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## Introduction

The topic surrounding the controversial debate of whether illegal immigrants should benefit from free education offered by the state and federal government has brought about various views presented by scholars, interest groups, governmental and non-governmental organization. Each group is of the view that there are reciprocal effects associated with views of the opposing group. With regard to contrasting views presented by these two groups, the paper seeks to conduct an argumentative analysis from which recommendations will be suggested based on the realistic and impacts the chosen views have on the socio-economic and geo-political status of various states in America.

## States should educate children of illegal immigrants

In the case of plyer vs. Doe 1982, the US Supreme Court judge ruled on the case in Texas where children of undocumented aliens were given the right like any other Native American child to benefit from free public education, and receive social security numbers that will facilitate the public services (Finkelman, 2006). It was therefore deemed that other states were supposed to follow suit and implement the ruling given based on the case. Categorically, learning institution heads were warned against implementing the US immigration laws; it was the state and federal government mandate to ensure that the policy of adhered. Although this law has not been followed in the state of Alabama, locals, and interest groups are pointing accusing fingers to the authorities stating that the legal provisions are cruel and counterproductive because the native children being favored are not taking advantage of the situation; instead, the majority are failing to go to school.   
The ability to realize the American dream should not be limited within the American boarders. The fact that illegal immigrants do not pay taxes should not be a rationale behind the failure of the states’ authorities to bar children of undocumented aliens from acquiring education. In essence, state governments should understand that to stop the culture of non-payment of taxes by illegal aliens, they should educate their children and employ them; this will give states a chance to impose taxes.

## States should not educate children of illegal immigrants

Alabama State was the first to enact legislations aimed at hindering children of illegal alien from registering and enrolling in institutions of learning. The rationale behind the enacting of this immigration law was that available learning institutions were congested and that the situation had affected children of Native American children (Drachman, Langran & Shank, 2008). Apart from that, the law aimed at discouraging other illegal immigrants from finding their way into America. For this reason, states should start by denying children of illegal immigrants the chance to acquire public education because it will encourage illegal immigration.   
The economic burden on states to educate children of illegal immigrants is high and that some states are even failing to tap their potential because of lack of enough funds (Borjas, 2001). Firstly, illegal immigrants do not pay taxes; the majority does this intentionally. Following this move, states government have failed to amass enough economic power to finance social amenity programs. Therefore, to lessen this economic burden, states are not required to educate children of illegal immigrants and instead invest the funds in other developmental programs.

## Recommendation and conclusion

States are required to educate children of illegal immigrants because laws in other states allow such an initiative. It is morally right to deliver social amenities in a non-discriminative way. However, the economic burden of delivering this services; states government should avoiding educating children of illegal immigrants because it not only possess an economic challenge, but also encourages other immigrants to enter America illegally.   
With regard to the argumentative analysis above, it should be advised that states in America should educate illegal aliens, but increase its monitoring and supervision along boarder points to limit the number of undocumented aliens entering America illegally. Considering that some states such as Texas have already enacted immigration laws that allow children of illegal immigrants to acquire public education, other states should adopt the same policy; this is morally right and a way of avoiding discrimination among its citizens. To facilitate the idea of educating children of illegal immigrants, immigration laws in all states should be reviewed to ensure that after educating these children, states should be able to recover their funds through loan payment after employment.
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