸. But if you look at the data—do most Chinese, or do many Chinese teenagers, kill their classmates? I think it's not common at all, right? You know, the murder rate of Chinese teenagers is very, very low. And I would say maybe the same thing with immigrants, right? When an immigrant does something, it's big news. But do immigrants often do those things? I don't know about the data. But if we open the borders, it does not mean the other countries will send all their criminals. Yeah, that's what Donald Trump says, right? "They're sending their bad people to our country." Yeah, it could happen—I hope not—but it could. But yeah, I think your point about culture is maybe an interesting one, right? Like, certain cultures don't really fit in very well with other cultures.

I think—I don't know—do you think Chinese people find it easy to live in Britain? Do British people find it easy to live in China? Yeah, you mean the food? I don't know. I guess people that move around the world probably—I mean, one thing I would say is it's very easy to get British food in Shanghai, and it's very easy to get Chinese food in Britain. 😊 So maybe not such a big problem. Yeah, food is interesting. But I mean, you know, for example, what do British people like doing in their free time? You know, they love football and snooker and beer and, you know, going out to eat. And I think Chinese people love these things too. I think it's quite easy to fit in. But I guess some cultures, like, you know, from the Middle East, right, Islamic people, they do not like beer. They do not like eating pork, for example, and so on. And so maybe they would struggle to fit in, or there would be some clash between the cultures.

Any other disagreements with them? Yeah, it's really good for Britain when an Indian doctor leaves India and goes to work in London, because now Britain gains an extra doctor. But is it also good for India? Yeah, the poor people in India—now they have one less doctor. So it's Britain's gain and India's loss. So yeah, you could argue that. Although you could also argue, well, maybe that doctor will go to Britain, learn how to be a good doctor, and go back to India and be a better doctor for Indians. So you could argue the other side. But we have a term for this. We say "brain drain," right? When a poor country loses its smart people to a rich country. I think America is very good at this. America will take smart people from all over the world and make its own industry better. Even though the American education system isn't that good, they can still get lots of smart people. They can just import them from China and India. You know, look at the top executives of Silicon Valley—there are so many Indians and Chinese people working there.

Any final thoughts? Yeah, if I'm a low-skilled worker, if I'm like a plumber or something like that, and now, you know, 100 Mexican plumbers come to my town, I have to lower my rate—you know, how much money I charge. Otherwise, everyone will pay them and not me. So yeah, it hurts the non-skilled or low-skilled labor. What do those low-skilled laborers do if they lose their jobs to immigration? Yeah, well, they might be marching, or they might vote for Donald Trump, right? Or they might start taking drugs. I mean, this is a big problem in America—drug abuse—and a lot of those people, they lost their factory jobs because of immigration. It's becoming a negative social consequence.

All right, I'll leave it there because the bell is going to ring. There's no reading for next week; just make sure you read the handbook, pages 2 to 8. And I would ask you maybe to bring a pen and paper with you next week, so I'll get you to do some writing in class. And I will say no DeepSeek or internet access, so bring a pen and paper to write on next week. All right, I'll see you next week.

The End