**Carensite Role sheet**

**Core Beliefs**

You are a proponent of the philosophy of Joseph Carens as it is outlined in the essay, “Aliens and Citizens: The Case for Open Borders.” This essay is the foundation of your beliefs. In some moments in the game it may be obvious how Carens’s arguments oblige you to speak and act. At other times, however, it will likely be unclear how to apply the essay’s abstract principles to political issues of the here and now. In such instances you will need to decide for yourself what to say or do. So long as your speech and actions do not contradict your foundational principles you will be living up to your role.

The central principle of your position and your foundational essay is that borders should be open. Carens challenges the commonly held view that a state should be free to decide who may or may not enter its borders. Instead, he concludes that “borders should generally be open and that people should normally be free to leave their country of origin and settle in another” (Carens 1987: 251). Carens’s argument is not rooted in a single theory. Instead, he proposes that accepting any one of three widely-known and influential positions –utilitarianism, Nozick’s libertarianism, and Rawls’s liberalism– commits us to open borders. Importantly, Carens does not explicitly endorse any of these positions (though he admits some sympathy for Rawls’s liberalism) in your foundational essay.

Though open borders are the most important commitment of your position, Carens is also generally committed to impartiality—that is, he is generally in favor of the idea that we give everyone equal consideration. So, in deciding which motions or legislation to vote for or against, you will need to ask whether the interests of everyone who will be affected by that motion are being given equal consideration or if any one group is being disproportionately favored or disadvantaged.

This general commitment to impartiality is widely shared. Small government advocates and uniform liberals share this commitment, and the difference liberals can accept it in many cases. This gives you a significant point of commonality with members of these three factions (and likely other indeterminates) as you try to forge agreements or alliances with them. Carens’s commitment to impartiality does put his view in conflict with at least some possible views. Notably, he explicitly opposes at least some forms of communitarianism, the view that questions of justice should be addressed from the point of view of a particular group or culture.

While many in our game favor impartiality, your commitment to open borders is less common. Some factions and indeterminates may regard the notion that we should have open borders to be implausible and radical. This will likely make it challenging to convince some of them to agree with you. However, the power of your view, and Carens’s argument, is that it is not tied to a single theory. Many in our game are sympathetic to Rawls’s liberalism, Nozick’s libertarianism, or even utilitarianism—helping them see that open borders are a possible implication of their beliefs/sympathies will help you achieve your goals.

**Major Goal**

The central goal for you will be to have the legislative assembly pass a motion supporting open borders. The precise details of the proposal will be up to you as long as they are not at odds with the view Carens presents. A good first step might be to feel out how open the small government advocates and the uniform liberals are to a proposal that would open the borders, but you might decide to build a coalition within the indeterminates, too. Gathering support before bringing this proposal to the floor is a good idea, but it is also important that you make sure this proposal actually gets on the agenda. This outcome is far from assured: other indeterminates will have their own proposals that they will want to add to the agenda. So, you will need to build support for your initiative by forging alliances with other indeterminates and, especially, with members of the three main factions.

It will benefit you tremendously if the assembly votes on the matter of open borders sooner, rather than later. So, you would do well to request the speaker include open borders on the agenda as early as possible. If you wait too long to make your move, it might not be added to the agenda at all, or your success will be complicated by proposals that have already been passed.

**Tips and Strategies**

Some players may accuse you of being unprincipled, since you are not committed to any single background theory. Another way to think of your position is as being flexible. The foundational essay that informs your perspective does not oblige you to endorse the three views it draws on (Rawls’s liberalism, utilitarianism, and Nozick’s libertarianism). In fact, if you *did* endorse just one of those views, your own position might lose some of its potentially broad appeal. So, for much of the game you can decide for yourself which factions or characters you want to ally yourself with, provided you do not give up on your general commitment to impartiality.

Because your general commitment to impartiality provides you with plenty of flexibility, you have broad freedom to decide which faction to vote with on issues not involving open borders. This is a great strength of your role which you would do well to take advantage of. You are truly indeterminate on the game’s central issues, and so are potentially of great value to any faction that takes the trouble to ally with you.

Many of the philosophers whose work other roles are based on have written on topics connected to the question of open borders, including property rights, free association, and pursuing economic opportunity. Discovering what others have written on these topics could be of great benefit to you, if you take the time to do the research.

**Victory Objectives**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Points** | **Objective** |
| 1 | Open borders proposal added to the assembly’s agenda |
| 4 | Assembly passes a resolution opening the borders entirely |
| 1 | Assembly opens the borders more than currently levels |
| -1 | The game ends without a vote on open or more borders |
| -2 | Closed borders |
| 1 | Assembly passes any resolution explicitly invoking the value or importance of impartiality as its rationale |
| 2 | Open borders |
| 1 | More open borders/immigration increase |
| -0.5 | Assembly passes any resolution that is overtly not impartial |
| -2 | Enhanced cultural protections for national minorities |
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In this essay, Carens argues that states do not always have the right to deport non-citizens who reside in a state without official, legal permission. He claims that this right is attenuated as time passes and irregular migrants become members of the society in which they live.