

CAPT Interdisciplinary Writing Test Session 1

Overview

The purpose of this Interdisciplinary Writing test is to determine how well you can write to persuade others to think as you do about a specific topic. In this test, you will read two short articles about a controversial issue, take a position on the issue, and write the first draft of a persuasive essay. You must support your position with information from *both* of the source materials. Your response will be read and scored by trained readers.

About This Test

In this Interdisciplinary Writing test, you will think about and take a position either supporting or opposing a controversial issue. While you are working on the test, you will use skills and knowledge you learned in your language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, arts, and other classes.

Steps to Follow

1. Read the source materials.

Before taking a position either supporting or opposing the issue, it is important that you read both source materials related to the issue. (Take a minute to locate the source materials beginning on page 14 in this booklet.) As you read the source materials, you may underline information, highlight, or write notes on the articles themselves. When you write your essay, you must include information from each source.

2. Prepare to write your letter.

You have been given two organizers, which you may find useful as you consider the various arguments for and against the topic provided. You may use the organizer that best suits your position. In addition, scratch paper has been included for any additional notes or outlining you may wish to do in preparing to write your letter. The organizers and scratch paper can be found on pages 18–20. **You are not required to complete these pages, and they will not be scored.**

3. Write your essay in the answer booklet.

Only what is written in the answer booklet will be scored. Three pages have been provided for your response. Any additional pages will be removed prior to scoring.

Your Score

Your score will be based on the following criteria:

1. **Position**—Did you take a clear position on the issue?
2. **Comprehensiveness**—Did you use information from *both* sources that are provided?
3. **Support**—Did you support your position with accurate and relevant information from the source materials?
4. **Organization**—Did you organize your ideas in a logical and effective manner so that your audience can understand and follow your thinking?
5. **Clarity and Fluency**—Did you express your ideas clearly and fluently using your own words?

Organizing Your Time

You will have 65 minutes to complete this test. The following schedule is suggested:

30 minutes for reading the source materials and planning your letter; and
35 minutes for writing your letter.

You may re-read or refer to the source materials at any time during the test. You may also highlight or make notes on the sources if this is helpful to you.

Know your purpose for writing and remember to:

READ, THINK, PLAN, WRITE.

The Issue: NATURALIZED CITIZENS AS PRESIDENT

Should the United States Constitution be amended to allow a naturalized citizen to be elected president of the United States? The United States has welcomed immigrants throughout its history. Many immigrants become naturalized citizens* and contribute greatly to the country, some even achieving high offices in the government. However, the highest office of president is barred to them by the Constitution's requirement that only "natural born" citizens fill this position. There are calls for changing the Constitution. Those in favor of amending the Constitution to allow naturalized citizens to serve as president contend that failing to do so is unfair to a group of loyal citizens. Those against argue that there is no compelling reason to change the Constitution, which has served the country well for over 200 years.

You will read two articles about the issue and take a position for or against a constitutional amendment allowing a naturalized citizen to be elected president of the United States. Using information from *both* articles, you must write a letter to your congressional representative either supporting or opposing an amendment to the Constitution allowing a naturalized citizen to be elected president of the United States.

* A naturalized citizen is a person who was born in a country other than the United States but who has met the requirements for citizenship.

Source One

This article appeared in the November 13, 2003, issue of *The Washington Times*. It addresses both sides of the issue of allowing naturalized citizens to serve as president.

A Foreign-Born President?

BY TERRY EASTLAND

"Only those born in the U.S.A. may apply." That, in effect, is what the Constitution says to naturalized citizens who might think about running for president. They may not do so. "No Person," states Article II, Section 1, "except a natural born Citizen ... shall be eligible to the Office of President."

The natural-born citizen requirement is one of those parts of the Constitution that has operated silently over the years, without litigation. But now comes Sen. Orrin Hatch, Utah Republican, to say we should amend the Constitution to take down that "do not apply" sign.

Mr. Hatch acknowledges what most scholars regard as the reason the Framers denied eligibility to naturalized citizens: concern that a foreign power might place someone inside the young and fragile nation and contrive to have that person elected president.

But that concern, says Mr. Hatch, is hardly so compelling today. And so, he argues, the natural-born requirement shouldn't be allowed to stand, especially not since it works in what the senator calls a "decidedly un-American" manner. By which he means that it's unfair to naturalized citizens, because they are denied an "equal opportunity" to run for president; and unfair to us voters, because we are denied "every opportunity to choose" our leaders. Not surprisingly, Mr. Hatch calls his proposal the "Equal Opportunity to Govern" amendment.

Because Mr. Hatch and Austrian-born Arnold Schwarzenegger, the soon-to-be California governor, are said to be close friends, the senator's measure has been skeptically dubbed the Schwarzenegger amendment. But the amendment is no respecter of political

parties. It would equally affect the career options of Jennifer Granholm, the Canadian-born Democratic governor of Michigan. Moreover, the interest in making foreign-born citizens eligible for the presidency is bipartisan. In the House, Arkansas Democratic Rep. Vic Snyder has proposed an amendment similar to Mr. Hatch's.

The natural-born citizen requirement is conspicuous on account of the fact that nowhere else in our law is there a distinction drawn between those who are citizens at birth and those who become citizens via naturalization. Yet this seeming anomaly [irregularity] has an interesting and not irrelevant history.

In his forthcoming book, "America's Constitution: A Guided Tour," Akhil Amar of the Yale Law School points out that the Constitution's approach to eligibility for office actually "represented a considerable liberalization of 18th-century English practice." As he explains, under England's 1701 Act of Settlement, naturalized foreigners were prohibited from serving in the Privy Council or Parliament, and from holding any office or place of trust, whether civil or military. "By contrast, the Constitution opened virtually all federal positions—the Congress, the judiciary, the Cabinet and the military—to naturalized citizens."

Notably, even as they reserved the presidency for natural-born citizens, the Framers refused to make that reservation absolute, since they made eligible for the office immigrants who were already American citizens in 1787.

Mr. Amar credits the Framers with operating according to a general rule of openness to immigrant Americans. They departed from that rule in writing the natural-born citizen requirement because of their worry

a foreign duke might come to America "with immense wealth and a vast retinue and then use his European riches to buy friends on a scale that virtually no homegrown citizen could match." Here, too, observes Mr. Amar, America differed from England since the 1701 Act imposed no natural-born requirement on the head of state and in fact contemplated the foreign-born monarchs that soon would rule.

The chances that Mr. Hatch's amendment might be added to the Constitution are, it must be said, very slight. Since the Founding, members of Congress have suggested thousands of amendments, but Congress has actually proposed only 33, and of those just 27 have been ratified. So far, no groups have organized on behalf of Mr. Hatch's amendment. Nor does anyone really believe the country has a problem supplying itself with qualified presidential candidates.

Ultimately, what's most striking about the Hatch and Snyder proposals is that under both there would still be a distinction between immigrant and natural-born citizens. Which is to say, there would not be complete equality. A foreign-born American must be a U.S. citizen for 20 years before gaining eligibility under Mr. Hatch's amendment, and 35 years under Mr. Snyder's.

Those waiting periods evince [reveal] a concern that foreign-born citizens who aspire to the presidency must be essentially American. Were they living today, the Framers would understand that concern, just as they would also understand the desire to liberalize requirements for holding office, even the nation's highest.

"A Foreign-Born President" by Terry Eastland.
Copyright © 2003 News World Communications, Inc.
Reprinted with permission of The Washington Times. All rights reserved.

Source Two

The following article appeared in the October 24, 2003, issue of *The Weekly Standard*. It provides both sides of the current debate about allowing naturalized citizens to run for president.

Immigrants for President?

BY ERIN MONTGOMERY

On October 11, the *Chicago Tribune* editorialized that the United States has more important things to worry about than whether or not to amend the Constitution to allow foreign-born citizens to run for president: "This is a nation of immigrants, of course, and one that offers more opportunity to immigrants, naturalized citizens or not, than any other country in the world. But is it imperative that such opportunity extend to the highest office in the land? Is that critical enough to take the extraordinary step of amending the Constitution for only the 28th time in 216 years? The short answer: No." The *Tribune* continued, "It is more important ... to retain the sense that the Constitution is not subject to cutting and passing at will. It is the bedrock of the nation's laws, and amendments should be restricted to matters of the greatest import."

Is the *Tribune's* "If it ain't broke, don't fix it" approach a reasonable one, when our nation's immigrant population is at an all-time high? And should one Constitutional clause—"No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of president" (Article II, Section 1)—keep a slew of bright, foreign-born Americans from running for the office? Among those barred from the presidency are Michigan governor Jennifer Granholm, a Canadian-born Democrat, Labor secretary Elaine Chao (Taiwan), Housing and Urban Development secretary Mel Martinez (Cuba); former secretaries of State Henry Kissinger (Germany) and Madeleine Albright (Czechoslovakia); and of course, California governor-elect Arnold Schwarzenegger, who told CBS, "I have no

interest in running for any higher office." Not that he has a choice.

But on July 10, 2003, Orin Hatch, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, took action against what he calls "an anachronism [out of proper time period] that is decidedly un-American." He introduced a bill that would allow a person who has been a U.S. citizen for 20 years and a resident for 14 years to run for president. Schwarzenegger recently celebrated his 20th year as a U.S. citizen, though employees of the Senate Judiciary Committee, where the bill currently stands, say the birth of Hatch's bill had nothing to do with the political aspirations of the Austrian-born muscleman. While introducing his "Equal Opportunity to Govern" Amendment before the Senate, Hatch said that perhaps the most disturbing aspect of our Constitution as it reads today is that "scores of foreign-born men and women who have risked their lives defending the freedoms and liberties of this great nation remain ineligible for the Office of President."

More than 700 recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor have been immigrants, he added. The amendment, which some have dubbed the "Arnold Amendment," would have to be approved by two-thirds of the Senate and House and three-fourths of the states.

Rep. Vic Snyder introduced a separate, yet similar measure in the House a month earlier. Co-sponsored by Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.), this amendment would require a person to have been a citizen for at least 35 years in order to run for president. Under the House version, Schwarzenegger wouldn't be eligible until he was 70. (Before the new California governor-elect was even elected, Frank lamented that Schwarzenegger may hurt the effort more than help since "he is a pretty polarizing figure.")

University of Alabama historian Forrest McDonald is adamant that the Constitution remain unchanged. While testifying before a House subcommittee three years ago, he recalled that delegates to the American Constitutional Convention of 1787 feared foreign influence, especially after Austria, Prussia, and Russia "rigged the election of a new monarch in Poland, subsequently dividing the hapless nation among themselves." It was this fear, as well as the founders' concern that a European monarch, such as a relative of King George III, might be imported to rule America, that prompted the formation of the natural-born citizen clause. Naturalized citizens are "bound to be influenced by nativity, whether in the form of hostility or favoritism," McDonald told the House subcommittee.

Many immigration officials also say immigrants always have emotional ties to the country of their birth. And even if a foreign-born president judged fairly in a dispute between the United States and a home country, he still might have to grapple with a public perception of bias, McDonald told the Los Angeles Times. The professor also worries about a foreign government planting an agent in the United States, and grooming him to one day run for the presidency. "As commander in chief, it is not enough to be above reproach, one must be above the suspicion of reproach," McDonald says.

Still, the language of the Constitution implies that foreign-born citizens are less trustworthy than native-borns. As a nation founded by immigrants, do we have the right to maintain that the more than 12 million Americans who were born elsewhere and who pay taxes, serve on juries, vote, and die in combat cannot have the same opportunities? On the other hand, how do we measure patriotism, and is it a compelling enough reason to amend the Constitution?

When we consider how slow-moving the legislative process has been for both bills, such questions begin to sound premature. The Legislative Status Office at the Senate says Hatch's bill is still in the Committee on the Judiciary. No action has been taken since it was

first introduced in July. As for the House bill, it was referred to the Subcommittee on the Constitution in June, but a hearing has not yet been held. Neither bill is scheduled for committee action at this time.

"Immigrants for President?" by Erin Montgomery. Erin Montgomery is an editorial assistant at The Weekly Standard. Reprinted with permission of The Weekly Standard. Copyright © 2003. All rights reserved.