

Census & Citizenship: Structured Academic Controversy

Unit duration: 1-2 lessons (55-80 mins each)

Grade level: High School

Objectives:

1. At the end of this lesson students will be able to construct an argument regarding the proposed changes to the 2020 Census.
2. At the end of this lesson students will be able to articulate current political arguments surrounding citizenship and the Census.
3. At the end of this lesson students will be able to explain the purpose of the Census and its frequency.

Essential Questions:

Should the US Census Bureau ask the question “is this person a citizen of the United States” on the 2020 Census?

Colorado State Standards Addressed: High School, Standard 4. Civics

Prepared Graduates: 7. Express an understanding of how civic participation affects policy by applying the rights and responsibilities of a citizen. 8. Analyze the origins, structures and functions of governments to evaluate the impact on citizens and the global society.

Grade Level Expectations 2. Purposes, roles and limitations of the structures and functions of government. 3. Evaluate the impact of the political institutions that link the people to the government.

- Colorado State Standards 2020 cde.state.co.us/cosocialstudies/2020cas-ss-p12

AP U.S. Government and Politics Disciplinary Practices

- Practice 5: Argumentation
 - o Develop an argument in essay format
 - 5.A: Articulate a defensible claim/thesis

Lesson Plans:

Day/time/duration	Title/content	Step by step instructions	Materials needed/notes
1 Day – 55 minutes or 80-minute block	Do Now/Intro activity	5 minutes: Partner or table or whole class discussion question: Why is it important for the US to know how many people are in the nation? What benefits does that provide the country?	Student Handout 1 NOTES Depending of student skill level/engagement this lesson could be completed in a 55 minute or 80-minute class period. Accommodations: higher level articles (Articles 2 & 4) can be removed, or assign multiple articles to mixed ability groups. Relevance: This question is proposed to the 2020 Census. If the question has been added, or not added at the time this lesson is taught, it remains relevant to the political issues of immigration and the census. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potential Discussion Questions based on future events<ul style="list-style-type: none">o What Impact is this likely to have on the census?

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What made the arguments for/against the question successful or unsuccessful? ○ Do you believe that the 2020 Census was accurate?
	Discussion Questions:	5 minutes: Have partners read the proposed census question and answer the questions in writing or verbally. Don't interject and answer questions for students. These are meant to familiarize them with the topic and spark discussion.	
	Reading	15 minutes: Distribute readings to pairs. There are two reading sets: One set is Pro and one set is Con. Half of the partners will get each. Give them 15 minutes to partner read their questions and complete the top portion of the handout.	<p>Teacher Actions: Teacher should circulate and answer student questions, but allow students to engage with each other and the documents independently.</p> <p>Student Handout 2: Structured Academic Controversy. (If you're using all 4 articles, each student gets both handouts, if you're only using 2, each student only needs one handout).</p> <p>Article 1a. Article 1b. Article 2a. Article 2b.</p>
	Discuss	<p>10 Minutes: Team up with a pair that had the other set of documents. While teamed up, students should be creating questions to discuss during this time, and during the whole class discussion using the levels of questions document. Give students 3-5 minutes after this portion to complete this before the whole class discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 minute: Present authors 2 best arguments while other team silently 	<p>Teacher Actions: Teacher should circulate and answer student questions, but allow students to engage with each other and the documents independently.</p> <p>Handout 3: Levels of Questions.</p>

		<p>listens and jots notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 minutes: Questioning – listening team asks questions of presenting team. • Switch teams – now the listening team becomes presenting team. • 1 minute: Answer final question. 	
	Question Writing	<p>individually, or with partners, have students create leveled questions for whole class discussion using the guidelines in the Levels of Questions Handout.</p>	Teacher Actions: Circulate and push student thinking. Students will struggle with level 2 and 3 questions. Push them to create questions that are not “googleable.”
	Whole class discussion	<p>15 - 30 minutes: Divide the class by their chosen sides. Put pro students on one side of the room, and con students on the other, or organize class in a circle. Now that students are well versed in the arguments of both sides, they’ll engage in a whole class debate over the issue. Students should continue to make their assigned argument. Grade using the attached Rubric.</p>	<p>Teacher Actions: The teacher should be a referee, not a discussion leader. Place the weight of the discussion on students. Use assigned roles if necessary.</p> <p>SAC Rubric</p>
	Wrap-Up:	<p>5 minutes: Have students answer the Exit Ticket questions in the final 5 minutes.</p>	

SAC Rubric

Name: _____

A- to A+: Advanced: Student meets *all* of the *proficient* criteria plus *one or more* of the following:

- **Actively incorporates** others into the discussion
- **Summarizes** points of agreement and disagreement
- **Qualifies** or **justifies** own views and understanding
- **Makes new connections** (to previous material or other ideas) in light of the evidence and reasoning presented
- **Provides a counterclaim** to disprove or challenge another's assertion

B- to B+: Proficient

- *Participate & Engage*
 - Student comes to discussion **prepared** (with **completed preparation notes and text**)
 - Uses **body language** and **eye contact** to indicate **active listening** for the **duration of the seminar**
 - **Articulates thinking** by responding to a question or sharing an idea
- *Reason with Evidence*
 - Student **uses evidence** to support their claims, drawing on either paraphrases or direct quotations
- *Co-Construct Ideas*
 - **Poses questions** or asks clarifying questions to generate deeper understanding
 - **Builds on the thoughts of others**, either explicitly or implicitly
- *Critique Ideas*
 - **Critiques the contributions of others** in thoughtful, well-reasoned exchange of ideas

C- to C+: Basic: Student meets 2-3 of the *proficient* criteria

D- to D+: Below Basic: Student meets only 1 of the *proficient* criteria

F: Far Below Basic: Student meets none of the *proficient* criteria

Handout 1

2020 proposed Census question

Is this person a citizen of the United States?

Yes, born in the United States

Yes, born in Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or Northern Marianas

Yes, born abroad of U.S. citizen parent or parents

Yes, U.S. citizen by naturalization – *Print year of naturalization* ↴

--	--	--	--

No, not a U.S. citizen

i

Discussion Questions

1. Why might the Trump Administration want to add this question to the Census?
2. What groups or people might oppose this question? Why?

Exit Ticket: Articulate a defensible claim or thesis that responds to the prompt and establishes a line of reasoning for the following question: **Should the US Census Bureau ask the question “is this person a citizen of the United States” on the 2020 Census?**

Handout 2

STRUCTURED ACADEMIC CONTROVERSY:

Should the US Census Bureau ask the question “is this person a citizen of the United States” on the 2020 Census?

Name of Article 1a and Author: _____

Record the two BEST arguments this author presented:

1.

2.

As you LISTEN to the other group present, record your questions/thoughts here:

Name of Article 1b and Author: _____

Record the two BEST arguments this author presented:

1.

2.

As you LISTEN to the other group present, record your questions/thoughts here:

Name of Article 2a and Author: _____

Record the two BEST arguments this author presented:

1.

2.

As you LISTEN to the other group present, record your questions/thoughts here:

Name of Article 2b and Author: _____

Record the two BEST arguments this author presented:

1.

2.

As you LISTEN to the other group present, record your questions/thoughts here:

Handout 3

LEVELS OF QUESTIONS

Individually, or with your partner, use the guidelines to create discussion questions for our whole class Structured Academic Controversy. Use the space below, or a notebook.

1. Write THREE LEVEL ONE QUESTIONS:
 - These questions are limited to recall knowledge. The answers should be easily located in the text. They usually ask *who*, *what*, *when*, or *where*.
 - Example: What did the wolf want from the three little pigs?

2. Write TWO LEVEL TWO QUESTIONS:
 - These questions require the skill of application, inference and analysis. They usually ask *why* and *how*. These questions investigate purposes, motivation, etc. The answers are in the text, but they are *implied/inferred*, rather than easily located.
 - Example: Why didn't the first two little pigs build stronger houses?

3. Write ONE LEVEL THREE QUESTION:
 - These involve the skill of synthesis and evaluation. The answers to level three questions are NOT found in the text, and are *beyond* or *outside* the text. They involve a universal principle or concept that can be applied in other situations. There are no single correct answers to these questions. They are open ended, and designed to provoke discussion.
 - Example: Does good always overcome evil?

Article 1a

Pro-Con: Should our next census ask about citizenship status? | Tri-City Herald

 tri-cityherald.com/opinion/editorials/article208741679.html

By Merrill Matthews and Wayne Madsen Tribune News Service

Yes: The question allows government to properly disburse needed funds and services

Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross, at the request of the Justice Department, has instructed the U.S. Census Bureau to include a question on the 2020 decennial census asking whether the respondent is a U.S. citizen.

Such a request should be relatively uncontroversial, since census takers have been asking that question on one survey or another since the very first census. But these days, even the uncontroversial is controversial.

Most of the pushback is coming from the left, especially politicians and rent-seeking groups that thrive on redistributing taxpayer dollars. But such a question could be very helpful for those who work in public policy — for example, in counting the uninsured.

The Census Bureau included a citizenship question through 1950, stopping in 1960, as it sought ways to increase response rates. But the question was included on what is called the “long form” census in 1970, which went to fewer households.

In 2005, the citizenship question was added to the American Community Survey, an annual survey of a very small percentage of households.

Because the Census Bureau’s decennial census has not included a citizenship question for decades, analysts and elected officials do not know how many of the respondents are (1) citizens, (2) aliens in the U.S. legally, or (3) undocumented and in the U.S. illegally.

Thus, when the Census Bureau releases its annual survey of health coverage and the uninsured, it simply ignores how many of the uninsured are here illegally.

During healthcare reform debates in the past, some of us pointed out that perhaps 25 percent of the uninsured were undocumented aliens and so unlikely to be covered by health insurance reform efforts — and sure enough, Obamacare excluded illegals from receiving health insurance subsidies.

Even today, of the roughly 27.6 million (2016) uninsured, perhaps 8 million or so — a guesstimate — are illegal immigrants ineligible for taxpayer subsidies. Very few of them are going to spend their own money, especially given the high cost of Obamacare coverage. They will simply remain uninsured.

And yet those pushing for some type of big-government solution to the uninsured — including those who backed President Obama’s Affordable Care Act — use the larger uninsured number to make the problem look bigger than it is, or at least bigger than any likely legislative solution would address.

To be sure, the Census Bureau’s annual American Community Survey does ask a citizenship question. But while more frequent, those surveys are limited samples, about 3.5 million out of roughly 126 million

households. The sample numbers are then extrapolated for the country as a whole. But even then, the bureau doesn't include an estimate of the uninsured who are in the U.S. illegally.

The result is that estimating the number of uninsured who are illegal has mostly been a guessing game.

But the issue is not limited to the uninsured. The federal government funds a number of programs where taxpayer money supports illegal immigrants, either directly or indirectly. Knowing how many undocumented people are receiving those funds could help inform policy decisions.

Those opposing a citizenship question claim that the U.S. Constitution requires the government to count everyone who resides in the country, legally or not.

Ironically, these are mostly the same people who long ago abandoned the notion of a literal interpretation of the Constitution for what they call a "living Constitution," defined as "one that evolves, changes over time, and adapts to new circumstances, without being formally amended."

While a citizenship question might discourage some participation, the Census Bureau has increasingly used various methods, statistical and otherwise, to fill in the gaps.

Some form of a citizenship question has been around for two centuries. Stressing it once again would help take a little of the guesswork out of many of our public policy challenges.ⁱⁱ

The importance of answering the citizenship question on the census

John S. Baker, Jr., Opinion Contributor June 12, 2018

This past week the American Civil Liberties Union filed yet another desperate lawsuit challenging the secretary of Commerce's decision to reinstate a citizenship question on the 2020 decennial census. The ACLU filed suit two months after the sanctuary state of California first asked the federal courts to prevent the 2020 census from asking who is and is not a citizen.

Many elected officials in California and other Democrat-led states, assisted by left-wing, legal groups, seem more concerned about advancing the interests of illegal aliens than those of U.S. citizens.

States have an obligation to ensure free and fair elections for their citizens. For that reason, states including Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas have requested that the Census Bureau include a question regarding citizenship on the 2020 Census questionnaire. A reliable calculation of the citizen, voting-age population is needed in order for states to meet their obligations. The decennial census questionnaire is the constitutional vehicle for collecting that information.

States need citizenship data for redistricting. Litigation over redistricting is currently before the Supreme Court. However the Court decides in these cases, follow-on litigation over redistricting is a certainty. States must have accurate data for defending against claims that they have diluted the right to vote. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act prohibits "vote dilution" that produces discrimination in the results of redistricting.

Ironically, effective April 1, California itself asks about citizenship. California's expanded Motor Voter Registration law, allowing illegals to get a driver's license, theoretically prevents illegals from automatically being registered to vote. The law requires the driver-license applicant to attest that he or she is qualified to vote, namely attesting to being a citizen. The pertinent statutory language is "A notation that the applicant has attested that he or she meets all voter eligibility requirements, including United States citizenship" is required before the person is automatically registered to vote.

So why the uproar about the 2020 Census asking the citizenship question? The Census Bureau already asks the citizenship question on what is called the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS, however, only goes to roughly one in every thirty-eight households. Asking the citizenship from the ACS on the 2020 Census, the count actually required by the Constitution, ought not to be controversial.

Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross, however, must have anticipated controversy over the citizenship question. The media firestorm prior to and since the announcement confirms his prescience. Fortunately, Ross's memorandum announcing the question explains the process, rationale, and indeed the necessity for adding the citizenship question.

In addition, the Department of Commerce has produced the documents the secretary relied upon in making his decision. Those documents further illustrate his extensive review and careful consideration of the question.

Ross's memorandum shows that the ACS citizenship estimates are very flawed. In the ACS responses, approximately 30 percent of those claiming to be citizens are in fact not citizens. Cross-referencing the ACS responses with other administrative records demonstrates the high level of false claims of citizenship. That means that the ACS 2013 estimate of 11 million illegals is grossly inaccurate. The actual number of illegals in the U.S. is millions more.

If the Attorneys General of California and New York truly care about a complete and accurate Census population count, they would be encouraging their citizens to be counted. But instead they are spreading misinformation and encouraging non-participation in the Census.

These attorneys general are not telling people the facts. Census information is protected by law. Answers to a form may not be used for law enforcement or any other purpose that would reveal their identity or how they responded to a question. Census employees swear an oath to keep those data confidential for life, and impermissible uses of data may be punishable by significant fines and up to five years in prison.

Resistance by non-citizens to filling out their Census forms has occurred in the past. What is new are the actions of state officials that effectively encourage non-citizens, their families and friends to resist the Census. Resisting the Trump administration on the Citizenship question actually jeopardizes protection of minority rights by blocking collection of more accurate data that would ensure better enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

The strategy of California and New York is indeed a high-risk one. It also risks reducing their receipt of federal funds. Congress has given the Census the critical, but non-constitutional, purpose of providing the basis for allocating much federal funding.

If their court challenges to the citizenship question ultimately fail, as they should, California and New York likely will have achieved exactly what they say they fear: lower Census participation by non-citizens. Whatever political advantage and ideological satisfaction their actions may serve, those actions do not serve the citizens of California and New York.

California's fight to prevent collection of accurate citizenship data, however, is certainly understandable in terms of power politics. California's population has continued to grow, although it has slowed in recent years. The increase in California's population between 2006 and 2016 is reported to be about 3.1 million. Yet, in that same period, California is also reported to have lost about 1.2 million more people to other states than it gained from other states. Also, the number of births, less deaths, during that period is only about 2.8 million people. Thus, adding the net number of births to the net number lost to other states should produce an increase in population for the 2006-2016 period of only about 1.6 million. The additional increased population of 1.5 million during just this 10-year period came from out of the country.

How many of these new, as well as other, Californians are illegals? We don't know due to the lack of good data.

Most, if not all, states want to grow their populations. It's about political power. Gaining or losing population relative to other states means gaining or losing seats in the U.S. House of Representatives and votes in the Electoral College.

Other states are entitled to know how much of California's population consists of illegals and the children of illegals born in the U.S. An increasing percentage of California's political power is obviously built on a population of illegals.

By declaring itself a sanctuary state, California has put out the welcome mat for illegals. Other states deserve to know how much political power California has taken from them by inviting illegals to move into the state. Thanks to Secretary Ross's decision, the other states will have the information necessary to know how many seats in the U.S. House and votes in the Electoral College California are being unjustly taken from them.

John S. Baker, Jr. is a Professor Emeritus at the Louisiana State University Law Center whose teaching and writing focuses on Constitutional law.ⁱⁱⁱ

Article 2a.

Pro-Con: Should our next census ask about citizenship status? | Tri-City Herald

By Merrill Matthews and Wayne Madsen Tribune News Service

No: Such questions don't belong in a free country's census

For the first time since the 1950 decennial census, the 2020 census will include a question on a respondent's citizenship status.

The Trump administration enunciated some worrying plans for the 2020 census when Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross testified before the Senate in 2017 that he wanted census data to be "strategically reused" by other government departments and the private sector.

The inclusion of a citizenship question in the 2020 census and the willingness of Ross and Trump to "re-use" census data for other purposes, including informing the Department of Homeland Security and its Immigrations and Customs Enforcement agents where pockets of non-citizens are located — right down to 9-digit zip code addresses — is worrying.

Federal law prohibits sharing census data with other government agencies. For those who believe census data abuse cannot happen, it should be noted that it has already occurred — and quite recently — in the United States.

In 2004, DHS requested 2000 census data on Americans of Arab descent, right down to the 9-digit zip code level, that is, individual street addresses.

By sifting through such census data, DHS was able to calculate where the Arab-Americans lived, according to individual ancestral homelands of Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, Syria, Palestine and Morocco as well as "other Arab nation" or generic Arab descent.

Using 1940 census data, the federal government rounded up some 120,000 Japanese-American citizens for internment during World War II.

Given the jingoistic and xenophobic hateful rhetoric emanating from Trump, other high-ranking officials and Republicans in Congress, the interest of Trump's Census Bureau in collecting citizenship information can only have a malevolent intent.

The official reason given by the administration — that Attorney General Jeff Sessions requires citizenship data, so the Justice Department can adequately enforce the Voting Rights Act by determining who is eligible to vote — is laughable on its face.

Nothing in Sessions's shameful record in Alabama of opposing civil rights and voting rights suggests he has had some sort of "sudden awakening" and now wants to assist African-Americans and other minorities to exercise their constitutional franchise.

Nor does Donald Trump's repeated false statements claiming "millions" of non-citizens voted illegally in the 2016 election add any legitimacy to the inclusion of the citizenship question.

States and cities are right in fighting the Trump Administration's unconstitutional citizenship question in federal court. At least seventeen states have filed lawsuits against the citizenship question. Former Census Bureau directors, in both Republican and Democratic administrations, have cautioned against asking about citizenship.

It is amazing that many conservatives, who constantly argue for a strict interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, are willing to tamper with the framers' original intent regarding the census.

Article 1, Section 2 of the United States Constitution specifically states, an "Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of Ten Years."

Enumeration, in this context, means a head count of the people living in the United States. The framers were not interested in citizenship status but wanted a clean headcount of people.

The name Jacques Fauvet is not known to many Americans. However, in France, Fauvet was known for perpetually warning against the misuse of census data.

Fauvet, who oversaw French data protection from 1984 to 1999, pointed out that when the German Nazis took over France in 1940, one of the first acts of the Gestapo was to seize as many detailed census records as possible.

From these records, the Nazis were able to construct their lists of who would be arrested and deported to the concentration camps in the east. Enough said!^{iv}

Article 2b.

The Moral Hazards of a Census Citizenship Question

Michael Blake

A political philosopher investigates the question of how a citizenship question on the 2020 census could create bias in public policy that would lead to injustice.

New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman speaks at a press conference to announce a multi-state lawsuit to block the Trump administration from adding a question about citizenship to the 2020 Census form.

Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross recently announced that the 2020 census will include a question about citizenship. Ross argued that such a question is required for a "complete and accurate" count of Americans. Others in the Department of Justice have argued that the knowledge produced would be useful in ensuring against voter fraud.

Much recent commentary has focused on the ways in which Ross' proposal might shift power from states with many undocumented residents to those with comparatively few—and, therefore, from Democratic states to Republican ones.

As a political philosopher who studies how abstract moral notions such as justice apply to political institutions, I am more concerned with the fact that undercounting the undocumented might introduce bias into our public policy. This bias might lead to injustice—toward citizens and non-citizens alike.

Injustice Toward Citizens

There is a long tradition in political philosophy that understands injustice as unequal treatment without justification. A state is unjust, on this account, when it treats different people in different ways—unless that particular difference in treatment can be shown to reflect some morally important difference between those people. In other words, if you and I are both subject to the law, I have the right to have my interests and desires treated as equal in importance to yours—unless we can find some morally important reason for us to be treated differently. The legal notion of equality before the law reflects this ideal.

It is for this reason that undercounting the undocumented could lead to injustice. The census will be the basis for the allocation of a great deal of funding—over \$600 billion, in areas including health, public health, nutrition, and law enforcement. If the census were to count only citizens, rather than all residents, the budget allocations will not accurately reflect the actual number of people who will make demands upon public institutions.

To take a simple example: The police have a legal duty to respond to crimes committed by undocumented residents, as well as toward crimes committed against them. If a state with far more undocumented residents receives the same amount of money as one with very few undocumented residents, it will end up serving more people with fewer resources.

To understand how significant this difference could be, consider these numbers: There are approximately 22 million non-citizens in the United States—which amounts to 7 percent of the population. These residents are not distributed equally between states. California, for example, has more than 2.5 million undocumented residents, whereas states such as North Dakota, West Virginia, and Maine have fewer than 5,000.

The citizens of states with a great many non-citizens may be placed at a significant disadvantage in comparison with the citizens of states with few non-citizen residents.

If there is no good moral reason to justify this inequality—and in my view there is none—then we have a reason to regard this inequality as unjust.

Rights of the Undocumented

Furthermore, undercounting the undocumented might also entail injustice toward the undocumented themselves.

One immediate reply here, of course, is to say that the question of injustice toward the undocumented does not arise. Since they have no right to legal residency, there cannot be an issue about fairness toward their interests.

From my perspective, the proper response to that objection is to notice that there are some things states must do even for those who are present without right. Think, again, of police protection. The police are bound by law and morality to protect the bodily and property interests even of those present illegally.

It is true that a person who is a resident in the U.S. without right is liable to deportation. But that liability does not give the local police the right to refuse to act on that person's behalf. Someone can be rightly subject to deportation, but still be entitled to have their basic human rights defended prior to deportation.

The Supreme Court's recent decision, in *Evenwel v. Abbott*, reflects these moral facts. This case involved a challenge to the Texan policy of creating districts that reflected total population, rather than the population of legal voters. A unanimous court declared that Texas was permitted to apportion voting districts by population—including the undocumented.

There are some interests, said the court, that are held by everyone resident in a place, "regardless of whether they qualify as voters."

Impact on the Climate of Fear

The proposed question about citizenship, finally, is liable to exacerbate an existing inequality in the administration of justice. It is likely to make the current climate of fear in immigrant communities worse. The police are charged with protecting the rights of the undocumented, but they are also frequently called upon to deport them.

This dual role has made the relationship between the undocumented and the police more adversarial than effective policing would recommend. As Houston Police Chief Art Acevedo has noted, when people are afraid of interacting with the police, they are less likely to come forward as victims and as witnesses. The police, he argues, ought to "focus on crime, not be ICE agents."

What is true for the policeman may also be true for the census-taker. Questions about citizenship may lead to a sense that even the census-taker—whose job is simply to get an accurate count of those residents within the U.S.—is helping the federal government with deportation. Sunshine Hillygus, who advises the federal government on the census, notes that this question is likely to fuel suspicion on the part of the undocumented that the census will become a political tool to be used against them—with negative implications for both data accuracy and for the long-run reputation of the Census Bureau as a non-partisan agency.

It is not clear, at this point, that a question about citizenship will actually end up being a part of the 2020 census. Several states have filed a lawsuit, seeking to block Ross' proposed question. Whether or not that lawsuit succeeds, the fact that this question is being considered should give all of us some moral concern—regardless of our perspectives on migration, and regardless of whether we are citizens ourselves.

This article was originally published on The Conversation. Michael Blake is a professor of philosophy, public policy, and governance at the University of Washington.^v

ⁱ "The Citizenship Question Planned For 2020 Census: What To Know". 2018. *Pew Research Center*. Accessed June 10 2019. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/03/30/what-to-know-about-the-citizenship-question-the-census-bureau-is-planning-to-ask-in-2020/>.

ⁱⁱ M. Matthews and Madsen, W. 2018. *Pro-Con: Should our next census ask about citizenship status?*. Tri-City Herald. Available at: <https://www.tri-cityherald.com/customer-service/copyright/> [Accessed 7 Jun. 2019].

ⁱⁱⁱ John S. Baker, Jr., "*The Importance Of Answering The Citizenship Question On The Census*". 2018. The Hill. Accessed June 10 2019. <https://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/politics/391932-the-importance-of-answering-the-citizenship-question-on-the>.

^{iv} M. Matthews and Madsen, W. 2018. *Pro-Con: Should our next census ask about citizenship status?*. Tri-City Herald. Available at: <https://www.tri-cityherald.com/customer-service/copyright/> [Accessed 7 Jun. 2019].

^v Michael Blake Michael. "*The Moral Hazards Of A Census Citizenship Question*". 2019. Pacific Standard. Accessed June 7 2019. <https://psmag.com/social-justice/moral-hazards-of-citizensh>.