




submission

-  My Files
-  My Files
-  University

Document Details

Submission ID**trn:oid:::28592:82646229****Submission Date****Feb 19, 2025, 12:21 PM GMT+5:30****Download Date****Feb 19, 2025, 12:21 PM GMT+5:30****File Name****Journal article summary.docx****File Size****21.3 KB****7 Pages****956 Words****6,089 Characters**





4% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.




Filtered from the Report

- Bibliography
- Quoted Text

Match Groups

-  **4** Not Cited or Quoted 4%
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
-  **0** Missing Quotations 0%
Matches that are still very similar to source material
-  **0** Missing Citation 0%
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
-  **0** Cited and Quoted 0%
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 3%  Internet sources
- 0%  Publications
- 1%  Submitted works (Student Papers)

Integrity Flags

0 Integrity Flags for Review

No suspicious text manipulations found.

Our system's algorithms look deeply at a document for any inconsistencies that would set it apart from a normal submission. If we notice something strange, we flag it for you to review.

A Flag is not necessarily an indicator of a problem. However, we'd recommend you focus your attention there for further review.

Match Groups

- 4** Not Cited or Quoted 4%
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- 0** Missing Quotations 0%
Matches that are still very similar to source material
- 0** Missing Citation 0%
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- 0** Cited and Quoted 0%
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 3% Internet sources
- 0% Publications
- 1% Submitted works (Student Papers)

Top Sources

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1	Internet	
www.coursehero.com		2%
2	Internet	
www.mattfind.com		2%
3	Submitted works	
University of North Texas on 2025-02-04		<1%

Journal Article Summary

Student's Name

Institutional Affiliation

Course

Professor's Name

Date

Journal Article Summary

Abstract

3 Carlos Lozada's article "*Born in the U.S.A. Doesn't Mean What It Used To*" examines the historical and legal significance of birthright citizenship in the U.S. It begins by contrasting the birthright citizenship enshrined in the 14th Amendment with exclusionary ideas of inheritance. The method section reviews the efforts of the Trump administration to oppose this principle through policy. The attempts were met with immediate legal challenges, and these were shown to be very vulnerable constitutionally. If they fail legally, their discussion assesses how they shape the broader discourse on national identity and citizenship.

Introduction

2 This piece by Carlos Lozada analyzes birthright citizenship in the United States through the lens of changing political discourse that attempts to redefine its core meaning. According to the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, anyone who gives birth on American territory receives U.S. citizenship through birthright. After the Civil War, the federal government shaped this principle to offer equal citizenship opportunities against policies that previously barred specific population groups from attaining citizenship. According to Lozada, birthright meets the opposite requirement of inherited privileges because it extends citizenship to all regardless of whether their social status provides an advantage (Lozada, 2025).

The text examines the longstanding place of birthright citizenship in American democracy by showing how the United States grants automatic legal status to everyone born within its borders, regardless of parentage. The right to birthright citizenship faced increasing doubt while the Trump administration held power. Security of American birthright citizenship has become a national focus ever since former President Donald Trump enforced executive measures to oppose automatic citizenship for undocumented immigrant children, according to Lozada. While legally tenuous, this stance sought to reshape public perception of who is entitled to American citizenship.

Method

The author evaluates Trump administration policies by analyzing their legal frameworks and social impact assessment. Birthright citizenship remains the core discussion point in his research as he analyzes the executive order that tried to end automatically conferred U.S. citizenship for undocumented immigrants' children. Lozada studies how the administration structured the policy through language while he analyzes the court system's reaction to legal challenges. A significant part of this research approach requires evaluating current legal decisions

that guide the field. Legal interpretations of the 14th Amendment by courts established birthright citizenship coverage for people born in America with or without U.S. citizen parents. Many past Supreme Court decisions prove this principle unshakable, which makes such executive attempts to modify it legally baseless, according to Lozada (Lozada, 2025). The author focuses on Trump's executive order wording to explain how it states citizenship functions as a present rather than an inherent right. The political change in phrasing indicates that the government unilaterally exercises power to give and take away citizenship status instead of following legal entitlement.

Lozada analyzes the hidden political motives behind the executive order. The Trump administration expected this executive order to shape public perception about birthright citizenship instead of obtaining immediate legal modifications despite knowing the order would probably fail. The president wanted to establish doubting birthright citizenship as a valid topic for future policy changes. The redirection of public discussion represents a standard approach for political operatives investigating immigration and national identity matters. The article investigates reactions against the executive order through the many state-level lawsuits filed immediately. A Seattle-based federal judge temporarily stopped the order due to the obvious unconstitutionality of its content. Although legal institutions successfully oppose policy changes according to the judicial response, Lozada establishes that mainstream political exposure to this debate could create long-term results.

Results

The core focus of the article analyzes reactions from politicians and courts after the Trump administration tried to modify birthright citizenship laws. The executive order failed to achieve legal standing, yet its implementation substantially affected how people discussed it. After its

creation, the courts immediately declared this policy unconstitutional, while national divisions regarding immigration and national values emerged from the event.

Legal challenges that fail to succeed in court can fundamentally transform how political debates about the issue develop. The administration brought constitutional doubt to birthright citizenship through their administrative move even though legal systems declared this action unconstitutional (Lozada, 2025). Lozada identifies the created uncertainty as a risk factor for potential future modifications or constraints of citizens' rights.

Discussion

According to Lozada, the Trump administration's birthright citizenship challenge changed how Americans understand themselves nationally. Birthright citizenship became severely weakened when the policy entered political discussions despite facing prompt legal criticism. The article evaluates the wider consequences of converting birthright citizenship from an unassailable constitutional right to a controlled privilege that would increase legal ambiguity for Americans nationwide. Goldie Lozada demonstrates how transforming the American citizenship concept from right to gift alters democratic principles by creating a system based on political control rather than clear law.

According to Lozada, the whole process of discussing birthright citizenship through the courts fails to succeed, but it still manages to weaken public trust in established constitutional rights. The article points to a lasting danger that appears as neutral political moves can create enduring changes to both national identification and citizenship law structure. The analysis from Lozada is an alert about how political discourse shapes legal structures and social systems in today's world. Based on their present analysis, birthright citizenship remained untouched by legal institutions; however, the ongoing questioning reveals that essential rights should not be assumed

to be permanent. Birthright citizenship exists independently from the scope of immigration policies precisely because it reflects how America defines its national character among its citizens.

Reference

Lozada, C. (2025, January 27). Opinion | Born in the U.S.A. Doesn't Mean What It Used To. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/01/27/opinion/trump-birthright-citizenship-14th-amendment.html#>