

The Whole Truth and Nothing but the Truth on Natural Born Citizen – Article II

THE CONSTITUTION, VATTEL, AND "NATURAL BORN CITIZEN"

By Publius Huldah
July 18, 2012

We have been visited recently with several *very silly articles* which assert that Marco Rubio is a “natural born Citizen” within the meaning of Art. II, §1, cl. 5, U.S. Constitution (ratified 1789), and hence is qualified to be President:

[Bret Baier \(Fox News\)](#) asserts that Congress can define (and presumably *redefine*, from time to time) terms in the Constitution by means of law.

[Chet Arthur in American Thinker](#) quips that “the original meaning of ‘natural born citizen’” is determined by reference to “The Heritage Guide to the Constitution” and to the definition of “citizen” at Sec. 1 of the 14th Amendment, ratified 1868.

[Human Events](#) claims that *anyone* born within The United States is a “natural born citizen” eligible to be President.

[Jake Walker at Red State](#) purports to show how the term has been used from 1795 to the present. After quoting James Madison on the citizenship requirements imposed by Art. I, §2, cl. 2, *to be a member of the House*, Walker gleefully quotes a 1795 discussion of “natural born **subject**” to “prove” that anyone born here is a “natural born **citizen**”:

“It is an established maxim, received by all political writers, that every person owes a natural allegiance to the government of that country in which he is born. Allegiance is defined to be a tie, **that binds the subject to the state**, and in consequence of **his obedience**, he is entitled to protection...” [emphasis mine]

“The children of aliens, born in this state, are considered as **natural born subjects**, and have the same rights with the rest of the citizens.” [emphasis mine]

But “subjects” are not “citizens”; and we fought a war so that we could be transformed from “**subjects of the British Crown**” to **Citizens of a Republic!**

The four writers don't know what they are talking about. But I will tell you the Truth and prove it. We first address Word Definitions.

Word Definitions:

Like clouds, word meanings change throughout time. "Awful" once meant "full of wonder and reverence"; "cute" meant "bowlegged"; "gay" meant "jovial"; and "nice" meant "precise". Accordingly, if someone from an earlier time wrote of a "cute gay man", he was not referring to an adorable homosexual, but to a cheerful bowlegged man.

So! In order to understand the genuine meaning of a text, we must use the definitions the authors used when they wrote it. Otherwise, written texts become as shifting and impermanent as the clouds – blown hither and yon throughout the years by those who unthinkingly read in their own uninformed understandings, or deliberately pervert the text to further their own agenda.

So! Is Our Constitution built on the Rock of Fixed Definitions – those our Framers used? Or are its Words mere clouds to be blown about by Acts of Congress, whims of federal judges, and the idiotic notions of every ignoramus who writes about it?

What Did Our Framers mean by "natural born Citizen"?

Article II, §1, cl. 5, U.S. Constitution, requires the President to be a "natural born Citizen".

The meaning of this term is not set forth in The Constitution or in The Federalist Papers; and I found no discussion of the meaning in Madison's Journal of the Federal Convention or in Alexander Hamilton's notes of the same.

What does this tell us? **That they all knew what it meant.** We don't go around defining "pizza," because every American over the age of four knows what a pizza is.

Our Framers had no need to define "natural born Citizen" in the Constitution, because by the time of the Federal Convention of 1787, **a formal definition of the term consistent with the new republican principles**^[1] already existed in Emer Vattel's classic, *Law of Nations*.

And **we know** that our Framers carefully studied and relied upon Vattel's work. I'll prove it.

How Vattel's Law of Nations got to the Colonies, and its Influence Here:

During 1775, Charles Dumas, an ardent republican [as opposed to a monarchist] living in Europe sent three copies of Vattel's *Law of Nations* to Benjamin Franklin. Here is a portion of [Franklin's letter of Dec. 9, 1775 thanking Dumas](#) for the books:

“... I am much obliged by the kind present you have made us of your edition of Vattel. **It came to us in good season, when the circumstances of a rising state make it necessary frequently to consult the law of nations.** Accordingly that copy, which I kept, (after depositing one in our own public library here, and sending the other to the College of Massachusetts Bay, as you directed,) **has been continually in the hands of the members of our Congress, now sitting,** who are much pleased with your notes and preface, and have entertained a high and just esteem for their author...” (2nd para) [boldface added]

Vattel’s Law of Nations was thereafter “[pounced upon by studious members of Congress, groping their way without the light of precedents.](#)”

Years later, [Albert de Lapradelle wrote an introduction to the 1916 ed. of *Law of Nations*](#) published by the Carnegie Endowment.^[2] Lapradelle said the fathers of independence “were in accord with the ideas of Vattel”; they found in Vattel “all their maxims of political liberty”; and:

“From 1776 to 1783, the more the United States progressed, the greater became Vattel’s influence. **In 1780 his *Law of Nations* was a classic, a text book in the universities.**” (page xxx) [emphasis added]

In footnote 1 on the same page (xxx), Lapradelle writes:

“... Another copy was presented by Franklin to the Library Company of Philadelphia. Among the records of its Directors is the following minute: "Oct. 10, 1775. Monsieur Dumas having presented the Library with a very late edition of Vattel's Law of Nature and Nations (in French), the Board direct the secretary to return that gentle-man their thanks." **This copy undoubtedly was used by the members of the Second Continental Congress, which sat in Philadelphia; by the leading men who directed the policy of the United Colonies until the end of the war; and, later, by the men who sat in the Convention of 1787 and drew up the Constitution of the United States, for the library was located in Carpenters' Hall, where the First Congress deliberated, and within a stone's throw of the Colonial State House of Pennsylvania, where the Second Congress met, and likewise near where the Constitution was framed ...**” [emphasis added]

So! Vattel’s work was “continually in the hands” of Congress in 1775; Members of the Continental Congress “pounced” on Vattel’s work; our Founders used the republican Principles in Vattel’s work to justify our Revolution against a monarchy; by 1780, Vattel’s work was a “classic” taught in our universities; and our Framers used it at the Federal Convention of 1787.^[3]

Vattel on “natural born citizens,” “inhabitants,” and “naturalized citizens.”

From our beginning, we were **subjects** of the British Crown. With the War for Independence, we became **citizens.**^[1] [READ this footnote!] We needed new concepts to fit our new status *as citizens*. **Vattel provided these new republican concepts**

of “citizenship”. The gist of what Vattel says in [Law of Nations, Book I, Ch. XIX](#), at §§ 212-217, is this:

§ 212: **Natural-born citizens are those born in the country of parents who are citizens** - it is necessary that they be born of a father who is a citizen. If a person is born there of a foreigner, it will be only the place of his birth, and not his country.

§ 213: **Inhabitants, as distinguished from citizens, are foreigners who are permitted to stay in the country.** They are subject to the laws of the country while they reside in it. But they do not participate in all the rights of citizens - they enjoy only the advantages which the law or custom gives them. Their children follow the condition of their fathers – they too are *inhabitants*.

§ 214: **A country may grant to a foreigner the quality of citizen - this is naturalization.** In some countries, the sovereign cannot grant to a foreigner all the rights of citizens, such as that of holding public office - this is a regulation of the fundamental law. And *in England, merely being born in the country naturalizes the children of a foreigner.*

§§ 215, 216 & 217: **Children born of citizens in a foreign country, at sea, or while overseas in the service of their country, are “citizens.”** By the law of nature alone, children follow the condition of their fathers; the place of birth produces no change in this particular.

Do you see? The *republican concept* of “natural born citizenship” is radically different from the *feudal notion* of “natural born subjectship.” Under feudalism, merely being born in the domains of the King made one – by birth – a “natural born subject”. But in Vattel’s Model and Our Constitutional Republic, Citizens are “natural born” only if they are **born of Citizens**.

How Our Framers applied Vattel’s Concept of “natural born citizen” in Our Constitution:

The Federal Convention was in session from May 14, through September 17, 1787. [John Jay, who had been a member of the Continental Congress](#) [where they “pounced” on Vattel], sent this [letter of July 25, 1787, to George Washington](#), who presided over the Convention:

“...Permit me to hint, whether it would not be wise & seasonable to provide a strong check to the admission of foreigners into the administration of our national government and to declare expressly that the Command in Chief of the American army shall not be given to, nor devolve on, any but a natural born Citizen...”[\[4\]](#)

According, Art. II, §1, cl. 5 was drafted to read:

“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;

neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.”
[boldface added]

In § 214, Vattel states that “fundamental law” may withhold *from naturalized citizens* some of the rights of citizens, such as holding public office. The Constitution is our “fundamental law”; and, following Vattel, Art. II, §1, cl. 5 withholds *from naturalized citizens* (except for our Founding Generation which was “grandfathered in”) the right to hold the office of President.[\[5\]](#)

Remember! None of our early Presidents were “natural born Citizens”, even though they were all born here. **They were all born as subjects of the British Crown.** *They became naturalized citizens with the Declaration of Independence.* That is why it was necessary to provide a grandfather clause for them. But after our Founding Generation was gone, their successors were required to be **born as citizens** of the United States - not merely born **here** (as were our Founders), but **born as citizens**.

And do not forget that the children born here of slaves did not become “citizens” by virtue of being born here. Their parents were slaves; hence (succeeding to the condition of their parents) they were **born** as slaves. **Black people born here** did not become citizens until 1868 and the ratification of the 14th Amendment.

So! Do you see? If Our Framers understood that merely being born here were sufficient to confer status as a “natural born citizen”; it would not have been necessary to grandfather in our first generation of Presidents; and all the slaves born here would have been “natural born citizens”. **But they were born as non-citizen slaves, because their parents were non-citizen slaves.**

David Ramsay’s 1789 Dissertation on Citizenship

[David Ramsay was an historian, Founding Father, and member of the Continental Congress](#) [REMEMBER: This is where they “pounced” on Vattel], whose [Dissertation On The Manner Of Acquiring The Character And Privileges Of A Citizen Of The United States](#) was published in 1789, just after ratification of our Constitution and the Year the new Government began.

It is an interesting dissertation and only 8 pages long. At the bottom of his page 6, Ramsay states:

“The **citizenship** of no man could be previous to the declaration of independence, and, **as a natural right, belongs to none but those who have been born of citizens since the 4th of July, 1776.**” [modernized spelling & emphasis are mine]

Do you see? Ramsay’s Dissertation sets forth the understanding of the Time, formally stated by Vattel and incorporated by our Framers, that a “natural born Citizen” is one who is **born of citizens**. And we had no “citizens” until July 4, 1776.

Now, let us look at the First Congress.

How the First Congress followed Vattel and our Framers:

Article I, §8, cl. 4 delegates to Congress the power “To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization”.^[6] Pursuant to that power, the First Congress passed the Naturalization Act of 1790. Here is the text, which you can find at [1 Stat. at Large, 103](#):

“SECTION1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any alien, being a free white person, who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States for the term of two years, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof, on application to any common law court of record, in any one of the states wherein he shall have resided for the term of one year at least, and making proof to the satisfaction of such court, that he is a person of good character, and taking the oath or affirmation prescribed by law, to support the constitution of the United States, which oath or affirmation such court shall administer; and the clerk of such court shall record such application, and the proceedings thereon; and thereupon such person shall be considered as a citizen of the United States. **And the children of such persons so naturalized, dwelling within the United States, being under the age of twenty-one years at the time of such naturalization, shall also be considered as citizens of the United States. And the children of citizens of the United States, that may be born beyond 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 ... APPROVED, March 26, 1790.”^[7]

So! This Act of the First Congress implements the Principles set forth in Vattel, embraced by our Framers, and enshrined in Art. II, §1, cl. 5, that:

- A “natural born Citizen” is one who is born of parents who are citizens.
- Minor children born here of aliens do not become citizens until their parents are naturalized. Thus, they are not “natural born” citizens.

Our Framers rejected the anti-republican and feudal notion that mere location of birth within a Country *naturalizes the children of a foreigner*.^[8]

The distinction written into Our Constitution and implemented by the Naturalization Act of 1790 is between someone who is **born a citizen, by being born of parents who are already Citizens**, and someone who becomes a citizen after birth by naturalization. Only the former are eligible to be President.

So! Original Intent? Or Whatever the People with the Power want it to Mean?

I have proved the original intent of “natural born Citizen” at Art. II, §1, cl. 5 – **it is one who is born of parents who are citizens**. We may not lawfully change that definition except by Amendment to the Constitution. Section 1 of the 14th Amendment does not change the definition because the 14th Amendment defines “citizens” of the United States (which includes naturalized citizens) and not “natural born Citizen.”

Some Democrats no longer pretend that the glib, handsome & black Obama (who, following the condition of his putative father, was born a subject of the British Crown) is “a natural born Citizen”. They now assert that the [Democrat Party has the right to nominate whoever they choose to run for president, including someone who is not qualified for the office](#). [See pages 3 & 4 of the linked Court Order.]

The school-girlish Establishment Republicans who swoon over the glib, handsome & Hispanic Marco Rubio (who is not a “natural born Citizen”, but only a naturalized citizen) will ultimately destroy our sovereignty. Once we accept that our President need not be a “natural born Citizen”, we will have made a major step towards submission to global government. Because then, **anybody** can be President.

© 2012 Publius Huldah - All Rights Reserved

Footnotes:

1. Monarchies have subjects. Republics are formed by citizens. We broke from a monarchy under which we were subjects; and with our War for Independence, were transformed into citizens!

The common law of England recognizes only subjects of the Crown. England has never had citizens. Her feudal doctrine of “natural born subjects” is set forth in Book I, Ch. 10, of Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England (I modernized the spelling):

“THE first and most obvious division of the people is into aliens and natural-born subjects. Natural-born subjects are such as are born within the dominions of the crown of England, that is, within the ... allegiance of the king; and aliens, such as are born out of it. Allegiance is the tie ... which binds the subject to the king ...” [emphasis mine]

Under feudalism, people are possessions who belong to the Land in which they were born. So they are “naturally” subject to whoever owns the Land. They were born as subjects to the owner of the land [ultimately, the King] on which they were born.

With our War for Independence, We repudiated the notion of natural born subjects. As Citizens, We ordained and established Our Constitution wherein We created a federal government which was subject to us!

Jake Walker doesn't seem to know the difference between being “a subject of a King” and “a citizen of a Republic”, as he equates the feudal concept of “natural born subject” with the Republican concept of “natural born Citizen”.

Chet Arthur and Human Events tell us the “original intent” of “natural born Citizen” at Art. II, §1, cl. 5 is given by an Amendment defining “citizen” [not “natural born citizen”] ratified 80 years later!

And Bret Baier seems unaware that the methods for amending the Constitution are set forth in Article V; and that Congress may not amend the Constitution by making a law which redefines terms set forth in the Constitution!

These four amateurs would do well to study Birthright Citizenship and Dual Citizenship: Harbingers of Administrative Tyranny, by Professor Edward J. Erler. Erler addresses the distinctions between “citizenship” and “subjectship”; and the concept of “citizenship” at §1 of the 14th Amendment. He proves that not everyone born here is a “citizen”: Only those whose parents are “subject to the jurisdiction of the US” are citizens. Illegal aliens are not “subject to the jurisdiction of the US” – they are invaders whose allegiance is to the Country they left. Foreign diplomats stationed here are not “subject to the jurisdiction of the US”. Thus, children born here of these aliens are not citizens!

2. The 1916 ed. of Law of Nations with Lapradelle’s introduction is a Google digitized book. If you download it, you get an easily readable text.
3. Many thanks to my friend, **David J. Edwards**, who provided me with Evidence of Vattel’s profound influence on our Founders & Framers.
4. The hyperlink contains another link where you can see Jay’s handwritten letter!
5. Note that Art. I, §2, cl. 2, permits naturalized citizens to serve as Representatives; and Art. I, §3, cl. 3, permits them to serve as Senators.
6. “Naturalization” is the process, established by law, by which foreigners become citizens.
7. Note that in §§ 215, 216 & 217, Vattel says that children born of citizens in a foreign country, at sea, or while overseas in the service of their country, are “citizens”. He goes on to say that by the law of nature alone, children follow the condition of their fathers; the place of birth produces no change in this particular. But he doesn’t expressly say they are “natural born citizens”. The italicized words at the end of the 1790 Act correct that and make it clear that children of citizens of the United States are “natural born citizens” wherever they are born.
8. The 14th Amendment doesn’t change this one whit! READ Prof. Erler’s paper, linked above.

NOTICE! To all who strain to find something I “failed to mention”: I didn’t quote *Minor v. Happersett* because *Minor* merely paraphrases, in dicta, a portion of the Naturalization Act of 1790, the text of which is set forth above.

And I didn’t show why John McCain & Mitt Romney ARE natural born Citizens; and why Marco Rubio & Obama are NOT natural born Citizens. J.B. Williams has already done an excellent job in applying the Republican Principles set forth by Vattel, and which were embraced by our Founders, Framers, and the First Congress, in his recent paper, *Romney, Rubio, McCain And Natural Born Citizen*.

Publius Huldah is a retired attorney who now lives in Tennessee. Before getting a law degree, she got a degree in philosophy where she specialized in political philosophy and epistemology (theories of knowledge). She now writes extensively on the U.S. Constitution, using the Federalist Papers to prove its original meaning and intent. She also shows how federal judges and politicians have ignored Our Constitution and replaced it with their personal opinions and beliefs.h

E-Mail: publiushuldah@gmail.com

ROMNEY, RUBIO, McCAIN AND NATURAL BORN CITIZEN

By J.B. Williams
June 11, 2012

The recent release of my previous column titled [Rubio Can Lock the Election for Obama](#) resulted in numerous reader emails that demonstrate a continuing confusion over the indisputable definition and application of the term Natural Born Citizen. This follow up column is written to remove all confusion from the topic, once and for all.

Sadly, most of the people concerned with this topic believe they each know the truth, even though they do not agree on what the truth is. Most opinions are based upon second source or third hand information, most of it motivated by political agenda.

My objective is to establish through first source evidence the true meaning of the term Natural Born Citizen as used by our Founders in Article II of the Constitution, and spread the truth, no matter who it helps or harms in the political arena. I have written on this subject extensively and my only loyalty here is to the truth, no matter who it serves.

The true definition of Natural Born Citizen

Simply stated, a Natural Born Citizen is a second (or more) generation citizen by birth right. None of the Founding Fathers were Natural Born Citizen as they all became first generation citizens the moment they created our nation. As a result, they had to exclude

themselves from the NBC requirement, even though most of them were born on soil (aka Native Citizen), or none of them could have held the office of President.

The term Natural Born Citizen was borrowed from Vattel's treaties The Law of Nations, based upon the unalienable rules of Natural Law. Most people understand and agree on this. Then, they begin cherry-picking their facts from there, in all cases, based upon their individual political agendas rather than a careful and complete study of the facts.

I direct you to four sections in particular...

[The Law of Nations](#) - Book 1 - Chapter 19 - Sections 212, 213, 214 and 215 - The true definition of NBC is given in these sections.

§ 212. Citizens and natives (the section most people are familiar with) READ IN ENTIRETY PAYING CLOSE ATTENTION TO SECTIONS I HAVE HIGHLIGHTED.

"The citizens are the members of the civil society; bound to this society by certain duties, and subject to its authority, they equally participate in its advantages. The natives, or natural-born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens. **As the society cannot exist and perpetuate itself otherwise than by the children of the citizens, those children naturally follow the condition of their fathers, and succeed to all their rights.** The society is supposed to desire this, in consequence of what it owes to its own preservation; and it is presumed, as matter of course, that each citizen, on entering into society, **reserves to his children** the right of becoming members of it. **The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children; and these become true citizens merely by their tacit consent.** We shall soon see whether, on their coming to the years of discretion, they may renounce their right, and what they owe to the society in which they were born. **I say, that, in order to be of the country, it is necessary that a person be born of a father who is a citizen; for, if he is born there of a foreigner, it will be only the place of his birth, and not his country.**"

212 - Defines Natural Born Citizen as the natural offspring of a Citizen Father. Vattel explains this three times in this section. Just as all birthrights follow the blood of the father, so does natural rights of citizenship. This debunks the theory that "both parents" must be legal citizens at the time of birth of any offspring. Only the Father confers Natural Born Citizenship.

§ 213. Inhabitants (Refers to situations like Rubio's)

"The **inhabitants, as distinguished from citizens, are foreigners**, who are permitted to settle and stay in the country. Bound to the society by their residence, they are subject to the laws of the state while they reside in it; and they are obliged to defend it, because it grants them protection, though they do not participate in all the rights of citizens. They enjoy only the advantages which the law or custom gives them. The perpetual inhabitants are those who have received the right of perpetual residence. **These are a kind of citizens of an inferior order, and are united to the**

society without participating in all its advantages. Their children follow the condition of their fathers; and, as the state has given to these the right of perpetual residence, their right passes to their posterity."

213 addresses "citizen" and "inhabitants" - not Natural Born Citizens defined in 212. Rubio falls into this category as he was born in the U.S. - however, his parents (specifically his father) were legal citizens of Cuba at the time of Marco's birth. Due to our 14th Amendment based upon this section from Vattel, Marco became an inhabitant at birth, and an "anchor baby citizen" via our current immigration and naturalization laws. But because his Father was a legal citizen of Cuba, his father conferred natural citizenship rights to Cuba upon Marco's birth. It is on this basis that Marco Rubio is NOT a Natural Born Citizen of the United States.

§ 214. Naturalization (58) (confirms everything I just told you about Rubio)

"A nation, or the sovereign who represents it, **may grant to a foreigner the quality of citizen**, by admitting him into the body of the political society. This is called naturalization. **There are some states in which the sovereign cannot grant to a foreigner all the rights of citizens, — for example, that of holding public offices — and where, consequently, he has the power of granting only an imperfect naturalization. It is here a regulation of the fundamental law, which limits the power of the prince.** In other states, as in England and Poland, the prince cannot naturalize a single person, without the concurrence of the nation, represented by its deputies. Finally, there are states, as, for instance, England, where the single circumstance of being born in the country **naturalizes** the children of a foreigner."

215 answers the question of soil, or Native Born versus Natural Born

§ 215. Children of citizens born in a foreign country (NO born on soil requirement)

"It is asked whether the children born of citizens in a foreign country are citizens? The laws have decided this question in several countries, and their regulations must be followed. (59) **By the law of nature alone, children follow the condition of their fathers, and enter into all their rights (§ 212); the place of birth produces no change in this particular, and cannot, of itself, furnish any reason for taking from a child what nature has given him;** I say "of itself," for, civil or political laws may, for particular reasons, ordain otherwise. **But I suppose that the father has not entirely quitted his country in order to settle elsewhere.** If he has fixed his abode in a foreign country, he is become a member of another society, at least as a perpetual inhabitant; and his children will be members of it also."

This pertains to John McCain, who was born in Panama due to his father's military deployment. As Vattel explains in section 215, where a person is born cannot take away the Natural Born Birthright that passes via Natural Law from Father to Son. Because John McCain's Father was indeed a well-known legal citizen of the United States at the

time of John's birth, no matter where the birth took place, Natural Born Citizenship passed from John's Father to John at birth. John McCain is a Natural Born Citizen of the United States, no matter what else people think about John McCain.

In this regard, the United States Senate got it exactly right in their 99-0 [Sen. Res. 511](#) clearing John McCain to pursue the office of President in 2008. Using the exact same definition used to clear John McCain, Barack Hussein Obama and Marco Rubio would fail the test. The fact that the U.S. Senate is on record getting it right demonstrates that the entire U.S. Senate is complicit in the fraudulent seating of Barack Hussein Obama in the people's White House. It also proves it was a premeditated crime...

NOTE: This also relates to Mitt Romney - "I say "of itself," for, civil or political laws may, for particular reasons, ordain otherwise. But I suppose that the father has not entirely quitted his country in order to settle elsewhere. If he has fixed his abode in a foreign country, he is become a member of another society, at least as a perpetual inhabitant; and his children will be members of it also." – Mitt Romney's Father may have held dual citizenship as a result of being born in Mexico, the natural son of a U.S. Citizen Father. This could disqualify Mitt's Father from holding the offices of President and Vice President. However, Mitt was born in the USA the natural son of the legal citizen Father, with no direct divided loyalties. While Mitt's Father may have been disqualified, Mitt does not appear to be.

Just in case there is any doubt concerning McCain, Vattel goes further on the subject of the McCain circumstance in section 217

§ 217. Children born in the armies of the state (John McCain)

"For the same reasons also, children born out of the country, in the armies of the state, or in the house of its minister at a foreign court, are reputed born in the country; for **a citizen who is absent with his family, on the service of the state, but still dependent on it, and subject to its jurisdiction, cannot be considered as having quitted its territory.**"

One does not quit citizenship rights when deployed abroad by our government. In fact, even if a soldier deployed abroad sires a child, with a foreign mother, that child is still a Natural Born Citizen of the USA as those rights pass from Father to child at birth.

Are you with me so far? Rubio is NOT a Natural Born Citizen of the USA, John McCain is.....right? Barack Obama is NOT a Natural Born Citizen no matter whether he was born in Hawaii or Kenya.... right?

Now for Romney....

According to all available records on Romney, his Grandfather was a legal citizen of the United States who became an "inhabitant" of Mexico long before Mitt's birth. Mitt's father was born in Mexico, the natural offspring of a legal US citizen living in Mexico. Remember from above that soil changes nothing. According to all evidence available at

present, Mitt's father was born a Natural Born Citizen of the United States, even though his parents were "inhabitants" of Mexico at the time.

Mitt's Father later returned to the United States and became Governor of Michigan, something a non-citizen could not do. Mitt was born in Michigan, the natural offspring of a legal citizen Father, making Mitt a Natural Born Citizen of the United States at birth.

So, McCain and Romney both pass the NBC test according to Vattel and The Law of Nations. Rubio, Obama and others like Jindal DO NOT pass the test. Every member of the U.S. Supreme Court knows the truth presented in this column, as do every member of the U.S. Senate, most members of the House and almost every judge in the country.

This is why there is a concentrated effort to redefine the term to mean any citizen, protecting all who remain involved in the greatest electoral fraud ever perpetrated on any democratic society. The reason the Natural Born requirement must be eliminated is it is not possible to stand up a [Global Government in the United States](#) so long as only Natural Born Citizens can lead our government. That's why our Founders placed the requirement there – and that's why people are hell-bent to remove it.

Before you spread any more false information regarding the subject, [I welcome any challenge](#) you want to raise to any of the information provided here. If it is truth you seek, you now have the truth. If you seek something else, the truth will not serve that agenda.

One final time – If the natural birth Father is a legal U.S. Citizen at the time of the child's birth, the child is a Natural Born Citizen of the United States. If the natural birth Father is not a legal U.S. Citizen at the time of the child's birth, the child is NOT a Natural Born Citizen. End of story!

Last, if Marco Rubio truly wants to earn the title of *An American Son*, he should immediately pronounce himself "ineligible" for the offices of President and Vice President and explain why, which would immediately turn all focus upon the current Fraud-in-Chief, Barack Hussein Obama, and secure the defeat of Obama's international assault on the United States of America. If Rubio does not do this immediately, he is not what many Tea Party supporters had hoped...

© 2012 JB Williams - All Rights Reserved

JB Williams is a business man, a husband, a father, and a writer. A no nonsense commentator on American politics, American history, and American philosophy. He is published nationwide and in many countries around the world. He is also a Founder of Freedom Force USA and a staunch conservative actively engaged in returning the power to the right people in America.

E-Mail: JB.USPU@gmail.com

GOP READIES AUGUST SUICIDE IN TAMPA

By J.B. Williams
July 23, 2012

Back in June, I published a column demonstrating [just how difficult it will be](#) to unseat Obama in the 2012 election. In short, Obama will win a minimum of twenty states no matter what and those twenty states represent 242 of the 270 Electoral College votes Obama needs to win re-election. Obama is only one state away from winning at the starting gate, and that state is most likely Florida.

Romney could win twenty-nine of the fifty states and still lose the election. The states in his column at the start of the 2012 race represent only 146 Electoral votes, at best. He has a long way to go to victory.

But the game could end in August at the [GOP Convention](#).

Led by Republican news site Newsmax, a growing number of Republican talking heads across the airwaves and blogosphere are promoting Marco Rubio for Vice Presidential running mate.

In an [ongoing poll](#), approximately 58,000 Newsmax readers answer the question [Who Should Romney Pick for VP?](#) The results are absolutely frightening!

93% of Newsmax participants would vote for Romney if the election were held today, according to poll results, demonstrating a very solid Republican demographic in the poll and a party unifying against Barack Obama.

The rest of the poll results are unbelievable...

Knowing very well that [Marco Rubio is not a Natural Born Citizen](#) of the United States, but rather an immigrant-citizen from Cuba, [ineligible for the office of Vice President](#), 67% of Newsmax readers chose Marco Rubio for VP running mate.

According to the [XII Amendment](#) ratified in 1804 – “no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.” – and according to Article II of the U.S. Constitution, only a [Natural Born Citizen](#) of the United States is eligible for the office of President.

Many of the Republicans voting in this poll have opposed Barack Obama’s unconstitutional administration for the last four years. But they appear to have no trouble nominating their own unconstitutional VP running mate to run against Barack Obama.

According to the [Newsmax poll](#) results, 89% believe that placing an unconstitutional VP on the ticket with Romney will help Romney defeat Barack Obama in the general election. Newsmax placed fourteen potential VP choices on their ballot, only two of which are not eligible for the office of Vice President or President, Marco Rubio and Bobby Jindal, both born to foreign parents living in the U.S., a condition often referred to as *anchor baby*.

In addition, Marco Rubio is well on record supporting many Democrat agenda items opposed by most Republicans, including [amnesty for millions of illegal aliens](#) living in America in direct violation of our immigration and naturalization laws.

This might explain the gap between those who think Rubio might help Romney win (89%) and those willing to support Rubio (67%), a significant 22 point gap indicating that some of these folks will not vote for Rubio, even though they believe he could help Romney win.

This 22% could represent the number of participants who like Rubio and want Romney to win, but also understand that Rubio isn’t even eligible for the job.

As Florida promises to be a key state for both Romney and Obama, it isn’t hard to see the political strategy behind promoting the young and popular freshman Senator from Florida for VP. But will placing a [confirmed unconstitutional candidate](#) like Rubio on the ticket with Romney help or hurt Romney’s chances in November?

The fact is it will hurt Romney’s chances even in August at the GOP Convention, where [Ron Paul and Rick Santorum aim to upset the convention](#), gathering a storm of Convention Delegates opposed to Romney due to his past constitutional indiscretions.

Placing Rubio or any other unconstitutional candidate on the ticket with Romney will most likely end any serious Romney challenge to Barack Obama. I would read such a move as a forfeit of the race by strategic suicide.

It would also end any political future for the promising [Marco Rubio](#).

Florida won the heated 2000 contest for Bush and the 2008 contest for Obama. Florida is a huge gamble in 2012, not because of Florida’s large Hispanic community, but because of Florida’s even bigger retiree community.

It wasn't Hispanics or even college age kids foolishly voting for change who elected Obama in 2008, [it was senior citizens, retirees](#) and as those retirees vote, so goes Florida.

More than any other issue, the [Charters of Freedom](#) are center stage in the 2012 election. If voters are presented with two equally unconstitutional choices, Obama will win re-election by default. He has twenty states and 246 Electoral votes in his column at the starting gate.

Romney will have to make his VP choice very carefully or he can end his campaign in August. Obama has demonstrated a total disregard for the Charters of Freedom and if Romney does the same thing by choosing an equally unconstitutional running mate, the people will not support that ticket in Florida or anywhere else.

The 67% of Republican Newsmax readers need to see both Rubio and Newsmax for what they really are... I'm not trying to hurt Rubio, I'm trying to save Romney and thereby, hope for our country.

If Rubio is the real hero American Son many believe him to be, he must immediately and publicly [disqualify himself for the office of Vice President](#) and then challenge Barack Hussein Obama on the same basis.

If Rubio is unwilling to do so, he is not the hero many seem willing to bet their future upon. Romney cannot defeat Obama with a ticket just as unconstitutional as Obama. Here's where the rubber meets the road folks.

JB Williams is a business man, a husband, a father, and a writer. A no nonsense commentator on American politics, American history, and American philosophy. He is published nationwide and in many countries around the world. He is also a Founder of Freedom Force USA and a staunch conservative actively engaged in returning the power to the right people in America.

E-Mail: JB.USPU@gmail.com

Legal Eagles Say Anchor Babies are Natural Born Citizens too

By JB Williams
jb.uspu@gmail.com

Well, with the laundry list of political legal eagles lining up to claim that *anchor babies* like Marco Rubio are [Natural Born Citizens](#) too, one must assume that the RNC intends to place anchor baby Marco Rubio on the ballot with Romney and they are prepared to burn the Constitution to do it. They are apparently prepared to lose in November too....

In the latest RNC effort to redefine [Natural Born Citizen](#), clearing Rubio for the GOP ticket, once respected [Tennessee Senator Fred Thompson](#) enters the fray. Thompson wastes no time regurgitating the lies that have protected Barack Obama for four years now.

In a *they did it, so can we*, attempt to forever eliminate Article II [Natural Born Citizen](#) requirements for the offices of President and Vice President, Thompson repeats lies told by Heritage Foundation and left-wing lawyers for the Obama-nation in an overt attempt to silence the truth, that Marco Rubio and Barack Obama are both constitutionally ineligible for office, according to well-known constitutional history.

These legal eagles seem to have trouble defining anchor baby and Natural Born Citizen, even though the definitions and history are 100% clear on both.

An “[anchor baby](#)” is a child born in the U.S.A. to parents who are not legal U.S. Citizens at the time of the child’s birth. Under the 14th Amendment and subsequent *immigration and naturalization* laws, the U.S.A. gives that child “naturalized citizen” status at birth and then that child becomes an “anchor” upon which the foreign parents can apply and usually receive Naturalized Citizenship as immigrant Americans.

Contrary to false statements in Rubio’s bio, his parents did NOT “immigrate” to the United States in 1956. They did not begin their *immigration and naturalization process* until more than four years after Marco’s birth, more than fifteen years after they took residence in the U.S. Therefore, they could not confer upon Marco that which they did not possess at his birth, U.S. Citizenship.

While our immigration and naturalization laws currently offer general citizen rights to “anchor babies” born in the U.S. to foreign parents like Rubio, the 14th Amendment has no bearing at all upon the definition of Natural Born Citizen or the constitutional qualifications for the office of President and Vice President.

A citizen is either naturalized under the 14th or Natural Born to legal citizen parents, exempt from all immigration and naturalization laws and amendments. It is not possible to be both and Fred Thompson knows it!

In simple terms, a [Natural Born Citizen](#) of the United States is a child who inherits maximum citizenship rights from their citizen parents at birth, including the rights reserved for only Natural Born Citizens, like holding the office of President or Vice President. Obviously, if someone received citizenship via 14th Amendment immigration and naturalization statutes, they cannot possibly be a [Natural Born Citizen](#).

Now, either legal eagles like Fred Thompson know this and choose to lie, or they don’t know it, in which case they are legal beagles rather than legal eagles. You decide.... But know this.... Ignorance is quickly solved with information. Ignorance in the face of information is something quite different.

The outright lies (*intentional or unintentional*) [presented by Fred Thompson](#) and others are as follows...

1. “*First, this is a legal question. Therefore, the test with regard to a question such as this is, “What would the Supreme Court likely hold if the question were presented to it?”*”

FALSE – It is not a legal question for judicial usurpers to dictate definition upon their political agendas. It is a Constitutional question. The American people, NOT the Supreme Court, are the

final arbiters of what is or is not constitutional. Nobody above a 3rd grade reading level needs a lawyer to explain the true meaning of three simple words, [Natural Born Citizen](#).

2. *“I think that he is a charismatic politician with a bright future. He is also untested on the national stage. I can see arguments for and against him. But I won’t sit back and watch him get caught up in a bunch of foolishness that misleads people about his eligibility to be President.”*

FALSE - Thompson refers to the TRUTH about Natural Born Citizen and Marco Rubio as “foolishness.” He accuses people desperately trying to force the TRUTH out into the open as “mislead people about eligibility,” for Rubio, Jindal, Obama and others. Yet the TRUTH is readily available, obvious and on record. Anchor babies, children born to foreign parents receiving their citizenship via the 14th Amendment, are NOT Natural Born Citizens. To suggest otherwise is beyond foolishness, it is a treasonous lie.

3. *“The answer is the English common law, which formed the basis for our own legal structure, opinions of our Founding Fathers, U.S. court decisions, and the 14th Amendment.”*

FALSE – While it is true that our Judicial System was patterned after British Common Law and British court systems, it is FALSE to state that our Declaration, Constitution, Bill of Rights and system of self-governance were based upon British Common Law. Our Founders placed ALL faith in the people, not government or the courts, which they had seen corrupted from top to bottom in England. They entrusted ALL of our fundamental rights as “Endowed by our Creator” under Natural Law or the Laws of Nature, NOT British Common Law, which they had just separated from in the American Revolution.

4. **FALSE** – Thompson goes on to use 14th Amendment “naturalization” cases to define Natural Born Citizen, when in fact, the 14th mentions nothing at all about Natural Born Citizens, clearly a special type of citizen in the minds of our Founders, or Article II requirements for high office. In short, Thompson takes the lawyers only road to redefining Natural Born Citizen as nothing more than 14th Naturalized Citizen, or “anchor babies.” It is an outright lie!

Keep in mind that “anchor babies” and the 14th Amendment did not exist at the passage of the Constitution. That the Founders had to exclude themselves from the Natural Born Citizen requirement in order to hold office, as none of our Founders were Natural Born Citizens even though most of them had been born on what would later become known as U.S. soil.

In the long and distinguished list of active destroyers of the [Charters of Freedom](#), lawyers and judges lead that list.

In a November 1804 letter to Mrs. John Adams, Thomas Jefferson wrote – *“But the opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional, and what not, not only for themselves in their own sphere of action, but for the legislature and executive also, in their spheres, would make the judiciary a despotic branch.”*

At no time in history has judicial despotism more visible than it is today and it has been going on since the passage of the Constitution.

Readers MUST ask themselves several key questions and answer those questions as honestly as possible.

- Is there any chance that Fred Thompson does not know that our Founders borrowed the term [Natural Born Citizen](#) from Vattel's Law of Nations, along with almost everything else they created? Include Sean Hannity, Bill O'Reilly, Megan Kelly, Glenn Beck, Heritage Foundation, American Thinker, Newsmax, the RNC, and many others when asking this question?
- Is there any chance that these people don't know that eight attempts were made by congress to [alter or abolish the Natural Born Citizen](#) clause prior to the election of Barack Hussein Obama?
- Is there any chance that these folks don't know the difference between [Natural Law](#) (as-in Endowed by our Creator) and [British Common Law](#) (laws based upon political shifting sands), or that the latter is the rule of man via judicial despotism and tyranny?
- Is there any chance that these political experts don't know that 14th Amendment anchor babies are not Natural Born Citizens, or why the Founders chose "only Natural Born Citizens" for the highest offices in our land?
- If you believe that all of these people simply lack all of this knowledge, can you trust these people to protect and defend our inalienable rights as Endowed by our Creator?

Consider these questions very carefully, do your own homework, and draw your own conclusions. Is it possible that all of these Republicans are ALL wrong? YES! The question is WHY?

For me, there is NO chance that these intelligent people lack the knowledge that Natural Born Citizen was borrowed from The Law of Nation's, based in Natural Law NOT man-made laws, and that "naturalized" citizens are NOT "Natural Born Citizens," or why our Founders limited the highest offices in our land to Natural Born Citizens only.

Even the U.S. Senate got it right in a 99-0 Resolution [declaring John McCain a Natural Born Citizen](#) as the natural son of American citizen parents, no matter where he was born. Do you still believe these people don't know? Why are they all lying?

I was an enthusiastic supporter of Fred Thompson for President in 2008, proving that even I get fooled once in a while.

Fool me once, shame on you.... But fool me twice, and the buck stops with me!

Are you willing to be fooled any longer? Or are you ready to protect and defend the Charters of Freedom as they were written and intended?

Time will tell very soon. If Rubio appears on the ticket with Romney, it will signal that there is nobody left in politics that cares at all about the Constitution. Voters will face a choice between two unconstitutional tickets from the RNC and DNC in November, or a 3rd party protest vote that will re-elect Barack Obama for certain.

Where is Ron "Mr. Constitution" Paul who has been entirely MIA on this matter? People willing to let Article II fall, will let all of it fall.

How much longer are you willing to be deceived? Do you feel better being deceived by your friends rather than your known enemies? Are you really willing to give up your Constitutional Republic without even a whimper?