

# Immigration Id debate

[Law](#), [Justice](#)



Democratic ideals- Taxation Nozick Because a just government cannot violate the negative rights of its citizens I negate the resolution: in matters of U. S. immigration policy restrictions on the rights of non-citizens are consistent with democratic ideals. Definitions: According to US immigration law, immigrants are persons lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States. As we are only looking toward those lawfully admitted we must only look legal non-citizens and illegal immigrants can be excluded from the realm of the debate. Also as we are only looking to those seeking permanent residence we can exclude all tourists, and we can assume that those coming into the country have a desire to learn and assimilate into the culture. Democratic ideals- to define democratic ideals in terms of America, we must look to what are the ideals that this country was founded upon. At the spark of the American Revolution colonists cried out against injustices such as the stamp act and other taxes. the primary argument was that Americans were not allowed a say in the taxes that they were given. No taxation without representation became their chant. They felt as if they needed justice. Thus we can conclude that democratic ideals revolve around according each individual his or her due. I offer the following observations: Observation1- The evaluative terms within the resolution are democratic ideals and restrictions on the rights of non-citizens. Thus we must look to not whether restrictions are good or bad, but rather we must simply look to consistency with democratic ideals. O2- Since this is Id debate in which we debate philosophy and what is the best moral objective rather than cross-examination debate in which the participants are required to provide a plan, the affirmative can not simply give an example of 2 restrictions and show

how those restrictions are consistent with democratic ideals. Rather both sides must show how restrictions in general are consistent or not consistent. My value for this round to uphold democratic ideals is justice. As a state is created to organize and govern individuals, the moral duties of individuals are the basis of a just governments obligation. Robert Nozick explains:" moral philosophy sets the background for, and boundaries of political philosophy. What people may and may not do to another limits what they can do through the apparatus of a state, or do to establish such an apparatus. The moral prohibitions it is permissible to enforce are the source of whatever legitimacy that states fundamental coercive power has." The most fundamental moral obligation of the individuals is that they may not violate the rights of other individuals to advance their own ends. Even if violating one person's rights would protect more rights overall, such an action would not be morally justifiable because it would treat that individual as a means and not an end. Robert nozick explains the source of this moral side constraint:" side constraints upon action reflect the underlying Kantian principle that individuals are ends and not merely means; they may not be sacrificed or used for the achieving of other ends without their consent. Individuals are inviolable." Nozick continues:' the moral side constraints upon what we may do... reflect the fact that no moral balancing act can take place among us; there is no moral outweighing of one of our lives by others so as to lead to greater overall social good. There is no justified sacrifice of some of us for others. The root idea, namely, that there are different individuals with separate lives and so no one may be sacrifices for others, underlies the existence of moral side constraints." Accordingly the criterion is respect for

moral side constraints. I would like to provide the following observation. O1- governments are funded by taxes, and whether you choose to subscribe to a government service or not your taxes directly or indirectly will be used to fund that service. I. e. public education for all, regardless of whether u have kids, choose to send them to a private school, or how many you have you tax dollars will be sent to support public education. C1. My sole contention is that government provided health care would violate moral side constraints. Because restrictions are essentially asking that we view certain groups differently, it creates inequalities. Non-citizens pay taxes equal to those of citizens, and by not providing them with access to health care we violate moral side constraints, and the basic principles of American democracy. Robert Nozick explains" Whether it is done through taxation on wages on wages over a certain amount, or through seizure of profits, or through there being a big social pot so that its not clear what coming from where and what's going where, patterned principles of distributive justice involve appropriating the actions of other persons. Seizing the results of someone's labor is equivalent to seizing hours from him and directing him to carry on various activities. If people force you to do certain work, or unrewarded work, for a certain amount of time, they decide what you are to do and what purpose your work is to serve apart from your decisions. This process whereby they take this decision from you makes them a part-owner of you, gives them a property right in you." The impact is that taxing individuals and then not according them equal rights does not respect moral side constraints on individual action, meaning that affirming the resolution is not in line with

the obligations of a government. The only possible recourse is a negative ballot. I now stand for cross examination.