



For Many Democrats, the Right to Vote Is Not Sacred, but Merely a Means to an End

The New York City Council is expected to approve a bill that would allow approximately 800,000 non-citizens to vote in local elections. The bill, named "[Our City, Our Vote](#)," would allow non-citizens in New York to vote in hopes of encouraging voter participation. While voter participation is a worthy goal among those who should legally be permitted to vote, it is nothing but a ruse in this case. Rather, this bill is consistent with other efforts by Democrats to garner votes solely because they think that such bills will help their cause. To many on the Left, the right to vote is not precious and sacred, but solely a means to an end.



Elad Hakim

As reported by [Fox News](#):

The bill aims to amend the city's charter by including a new chapter with provisions for allowing green card holders and those with work authorization to register to vote and take part in citywide elections through the creation of a separate municipal voter registration.

Therefore, this bill allows noncitizens to vote and to have a major say in the city's election. This is unacceptable for several reasons. To begin, by allowing noncitizens to vote, as opposed to waiting until they obtain citizenship, the right to vote is being cheapened. After all, many people wait years to obtain citizenship so that they may exercise this sacred right. New York's law, on the other hand, frowns upon and minimizes their patience and perseverance. Also, noncitizens have less incentive to become citizens. After all, if they can vote in City elections and get additional perks/benefits resulting from various far-Left policies, why go through the hurdles associated with seeking citizenship?

Additionally, the New York bill creates a dangerous precedent. For example, if noncitizens are permitted to vote in citywide elections, why should they not be permitted to vote for governor, etc.? Why would voting rights for noncitizens arbitrarily stop at the city level and not extend to elections for other, more prominent, positions? Moreover, by allowing noncitizens to vote, New York is diluting the votes of the City's citizens, which is inequitable. For example, if the number of non-citizens exceeds the number of citizens in a particular city, the non-citizens could significantly dilute the votes of the city's citizens or render their votes inconsequential.

Finally, the bill contains language that permits a noncitizen to vote if that individual has been a resident of New York City for a minimum of [30 consecutive days](#) by the time of the next election. In other words, a noncitizen who has lived in New York City for at least 30 consecutive days can vote in citywide elections. Talk about cheapening the precious right to vote where a non-citizen who has resided in the City for a month can offset the vote of a citizen who has resided there for years.



Written by [Elad Hakim](#) on November 30, 2021

The motivation behind this push is quite clear. Immigrants are more likely to vote Democrat. As reported in the [Washington Examiner](#), citing a report by University of Maryland professor James Gimpel:

A 2012 study of 2,900 foreign-born, naturalized immigrants cited in the report showed that about 62 percent identified themselves as Democrats, while 25 percent identified as Republicans, and 13 percent identified as independents. At this moment, according to the report, there are an estimated 8.7 million immigrants in the U.S. who are eligible for naturalization. Not all will become voting citizens, but somewhere between 50 percent and 60 percent will. And it's a sure bet that a majority will identify themselves as Democrats.

Gimpel cites several reasons why future immigration will likely mean more Democrats. The first is that "immigrants, particularly Hispanics and Asians, have policy preferences when it comes to the size and scope of government that are more closely aligned with progressives than with conservatives." Those preferences have expressed themselves in a two-to-one party identification advantage for Democrats in those groups.

Another reason is that the arrival of immigrants, whose ranks include substantial numbers of the poor and unskilled, increases [income inequality](#) in the areas they choose to live. "It is from areas of higher income inequality," writes Gimpel, "that we find the most support for a robust government with an expansive regulatory and redistributive role in the economy, among all citizens, not just immigrants." That will likely mean more electoral success for Democrats.

The bill in New York should not be viewed in a vacuum. Rather, it should be considered together with other left-wing efforts to expand voting rights and control the nation's elections. For example, in 2019, [Bernie Sanders](#) indicated that he would extend voting rights to the Boston bomber while he was still incarcerated. Democrats also pushed H.R. 1, a bill designed to federalize the nation's elections, steal power from the individual states, and to give Democrats a major advantage in future elections. Rather than tightening voting requirements, [H.R. 1](#) included provisions that dramatically loosened them. For example, H.R. 1 did not require voter ID, did not prohibit ballot harvesting, did not require a notary or witness signature for mail-in votes, expanded automatic voter registration, etc. Democrats also tried to ram through the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, which was another attempt to federalize the elections and impact the time, manner, and method of elections.

Along with these bills, Democrats in Congress and the Biden administration have encouraged and permitted people to enter the country illegally from the southern border, knowing that if illegal immigrants are permitted to vote, Democrats would be the likely [beneficiaries](#). It is also why Democrats vehemently oppose any push to tighten election and voting laws, and to make them more secure, as seen in Florida, Georgia, and other states around the country.

The right to vote should be cherished. Unfortunately, for many on the far-Left, it is not the right to vote that is cherished and sacred, but the opportunity that this right presents for the Democrats. For them, the right to vote is a means to an end, the ultimate goal of which is victory, power, and control. If there is any doubt about this proposition, consider whether New York City, Democrats in Congress, or the Biden administration would push to allow non-citizens to vote if they consisted primarily of Trump-loving, Second Amendment touting, limited-government seeking patriots? The answer to this question is



Written by [Elad Hakim](#) on November 30, 2021

resoundingly “no.”

The push to allow non-citizens to vote is largely due to the belief among those on the Left that doing so will help the Democratic Party. If they didn’t think it would help them, most Democrats wouldn’t support it.

It is not about the sacred right to vote. Rather, it is solely a means to an end.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.