



Written by [Staff](#) on February 22, 2016

Published in the February 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 04

---

## Letters to the Editor

### Natural-born Citizen?

In the January 25 “Letters to the Editor” column, Daniel Hunt questioned your inclusion of Senators Ted Cruz and Marco Rubio in the excellent overview of the presidential candidates (“Where They Stand,” November 23, 2015 issue). Hunt argued that neither is a natural-born citizen, but I would like to offer a contrary view.

First of all, Judge Andrew Napolitano, who certainly reveres the Constitution, recently said, “A human being born in another country with at least one parent who is an American citizen, who lived in the United States for at least one year during the parent’s life before the birth, is an American citizen. That is exactly Ted Cruz’s situation.”

A natural-born citizen is a citizen who is a citizen at birth, and does not have to go through a naturalization process to become a citizen. So, how does a person become a citizen at birth?

Three years after the drafting of the Constitution, the very first Congress enacted a statute that recognized that children born abroad to U.S. citizens were U.S. citizens at birth, and explicitly recognized these children as “natural born citizens.” The Naturalization Act of 1790 provided that “the children of citizens of the United States, that may be born beyond the sea, or out of the limits of the United States, shall be considered as natural born citizens: Provided, that the right of citizenship shall not descend to persons whose fathers have never been resident in the United States.”

The First Congress included many of the men who had been delegates at the Constitutional Convention. In fact, eight of the 11 members of the congressional committee that proposed the Citizenship Act language had served at the Convention, including James Madison. And of course, the president who signed this legislation had served as the chairman of the convention: George Washington.

Are we to believe that these men all missed the inclusion of the term “natural born” in the legislation by some “mistake”? This is nonsense. The most logical conclusion is that these men believed it necessary to include a definition in the statutes, since the term “natural born citizen” had not been so defined in the text of the Constitution itself.

In the case of Ted Cruz, had his parents never returned to the United States from Canada, Cruz would be ineligible for the presidency, because the Constitution also requires one be a resident of the United States for at least 14 years. But they did return, when Cruz was four years old.

I agree with Judge Napolitano. And the Founding Fathers.

Steve Byas

Norman, Oklahoma

### The Common Defense

In your January 25, 2016 issue, you published a letter to the editor from Mickey White about my letter concerning Russ Haas’s letter published in your December 21, 2015 issue.

Mickey wrote: “My question to Schroeder would be, ‘Where in the Constitution does it state that we can tell any country what weapons, power or medical technology they can or cannot possess?’”



Written by [Staff](#) on February 22, 2016

Published in the February 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 04

---

Kudos to Mickey White for asking the proper question that should be asked and answered before the Union ever contemplates any action whatsoever!

The answer is simple and direct: The preamble of the Constitution states: "We the People of the United States, in Order to ... provide for the common defence ... do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

When another nation behaves as Iran, declaring "Death to America!" etc., and we are certain of our superior comparative strength, it is clearly imperative that the Union is directed to do what is required to ensure they are denied the means to be able to achieve their lethal objective.

Directing them to not develop a nuclear capability is merely carrying out the mandate to the Union by "We the people of the United States" in the Constitution.

It is the polite, guarded, hopefully peaceful approach to make them clearly aware of our stance and intent, so that direct confrontation and use of force may be avoided but not ever disavowed. n

Louis J. Schroeder

Greenwood Village, Colorado



Written by [Staff](#) on February 22, 2016

Published in the February 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 04

## 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.