

**Press from NFAP Birthright Citizenship Report:**

**National Journal:**

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/norquist-says-ending-birthright-citizenship-is-a-tax-20120305>

**Wall Street Journal:**

<http://online.wsj.com/video/opinion-taxing-immigration/E09334F5-9536-4A01-8627-2E15EBED730D.html>

**Houston Chronicle:**

<http://blog.chron.com/txpotomac/2012/03/anti-tax-activist-grover-norquist-says-ending-birthright-citizenship-equals-a-tax-increase/>

<http://www.laht.com/article.asp?ArticleId=475416&CategoryId=12395>

<http://blogs.ilw.com/gregsiskind/2012/03/nfap-birthright-citizenship-proposal-would-result-in-tax-of-1600-for-every-baby-born-in-the-us.html>

<http://www.diariolasamericas.com/noticia/136589/conservadores-advierten-de-consecuencias-de-suprimir-la>

La Opinion: <http://www.impremedia.com/article/20120306/NEWS03/303069906>

AOL Latino: <http://noticias.aollatino.com/2012/03/06/costosa-anulacion-de-ciudadania-ninos-nacidos-eeuu/>

EFE: <http://www.pontealdia.com/estados-unidos/rechazan-propuesta-de-consejero-de-romney-de-suprimir-ciudadania-automatica.html>

**National Journal**

**March 5, 2012**

**Norquist Says Ending Birthright Citizenship Is a Tax**

By Fawn Johnson

Americans for Tax Reform President Grover Norquist, who is most famous at the moment for waging a political war on government spending, said on Monday that ending automatic citizenship for babies born on U.S. soil would be a tax on having babies.

“This is a tax on every child being born,” he said during a telephone conference call hosted by the public-policy group **National Foundation for American Policy**. “It solves no problems and instead creates all sorts of problems and costs in terms of Americans.”

NFAP published a study on Monday showing that ending so-called “birthright citizenship” would cost new parents \$600 to \$1,000 in legal fees to establish citizenship for their babies. Some Republicans have suggested that automatic citizenship be rescinded, a change that almost certainly would require a constitutional amendment. GOP presidential hopeful Mitt Romney has tapped immigration hardliner Kris Kobach as an adviser. Kobach is the brains behind Arizona’s tough immigration law and has also authored studies suggesting various ways to end birthright citizenship.

As a way of appeasing the Republican base, GOP candidates like Romney have tacked hard to the right on immigration. Norquist was a supporter of a comprehensive immigration reform bill in 2006 and 2007 and has consistently argued that Republicans should embrace a broader immigration policy that would help employers in agriculture and the hospitality industries get access to foreign workers. Thus far, those arguments have been ignored, a fact Norquist acknowledged. “It’s frustrating, and it’s why people lash out and reach out for these non-solutions” like ending birthright citizenship, he said.

# **Latin American Herald Tribune**

**March 5, 2012**

## **Conservative Group Against Ending Birthright Citizenship**

WASHINGTON – Revising the 14th Amendment to eliminate automatic citizenship for babies born in the United States, as proposed by some advisers to Republican presidential hopeful Mitt Romney, would hurt the nation’s economy as well as having very negative demographic and political consequences, a conservative think-tank says.

The National Foundation for American Policy published a study Monday on the immediate effects that eliminating birthright citizenship would have.

Some advisers to Romney, the front-runner for the Republican nomination, have already come out in support of altering the 14th Amendment.

One of the chief promoters of this change to the Constitution is Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach, who is considered the “godfather” of the harsh Arizona and Alabama immigration laws and who has endorsed Romney.

The most immediate result of eliminating birthright citizenship would be an increase in bureaucracy and the amount of money that many families would have to spend on lawyers, federal fees and examinations to prove they are in the country legally, the study’s author, lawyer Margaret Stock, said Monday in a conference call with journalists.

According to the study, the annulling of birthright citizenship would hike costs by between \$600 and \$1,600 for newborns, as well as causing enormous problems for Social Security and other federal programs.

Ending birthright citizenship would also drive more people into the shadow economy and narrow the tax base, Stock said.

The president of the Center for Equal Opportunity, Linda Chavez, said the measure would not only bring “devastating” economic consequences, but would also spark a vast change in the country’s demographic makeup and would have strong political consequences.

“Besides, it is a radical affront to our idea of a nation and could be a demographic disaster by making illegal millions of citizens who are real Americans,” Chavez said.

Stuart Anderson, executive director of the NFAP, told Efe that the study provides so much evidence of the negative effects of putting an end to birthright citizenship “that there’s no sense in defending that position either now or any time in the future.”

The Migration Policy Institute estimates that the United States would lose between 4.7 million and 13.5 million new citizens by the year 2050 if the children of undocumented immigrants are denied citizenship.

The study also warns that the chief reason that undocumented immigrants come to the United States is not to obtain citizenship, but to reunite the family or find work, so the immigrant population would in no way be reduced – the measure would simply expand the number of people in the country illegally. EFE

## Greg Siskind on Immigration Law and Policy

March 5, 2012

### NFAP: Birthright Citizenship Proposal Would Result in "Tax" of \$1600 for Every Baby Born in the US

A great [new report](#) authored by noted immigration lawyer Margaret Stock makes the case that actual implementation of a birthright citizenship law would create a massive new bureaucracy and result in astronomical costs for American citizens. From NFAP:

*Based on current costs to verify the citizenship status of children born overseas to U.S. citizens, changing the Citizenship Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment will cost new parents in the United States approximately \$600 in government fees to prove the citizenship status of each baby and likely an additional \$600 to \$1,000 in legal fees. This represents a "tax" of \$1,200 to \$1,600 on each baby born in the United States, while at the same time doing little to deter illegal entry to the United States. Direct fees to the federal government would reach \$2.4 billion a year, based on current estimates.*

The report outlines a number of additional consequences.

1. Creating a two-tier American caste system that will result in a significant decrease in the population of younger U.S. citizens. An estimated 4.7 to 13.5 million Americans would lose their citizenship by 2050, according to the Migration Policy Institute.
2. Increase the size of the shadow economy in the US.
3. Reducing the country's tax base, including contributions to Social Security
4. Reducing the military recruiting base.
5. Creation of a large new bureaucracy to administer documenting entitlement to citizenship.
6. Realistically, the only way to document citizenship will be through a national identification card, something that birthright citizenship advocates should justify. I've said in the past that given the dramatic changes that would be required to the Constitution as well as to public policy and the incredibly expensive cost of such a system, advocates of birthright citizenship should have the burden of proving to the public that there has been a significant change occurring in the country that justifies such a move. Prove that there has been a significant increase in the number of children born to unauthorized parents over the last few decades. Prove that birth tourists, the subject of periodic anecdotal media reports, represent more than a very tiny percentage of births in this country. Prove that the massive costs associated with a birthright citizenship policy will be more than made up for by other economic benefits.

**March 6, 2012**

**Houston Chronicle**

**Texas on the Potomac**

**Anti-tax activist Grover Norquist says ending birthright citizenship equals a tax increase**

Anti-tax activist Grover Norquist believes Americans could effectively start paying a tax on having babies should conservative immigration advocates have their way on ending the right for automatic citizenship for babies born on U.S. soil.

“This is a tax on every child being born,” Norquist said on Monday during a conference call set by the National Foundation for American Policy, a nonpartisan think tank. “It solves no problems and instead creates all sorts of problems and costs in terms of Americans.”

The foundation released a report on Monday that shows that changing the Fourteenth Amendment’s Citizenship Clause, which guarantees U.S. citizenship to most American-born babies, would cost parents about \$600 in government fees plus a similar amount in legal fees to validate their babies’ citizenship.


The federal government could collect nearly \$2.4 billion per year with an estimate of 4 million annual births.

Advocacy groups that favor lower immigration and some Republicans have long proposed ending birthright citizenship. The mastermind of the tough immigration laws in Alabama and Arizona, Kris Kobach, who recently endorsed GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney, has supported this measure.

Supporters argue the change would deter undocumented immigrants from moving into the United States. But the report issued on Monday challenges this argument.

Undocumented parents typically don’t benefit from their child’s American citizenship because “if the parent entered the U.S. unlawfully, the parent must depart the United States to obtain an immigration visa, and the parent’s departure triggers a 10-year bar from the U.S.,” which cannot be waived, according to the study.

Norquist on Monday deemed the conservatives’ call to end birthright citizenship a “non-solution” arguing that Republicans would be better off by embracing an overhaul of the country’s immigration system and stopping this “political game.”



March 9, 2012

## **Ending Birthright Citizenship Would Be Costly for Americans**

By STUART ANDERSON

Repealing birthright citizenship would be the equivalent of “a tax on every child born in America,” said Grover Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform. He was commenting on a recent National Foundation for American Policy study by immigration expert Margaret Stock, a former professor at West Point and an attorney with the law firm of Lane Powell. (A copy of the study can be found [here](#).)

Birthright citizenship guarantees U.S. citizenship to almost all babies born on U.S. soil, with the children of diplomats the primary exception. We take for granted as Americans that we don’t need to hire attorneys and fight through a bureaucratic maze to prove the child of a baby born in a U.S. hospital is an American citizen.

That would change if efforts were successful to repeal through a Constitutional amendment or other means the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment’s guarantee of citizenship to American-born children. Such a change would not reduce illegal immigration, since there is little evidence the primary motivation of illegal immigrants coming here is to give birth on U.S. soil, as opposed to jobs. Countries that do not guarantee birthright citizenship have not eliminated illegal immigration.

Margaret Stock notes that Americans now pay \$600 to the federal government to verify citizenship in certain cases, and legal fees can range another \$600 to \$1,000. If every baby needed an affirmative defense of its citizenship status, then these types of costs would be borne by new parents in America.

“Perhaps the most important reason conservative voters should be highly skeptical of denying birthright citizenship is what it would do to all American citizens who give birth in the United States,” explains [Linda Chavez](#), chair of the Center for Equal Opportunity. “Because babies born here now are presumed citizens under the Constitution and current law, parents aren’t required to do anything to prove their own citizenship. There’s no expensive paperwork or bureaucracy involved. Indeed, birth certificates showing a child was born on U.S. soil are now proof of citizenship.” She warns against “a whole new, cumbersome agency to verify claims and issue documents.”

The costs would go further. Several categories of children could become largely stateless, including those with parents who can claim dual citizenship, are in a temporary visa status or without legal status. The Migration Policy Institute estimates another 100,000 to 300,000 children a year would live here without legal status and be unable to participate fully in American society in numerous ways.

Margaret Stock concludes, “The proposed change will impose burdensome bureaucratic costs on all newborns and their parents at a time when many Americans favor less government, not more. This proposal threatens to become the latest in a long line of expensive verification systems that fail a basic cost-benefit analysis and threaten to drown Americans in bureaucracy at every stage of their lives.”



# Conservadores advierten de consecuencias de suprimir la ciudadanía automática

Por Raquel Godos  
Agencia EFE

WASHINGTON.-- Varios líderes conservadores advirtieron de que la supresión de la ciudadanía automática, como proponen algunos consejeros del aspirante republicano a la presidencia Mitt Romney, causaría efectos “devastadores” en la economía del país, además de tener consecuencias muy negativas a nivel demográfico y político.

La Fundación Nacional de Política Estadounidense (NFAP, en inglés) publicó hoy un estudio sobre las consecuencias inmediatas que tendría la eliminación de este derecho reconocido por la Constitución estadounidense por el que se concede la ciudadanía automática a todos aquellos nacidos en territorio de EE.UU.

Algunos de los consejeros del precandidato republicano a la presidencia Mitt Romney ya han puesto de manifiesto su apoyo a la modificación de la Decimocuarta Enmienda de la Constitución que recoge el derecho a la ciudadanía por nacimiento.

La abogada Margaret [Stock](#), que lideró el estudio para la NFAP, consideró de especial importancia las conclusiones extraídas del mismo debido a la política de inmigración que ha anunciado el candidato en su campaña.

Uno de los principales promotores de esta modificación constitucional es Kris Kobach, considerado el “padrino” de las leyes de inmigración de Arizona y Alabama y uno de los principales asesores de Romney.

“La consecuencia más inmediata será un incremento de la burocracia y los gastos personales en abogados, pagos federales y exámenes a los que muchas familias se verán obligados para regular y probar su legalidad”, advirtió hoy la abogada en conferencia de prensa.

Según el estudio, la anulación de la ciudadanía automática provocaría un aumento de los costes por nacimiento entre 600 y 1600 dólares por recién nacido, además de producir grandes problemas fiscales en la seguridad social y otros programas federales.

“Incrementará la sombra económica del país y reduciría la recaudación de la base impositiva. Los estadounidenses deben ser muy conscientes de las consecuencias que puede tener el moverse en esta dirección. Esta medida es extremadamente costosa, incluso para las familias que no tengan que probar su estatus”, insistió Stock.

La presidenta del Centro para la Igualdad de Oportunidades, Linda Chávez, explicó también que dicha medida no sólo supondría unas consecuencias “devastadoras” a nivel económico, sino que además provocaría un cambio más que sustancial en el tejido demográfico y tendría unas fuertes consecuencias políticas.

“La anulación de la ciudadanía automática incrementaría exponencialmente la población ilegal en el país. (...) Además, interfiere radicalmente con nuestra idea de nación y puede ser un desastre demográfico al ilegalizar a millones de ciudadanos que en realidad son estadounidenses”, puntualizó Chávez.

Stuart Anderson, director ejecutivo de la NFAP explicó a Efe que el informe pone tan en evidencia las consecuencias negativas que tendrían lugar si se pusiera fin a la ciudadanía automática “que no tiene sentido estar defendiendo esta postura ahora y tampoco en el futuro.

“Teniendo en cuenta los costos y los estragos que causaría acabar con la ciudadanía por nacimiento es evidente que los partidarios de ella, que tratan de hacer frente a la inmigración ilegal, no han pensado en las consecuencias negativas de sus propuestas y está claro que por ello la gente no debería escucharlas”, añadió Anderson.

El Instituto de Política Migratoria (MPI, en inglés) ha estimado que Estados Unidos perdería entre 4,7 y 13,5 millones de nuevos ciudadanos para el año 2050 si se negara la cláusula de ciudadanía a los hijos de inmigrantes indocumentados ya que carecerían del derecho a permanecer en territorio estadounidense.

El estudio publicado hoy, advierte además de que la principal causa por la que los inmigrantes indocumentados llegan a EE.UU. no es la búsqueda de la ciudadanía, sino la reunificación familiar o la búsqueda de empleo, por lo que no reduciría la población inmigrante, sino que simplemente aumentaría la de aquellos en situación ilegal.

# **The Washington Examiner**

**March 8, 2012**

## **Who Is A Citizen**

**By Linda Chavez**

Is Mitt Romney in favor of increasing the number of illegal immigrants in the United States? You might not think so, given his tough anti-illegal immigration rhetoric, but his leading immigration adviser wants to do just that. What's more, the proposal this adviser is pushing would impose a new tax — from \$1,200 to \$1,600 — on every American family for the birth of each child. These are the conclusions of a new study put out by the conservative think tank the National Foundation for American Policy. The whole study calls into question the motives behind the radical anti-immigration groups that have been trying to make illegal immigration a central issue in the campaign.

The Romney adviser is Kris Kobach, who is the brains behind the anti-illegal immigrant laws in Arizona and Alabama now being challenged in the courts. Kobach's latest effort is to revoke birthright citizenship, which is guaranteed by the 14th Amendment. Kobach and a plethora of groups not only oppose illegal immigration but also want to drastically reduce the number of legal immigrants, and they are pushing state legislation to deny citizenship to children born to illegal immigrants. And many conservative legislators are jumping on the bandwagon.

Even if enacted, these proposals will not likely hold up, because individual states do not have the right to restrict U.S. citizenship, according to most constitutional scholars. But for the sake of argument, let's say they passed constitutional muster; would they be a good idea if the goal is to reduce illegal immigration? In fact, they would create thousands of new illegal immigrants — babies who would be essentially "stateless" and who would be barred from ever working in the U.S. when they became adults. Meanwhile, these laws would do nothing to discourage future illegal immigrants, who come seeking jobs, not to have American babies.

But perhaps the most important reason conservative voters should be highly skeptical of denying birthright citizenship is what it would do to all American citizens who give birth in the United States. Because babies born here now are presumed citizens under the Constitution and current law, parents aren't required to do anything to prove their own citizenship. There's no expensive paperwork or bureaucracy involved. Indeed, birth certificates showing a child was born on U.S. soil are now proof of citizenship.

The NFAP study, however, argues that taking away this presumption would end up encumbering new parents with proving their own citizenship status and would create a whole new, cumbersome agency to verify claims and issue documents. Ironically, under

the most stringent proposals being pushed by those who want to end birthright citizenship, Romney's own right to be considered "a natural born Citizen" eligible to become president might be challenged.

Romney's father was born in Chihuahua, Mexico, where his family had been part of a Mormon community for three generations after fleeing the Utah territory in the 19th century when it became clear polygamy would be outlawed under statehood. At the very least, if such a law had been in place when Romney was born, his parents would have had to hire lawyers to prove his right to U.S. citizenship, and we might now be debating the authenticity of his birth certificate as vigorously as some conspiracy theorists debate President Barack Obama's.

It's too bad Romney and other conservatives feel the need to embrace the fringes on an issue as important as citizenship. One of the greatest gifts America has given to the world is its sense of inclusiveness. We are welcoming people who want to embrace those whose desire it is to become part of our great nation.

Creating barriers to citizenship for all people born on U.S. soil would not reduce, much less end, illegal immigration. What it would mean is fewer future Americans. One estimate puts the loss in future American citizens as high as 13 million by 2050. Of course, the hope of the radicals who are advising Romney is that all these people will pack up and go "home." But their only home is here, their birthplace.

*Examiner Columnist Linda Chavez is syndicated by Creators.*

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/2012/03/who-citizen/351301>