



An Outline of Joseph Caren's Argument for Open Borders

Uzair Khan

Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy,
Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh

Corresponding Author: Uzair Khan

Email: uzairkhan356@gmail.com

DOI-10.5281/zenodo.15095006

Abstract:

Joseph Caren's compelling argument for free borders is grounded in various political ideologies, contesting traditional notions of state sovereignty. This abstract delineates his methodology, emphasizing its interaction with Rawlsian liberalism, Nozickean libertarianism, and utilitarianism. Caren contends that a Rawlsian viewpoint, highlighting the original stance and the difference principle, mandates free borders. Individuals selecting principles behind a veil of ignorance would not support mobility limitations that disadvantage the global impoverished. He further argues that Nozick's libertarian ideals, which focus on self-ownership and property rights, strangely endorse free borders. Individuals ought to have the liberty to sell their labor, while property owners should be permitted to employ anyone they like, irrespective of nationality. Ultimately, a utilitarian calculus that seeks to maximize total well-being advocates for open borders, as the economic benefits and enhanced liberties surpass possible drawbacks. Caren presents a compelling ethical argument for the unrestricted movement of individuals by illustrating the convergence of two ostensibly dissimilar ideas.

Keywords: Open border, State Sovereignty, Liberalism, Libertarianism, Utilitarianism, Free Mobility.

Introduction:

The debate surrounding immigration policies and border controls remains a deeply contested issue in contemporary political discourse. Central to this debate is the question of whether borders should be open or closed, and to what extent state sovereignty justifies restricting the movement of individuals. In this context, Joseph Caren's argument for open borders emerges as a powerful and thought-provoking contribution, challenging the traditional frameworks of national boundaries and citizenship. Caren builds his case by weaving together insights from prominent political theories, including Rawlsian liberalism, Nozickean libertarianism, and utilitarianism. By exploring these ideological foundations, Caren constructs a multi-faceted argument that highlights the moral and ethical imperatives for free migration.

At the heart of Caren's argument is a Rawlsian perspective that draws from the principles of justice articulated by John Rawls. Specifically, Caren invokes the concept of the "original position" and the "veil of ignorance," which compel individuals to choose principles of justice without knowledge of their social, economic, or geographical status. In this hypothetical scenario, individuals would reject restrictive border policies, as such limitations disproportionately harm the global poor. Furthermore, Rawls's difference principle, which seeks to prioritize the well-being of the least advantaged, reinforces the moral case for open borders. By allowing free movement, societies

can address global inequalities and provide opportunities for the disadvantaged to improve their circumstances.

In addition to Rawlsian liberalism, Caren's turns to Nozickean libertarianism to argue that the principles of self-ownership and property rights implicitly support open borders. According to libertarian ideals, individuals should have the freedom to sell their labor and make autonomous economic decisions. Similarly, property owners should have the right to employ workers of their choosing, regardless of nationality. Caren posits that restricting immigration infringes upon these fundamental liberties, undermining the core tenets of libertarian thought. This unexpected alignment between libertarianism and open borders underscores the ethical inconsistency of restrictive immigration policies.

Finally, Caren employs a utilitarian framework to demonstrate that open borders maximize overall well-being. From an economic perspective, free migration facilitates the efficient allocation of labor, leading to increased productivity and prosperity. Additionally, the enhanced freedoms and opportunities associated with open borders contribute to the overall happiness and welfare of individuals. While concerns about potential drawbacks, such as cultural integration and resource strain, may arise, Caren argues that the cumulative benefits of open borders far outweigh these challenges.

By synthesizing these diverse ideological perspectives, Caren's constructs a compelling case for the unrestricted movement of individuals. His argument challenges the conventional assumptions of state sovereignty and national privilege, urging policymakers and societies to reevaluate the ethical foundations of immigration policies. Through his analysis, Caren's not only advocates for open borders but also fosters a broader discussion about justice, equality, and human rights in a globalized world. In an era characterized by increasing interconnectedness, his work remains a vital and relevant contribution to the ongoing debate on migration and border policies.

Research Methodology:

This research employs a normative analytical methodology to investigate the ethical and philosophical foundations for open borders, utilizing frameworks from Rawlsian liberalism, Nozickian libertarianism, and utilitarianism. The study begins with an in-depth analysis of Rawlsian principles, particularly the original position and difference principle, assessing how mobility restrictions impact the global poor. It then examines Nozickian libertarianism, focusing on self-ownership and property rights, and evaluates the assertion that libertarian ideals support unrestricted labor and property markets. The utilitarian perspective is incorporated through cost-benefit analysis to measure the overall welfare implications of open borders. A comparative analysis identifies ethical commonalities between Rawlsian and libertarian views, suggesting a shared moral imperative for open borders. Empirical evidence on the socio-economic effects of open borders is integrated, alongside counterarguments addressing security, cultural, and economic concerns, to strengthen the normative claims presented by Joseph Caren. For this research I used qualitative, primary, secondary, data collection method as well as reliable internet sources.

The Rawlsian & Carens Perspective on Open Borders:

In the discussion of open borders, Joseph Carens supports unrestricted immigration from a liberal egalitarian viewpoint, contending that freedom of movement is a fundamental right rooted in common liberal principles. He utilizes John Rawls' notion of the "original position," proposing that if individuals were to select principles of justice without awareness of their circumstances, they would advocate for open borders. Carens argues that a global perspective on justice would yield principles akin to those applicable in domestic contexts, facilitating unrestricted movement across borders.

Critiques emerge from various theorists, including Rawls, who underscores the significance of state boundaries and the legitimacy of borders

within political communities. Rawls' subsequent work, *The Law of Peoples*, emphasizes that although societies are obligated to aid those in need, this obligation does not require the establishment of open borders. Critics such as Brian Barry contest Carens' stance by emphasizing the disparity between the freedom to exit and the freedom to enter, positing that while individuals possess the liberty to depart, they lack an intrinsic right to access another state.

The discussion also addresses the ramifications of immigration on social cohesion and the possible backlash against immigrants in prosperous societies, highlighting concerns regarding the stability of liberal institutions. Ultimately, although Carens advocates for open borders as a moral principle, his arguments encounter considerable obstacles from both theoretical and practical perspectives, especially concerning the equilibrium between individual rights and the cohesion of political communities (Mekonnen, 2007).

Carens advocates for open borders grounded in liberal principles; however, his underlying assumptions regarding liberalism are unexamined, resulting in a deadlock in immigration discussions. Both advocates of open borders and proponents of immigration limits depend on unsubstantiated norms, leading to an absence of resolution. Carens has generated substantial scholarship promoting open borders, contending that states possess a moral duty to accept practically all immigrants. Nonetheless, immigration policies profoundly influence national identities, and Carens's liberal-centric thesis may unintentionally overlook the validity of non-liberal political systems. Critics contend that Carens's stance fails to provide a robust justification of liberalism, which is crucial for convincing individuals beyond liberal ideology. Although Carens's work urges liberals to reevaluate their ideals, it fails to sufficiently tackle the persistent discord within liberalism itself. If his argument is solely a communitarian appeal to liberals, it does not constitute a legitimate case for open borders applicable to all nations. Conversely, to promote universal open borders, it must engage with non-liberal viewpoints. Ultimately, Carens's argument, though substantial, is insufficient and requires additional examination to reconcile liberal principles with pragmatic immigration policies (Meilaender, 1999).

The Libertarian & Carens Endorsement of Open Borders:

Carens's examination of the connection between libertarian principles and open borders underscores the significance of personal rights, property ownership, and labor autonomy. He contends that the essence of the open borders' argument is congruent with libertarian principles,

promoting the unrestricted movement of individuals as a fundamental human right. Caren recognizes the necessity for a more sophisticated comprehension of liberalism that integrates cultural and historical contexts while maintaining support for the concept of open borders. He critiques conventional liberal theories, including those of Rawls and Nozick, for their anti-perfectionism and insufficient focus on collective objectives. He advocates for a pluralistic approach that honors individual rights without rendering them absolute, indicating that while certain immigration restrictions may be defensible, the default position should favor open borders (Carens, 1999).

Caren examines the methodological ramifications of contextualizing immigration debates within varying presuppositions, juxtaposing the "just world" presupposition, which emphasizes ideal moral principles, with the "real world" presupposition that accounts for practical limitations. He contends that although the open borders argument may not appeal to non-liberals, it can nonetheless stimulate discourse by emphasizing the ethical obligations of prosperous nations in regulating borders (Carens, 1987).

Caren's work aims to harmonize libertarian principles with the intricacies of immigration policy, promoting a framework that emphasizes human freedom and equality while recognizing the political and economic realities.

Utilitarian & Carens on Open Borders:

The utilitarian viewpoint on immigration prioritizes the maximization of total utility while acknowledging the moral equality of all persons. This approach contests conventional immigration limitations by positing that the economic and social advantages of open borders may surpass the possible disadvantages. Utilitarianism is based on the idea that all individuals are equal in utility assessments, necessitating the consideration of the interests of both citizens and non-citizens.

Utilitarianism concedes that heightened immigration may adversely affect certain individuals economically, although it also acknowledges that numerous citizens could gain from a more liberal immigration policy. The comprehensive economic benefits derived from unrestricted labor mobility, which requires open borders, are frequently regarded as crucial for optimizing utility. Consequently, although present citizens may incur certain economic expenses, these are improbable to warrant restricted immigration policies when contrasted with the prospective advantages for both citizens and immigrants.

Furthermore, utilitarianism considers the cultural effects and societal transformations resulting from immigration. The significance attributed to these elements differs among utilitarians. Some contend that only refined or long-

term preferences ought to be acknowledged, but others support a more inclusive perspective that encompasses all preferences, including those arising from bias. Ultimately, irrespective of the calculating method, a utilitarian framework that authentically considers the interests of immigrants is likely to advocate for more liberal immigration laws than those often enacted today.

Conversely, Carens' viewpoint on open borders underscores the ethical need of permitting unrestricted travel, contending that limitations are frequently unwarranted. He asserts that the right to migrate is essential, particularly for individuals escaping poverty and persecution. Collectively, these concepts promote a reassessment of immigration policies, favoring increased openness and inclusivity.

Conclusion:

Joseph Carens articulates a compelling case for open borders, contesting conventional ideas of state sovereignty using the frameworks of Rawlsian liberalism, Nozickean libertarianism, and utilitarianism. His research commences with a Rawlsian viewpoint, asserting that individuals, when situated behind a "veil of ignorance," would support unrestricted travel, as prohibitive measures disproportionately disadvantage the global impoverished.

This corresponds with Rawls's difference principle, highlighting justice for the most disadvantaged. Carens further incorporates Nozickean libertarian principles, contending that self-ownership and property rights intrinsically endorse open borders, permitting individuals the liberty to sell their labor and property owners the authority to hire without nationality constraints.

Utilitarianism supports Carens's argument by emphasizing that open borders enhance general well-being, as the economic advantages of unrestricted migration surpass any potential disadvantages.

He argues that although apprehensions over cultural integration and resource depletion are present, the overall benefits of open borders—improved liberties and economic growth—are substantial. Carens's integration of these varied ideological frameworks not only supports unlimited movement but also encourages a reassessment of the ethical underpinnings of immigration policies.

Critiques emerge about the constraints of Carens's liberal-centric thesis, which may neglect the intricacies of non-liberal political systems and the equilibrium between individual rights and societal cohesiveness. Critics contend that although Carens's work is significant, it demands additional scrutiny to align liberal ideas with pragmatic immigration policies. Carens's advocacy for open borders significantly enriches the debate on migration, prompting a more extensive dialogue

regarding justice, equality, and human rights in a progressively integrated global landscape. His work necessitates a reevaluation of immigration laws that emphasize ethical obligations rather than conventional state sovereignty.

Bibliography:

1. Mekonnen, K. (2007). The Idea of Open Borders: For and Against. *Ethiopian Journal of the Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(2).
2. Carens, J. H. (1999). Reconsidering open borders. *International Migration Review*, 33(4), 1082-1097.
3. Meilaender, P. C. (1999). Liberalism and open borders: The argument of Joseph Carens. *International Migration Review*, 33(4), 1062-1081.
4. Carens, J. H. (1987). Aliens and citizens: the case for open borders. *The review of politics*, 49(2), 251-273.