As the UK grapples with the complexities of migration, identity rights, and public service reform, the proposed BritCard, a mandatory, smartphone-based digital identity promises to reshape the relationship between individuals and the state. Framed as both progressive and pragmatic, it raises fundamental questions about liberty, inclusion, and the role of government in the digital age.

Is it truly possible to build a national identity system that simultaneously deters illegal activity and empowers legal residents, without crossing into authoritarian territory?

Would a mandatory digital credential regardless of how user-friendly or secure erode long-standing civil liberties that have traditionally resisted ID cards in the UK?

Can a digital ID like BritCard actually protect marginalised communities, or does it risk becoming another layer of systemic exclusion, particularly for those without smartphones or digital access?

Is there a point at which "efficiency" in public services comes at the cost of individual privacy? Can the government credibly guarantee that BritCard data won't be repurposed for surveillance or profiling?

Would employers and landlords be given too much discretionary power with a tool like BritCard potentially leading to over-policing of certain groups under the guise of identity verification?

Given the UK's mixed track record on digital infrastructure projects, what makes BritCard different? Is it realistic to expect agile delivery, transparency, and inclusivity at scale?

How would the introduction of BritCard change the social contract? Are we subtly shifting from a rights-based system to one where access must constantly be proven?

Could this technology, however well intentioned, deepen the mistrust many communities already feel toward immigration enforcement and government systems?

Is there a political risk that BritCard becomes a Trojan horse presented as a tool for empowerment, but ultimately used to intensify border control, reduce welfare fraud, or enforce compliance?

Does the polling support 80% approval truly reflect informed public consent, or are people being sold a promise of simplicity without understanding the long-term implications?

Could BritCard set a precedent for future policy innovations, such as digital voting or health passports? If so, what ethical safeguards must be in place before this infrastructure is embedded in everyday life?

And finally: should the right to prove your identity ever depend on digital infrastructure at all? In a liberal democracy, where the burden of proof has traditionally rested on the state not the citizen, are we prepared for that principle to quietly reverse?