

# True facts about the endless natural born debate

The 2008 Obama event caused people to start learning about what a natural born Citizen (NBC) is and why that condition for the Oval Office exists in Article II – who is and who isn't a natural born Citizen and the focus of the discussion was entirely upon who can and cannot seek or occupy the White House.

The political focus point caused two important problems... 1) overlooking the more important issues surrounding NBC, the Natural Right of every child to be born a true citizen of the country of their father, due to no process of man-made law, and 2) everything regarding politics immediately becomes open for debate due to competing agendas, the driving force behind most people's "facts" ... instead of allowing the real facts to drive the agenda.

The result has been an endless debate over NBC wherein there are now five competing definitions of those three very simple English words and people are searching the four corners of the earth, all of history and every law school to find the definition that suits their agenda....

The five competing definitions

#1 – The Original Meaning – Synonymous with the term “True Citizen” in Natural Law, a Christian bible based concept of Natural Law and Natural Rights in a patriarchal society wherein all rights pass from natural birth father to child at birth. This is the Vattel definition, and The Law of Nations is only political in the sense that it is a highly regarded treatise on the subject of Natural Law and the effects of Natural Law on nations, people and governments. (Part I – How natural-born Citizen came to appear in Article II and Part II

– What the Founders meant by natural-born Citizen as a matter of history)

“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.”

#2 – The Textual meaning – the words have the meaning of their face value, based upon the common use of the words at the time the words were used, in this case ratified. natural+born+Citizen, someone who is a legal member of society, at the moment of birth, as a result of nature alone. – (If one is a legal member of society only due to an act of legislation or governmental policy, they are a citizen via act, statute or government policy, and not by nature alone. One made a legal member of society by any act of government is a “naturalized” citizen.) In this case, the textual and original meaning are fully aligned.

#3 – The “birther” definition – “The natives, or natural-born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens.” The “birther” movement chose this single sentence from Vattel because the “jus soli” (born in country) part was what they needed to challenge John McCain in 2008. The focus on John McCain is what took focus off of Barack Obama and

allowed someone who is NOT a NBC to enter the White House while all eyes were on McCain, who is a NBC by any reasonable definition or intent. The U.S. Senate issued a 99-0 resolution affirming McCain, but no such resolution was sought for Obama, who cannot pass the McCain resolution statements. The “birthers” are of the opinion that even though this definition is not the original definition, and to some degree, is at odds with the original meaning and textual meaning, it none the less represents the “Founders intent” to eliminate any foreign influence from the office of Commander-in-Chief, in accordance with John Jay’s stated reasoning for proposing the requirement be added. They want no foreign influence, from the father, the mother or the place of birth. Not Vattel’s definition as “birthers” claim, but not an unreasonable view either. (The definition Cruz invented to attack Trump in the last RNC Debate is used by no one except Cruz. Ted created a sixth definition to suit his agenda, an outlandish extension of the “birther” definition.)

#4 – The Trump and Rubio definition – native born is natural born. This is one of two 14th Naturalization Amendment views, in which the claim is made that one must be born on US soil, aka “native born” in order to be a natural born Citizen, without any regard for parentage. Marco Rubio was born in the USA, but to two Cuban citizens who did not become legal US citizens until years after Marco’s birth. This is a 14th anchor baby, a native born citizen due only to US government policies on the naturalization of foreign children born on US soil. (Trump made a technical mistake during the exchange with Cruz because he has a poor understanding of native vs. natural born, maybe by intent.)

#5 – The Progressive definition, aka common law interpretation – (the second 14th Naturalization view) Common Law is the practice of making, amending or overriding constitutional and statute law via court precedence or scholarly opinions. We just watched this happen in real time on the term “marriage”

as the high court issued a 5-4 opinion that the 14th Amendment protects the right of gays to marry, thereby altering the definition of "marriage" from what it has meant since the beginning of recorded history to what the gay community and globalists want it to mean today. This is the same practice being employed by "legal experts" on both sides of the political aisle as we speak, to eliminate the NBC requirement for the Oval Office by simply using common law precedence to redefine the term to suit. This effort ends with no distinction between natural born, native born, naturalized and undocumented citizens from foreign lands. ALL of them will be NBCs when the "legal experts" are finished here, including "undocumented migrants and Middle East refugees."

How else to you eliminate U.S. national sovereignty and meld the USA into the global commune, unless people from all over the world can occupy the Oval Office?

When Ted Cruz was running for the Senate in 2012, he stated to supporters at a Texas 912 campaign event that he was "NOT ELIGIBLE for the White House because (using NBC #3 above) his father was never a US citizen until 2005, in addition to being born in Canada."

The problem isn't really that Ted was "born in Canada." The problem is, Ted was "born Canadian." A legal citizen of Canada from birth until he decided to run for the Oval Office in May 2014, when he renounced his birthright citizenship to Canada. Ted Cruz has NO authentic US documentation of any form of legal US citizenship. Ted is an "undocumented citizen" of the USA, no different than millions of "undocumented citizens" residing in the USA today.

Of course, by definition, a "constitutionalist" is a "constitutional originalist." Anyone who buys "precedence" and "modern interpretations" as a method of interpreting the Constitution or Bill of Rights, is NOT a "constitutionalist."

Now, we no more need "legal experts" to tell us what natural

born Citizen means, than what daylight and dark mean. The answer to both questions are obvious and self-evident. In both cases, the words mean exactly what they suggest...

The difference between natural born Citizen and every other type of citizen under U.S. law, is as obvious as the difference between daylight and dark.

Only when one seeks to alter the original and textual meaning of the term does the term become "ambiguous" and then, open to competing interpretations and debate. Only when one is willing to use very broad progressive interpretations of constitutional text, in order to slip their candidate through the key hole to the Oval Office, does the matter become confusing, by intent.

Whether or not RNC talkers Levin, Hannity, Kelly and Limbaugh have any honest clue what a natural born Citizen is, Obama, Cruz and Rubio, as well as many others "trained in the law" do know, which means they are not just mistaken, they are frauds actively working to subvert the Constitutional requirements for high office.

However, upholding, defending, protecting and preserving the US Constitution, the Bill of Rights and all foundational Rights of the American citizenry requires us to enforce the letter of the Constitution, based on the original meaning and Founders intent at the time of the adoption...

Anything less is an effort to undermine and subvert the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights, the result of which will be the loss of all constitutionally protected natural rights, as endowed by our Creator... and mistake of grave consequences that reach far beyond the political ambitions of both candidates and constituents.

We only have the Foundations we are willing to uphold and enforce... When the people become as corrupt as their politicians, there is no hope for America... Are we there now?

