The Unity Theory of "natural born Citizen"

Fact or Fiction?

by
Jedi Pauly

As many of the readers of the Post and Email News are aware, I have been submitting articles for some time now at the the the Post and Email News (search Jedi Pauly at the Post and Email News for previous articles on this subject), in an attempt to educate those concerned with the current political situation in America to the true meaning and interpretation of Article II "natural born Citizen". Most are probably aware that I champion a unique theory of law that is opposed to the mainstream consensus espoused by attorneys like Orly Taitz and Mario Apuzzo and others.

Whenever someone puts forth a theory that is viewed as new and opposed to popular opinion, there is always a resistance to abandoning the old failed theories and accepting the new theories. This resistance takes the form of personal anger and hostility directed by the proponents of the old theories towards those that show the old theories to be invalid. Eventually, over time, the old theories are indeed seen to be invalid and the new unpopular theories are accepted as people begin to realize that they cannot overcome the new theories or rationally support the old positions.

Both Editor Sharon Rondeau and I have had to endure a lot of heat and flak directed at us personally from those who will not accept that the old theories fail and that the new theory is sound. Isn't the truth more important than clinging to a popularly-held belief that is proven to be invalid? I believe that the truth is more important than personal opinion and popularity, and I believe that Sharon Rondeau believes this also. Sharon is a brave individual, in my opinion, who is willing to endure the kinds of personal attacks that both she and I have suffered, in order to provide a forum for debate with the purpose of getting to the truth. Rather than attacking Sharon for providing a voice for my described theories regarding "natural born Citizen" that are not popular since they are opposed to the popularly-held beliefs; people should

commend Sharon for allowing alternate sound and reasonable voices to have an opportunity to voice their views in order to stimulate ideas and discovery.

I am now going to put forth an analysis that, as far as I can determine, will show conclusively that the popularly-supported theories of law espoused by popular mainstream attorneys and supported by popular news organizations like World Net Daily, for example, are invalid, and that my described unpopular theory provides the correct explanation that properly describes the meaning and interpretation of Article II "natural born Citizen".

For the purpose of our analysis, we can summarize into two categories the theories of law that attempt to explain Article II "natural born Citizen". The popular theory that is espoused by the popular attorneys and World Net Daily I will call the "proof by inclusion theory" or the "Unity of parents and soil Theory". The theory that I put forth in opposition to the "Unity Theory" I will call the "proof by exclusion theory" or the "Natural Law Theory".

The Unity Theory goes something like this. The proponents assert that the term "natural born Citizen" from Article II is undefined in the Constitution. They combine this erroneous belief with the belief that the purpose and intent of the requirement "natural born Citizen" is to protect from foreign influences, and thus the definition of Article II "natural born Citizen" must be constructed in such a way as to deny any and all foreign jurisdictions at birth in order that there be no influence at all upon a child, because this might somehow cause some kind of conflict in loyalty to the United States for the children who later in life may become candidates for President. The proponents appear to proceed without applying any legal principles of Law as described in the Declaration of Independence and observed in Nature to define Article II "natural born Citizen". They apparently find no precedent in U.S. Law or history that gives them a satisfactory definition; they then look back in time to the works of Emer de Vattel and come across the first sentence of Section 212 in Chapter 19 Book 1 of the English translation of his treatise The Law of Nations that says:

> §212. Citizens and natives. 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**.

And voilà, they think they have a eureka moment and they now believe that they have discovered the definition that defines Article II "natural born Citizen", that they believed was undefined in the Constitution. Because this sentence in the English translation of this French work uses the phrase "natural born citizen", they seem to believe and assert that it must be a direct substitute for the similarly-sounding "natural born Citizen" of Article II. Furthermore, the above also includes the plural construct "parents" and the words "born in the country" so they conclude this to be a stated requirement that is being related by Vattel and that Article II "natural born Citizen" must be describing a necessary "Unity" of native parents (both mother and father) and native soil, and by logical implication this would prevent any foreign influence at birth upon native-born children. This satisfies what seems to be their pre-determined beliefs regarding Article II's purpose and intent, and so their conclusion is that Article II is defined by this one sentence taken out of context from the rest of Vattel's discussion, and that Article II therefore requires one to be born on native U.S. soil to a native U.S. citizen mother and native citizen father in order to qualify for the office of President. As a result, the proponents of this popularly accepted Unity Theory --which has been erroneously dubbed by World Net Daily as the "Vattel Theory" although in fact it is not actually what Vattel described-- conclude that Obama is not qualified to be President because he did not have the "required" unity since his father was never a U.S. citizen. I believe this accurately sums up the "Unity Theory" of law regarding Article II and the meaning of "natural born Citizen" that is widely accepted and promulgated by the mainstream popular attorneys and by World Net Daily as what they believe is the correct theory of law that describes Article II qualifications for President.

Now let us contrast this with the less-popular opposing theory that I have discovered and described.

The Natural Law Theory or "Exclusion Theory" goes like this. The term "natural born Citizen" in Article II is not undefined in the Constitution because it is not supposed to be defined there; as it is already defined by the Laws of Nature and is only declared in Article II in order to be protected, so that the Constitution will secure the natural sovereign political rights of children who are born to native citizen fathers, which also protects the sovereignty of the nation. The first sentence of Section 212 Chapter 19 Book 1 of the English translation of Vattel's Law of Nations is not a direct substitute for Article II because Article II "natural born Citizen" is a unique

construct in history and law that is fully described not by the first sentence of Section 212, but rather by the rest of the section and discussion of Vattel that follows the first sentence in Section 212, in further sentences which are simply ignored by the proponents of the Unity Theory; and is also supported by the Declaration of Independence which is also ignored by the proponents of the Unity Theory, since both contradict and refute the Unity Theory. Since the Laws of Nature are pre-eminent and superior to the invented laws of mankind (statutory constructs of the Positive Law jurisdiction), it is the Laws of Nature alone that govern the meaning and definition of Article II "natural born Citizen". As a result of the Laws of Nature being superior to the invented laws of mankind, it turns out that the laws that govern the soil jurisdictions and the citizenship status of the mother can be "excluded" from consideration because their jurisdictions are not controlling in determining who is a native sovereign of the country, as they cannot compete with the father's pre-eminent Natural Law jurisdiction that governs the sovereign political rights of the offspring that the sovereign father creates. As a result, there is no "requirement" for "unity", and only a native citizen father is required in order to protect a native child's sovereign political rights, and, when combined with the 14-year residency requirement, these two alone are sufficient to protect the nation from any loyalty or allegiance issues that might occur at birth due to foreign influence that could later on in life be a problem for a candidate who wishes to be President.

So these are the two proposed competing theories that attempt to describe the meaning and definition of Article II "natural born Citizen". But, which one is correct? How do we determine?

In science, whenever there are two competing theories that attempt to describe the same observed natural phenomena or attempt to describe natural reality, there are methods of examination and rules that permit one to test the theories to determine which one is the correct or valid theory. In science, if it can be discovered with only one example in Nature that cannot be adequately explained by the theory, or if one example of logic or observation in Nature can be found that proves the theory to be lacking, then the theory is no longer a valid theory and it fails and must be revised or abandoned. I will attempt to use this methodology upon the "Unity Theory" of law to show that it cannot withstand the rigors of logical scrutiny and therefore it is an invalid theory of law that fails to properly describe the meaning and definition of Article II "natural born Citizen". This approach is valid

because Law is a subject of science and therefore it must bow to the application of scientific methodology and reasoning.

Any properly constructed theory of Law that attempts to describe Article II "natural born Citizen" must include the governing bodies of law that exists in Nature and are controlling in order to be able to explain the entirety of matters that relate to the purpose and intent of Article II. One cannot ignore the other provisions of Article II that are influencing, and attempt to define "natural born Citizen" in isolation from the 14-year residency requirement, for example, or ignore one-half of the Law that governs natural reality such as the Laws of Nature that are described in the Declaration of Independence and in the rest of Vattel, that he relates if one reads past the first sentence of Section 212, and then expect people to believe that one has discovered a valid comprehensive theory of Law that adequately describes the meaning and interpretation of Article II "natural born Citizen". This is what the proponents of the Unity Theory ask us to do however, that is, to waive the complete context of Article II and the Laws of Nature as fully described by Vattel.

The weakness and failure of the Unity Theory of law that I see, is that it ignores Nature and Natural Reality and relies upon elevating both the Positive Law and the Natural Law jurisdictions to be on an equal footing, a situation that does not exist in reality and is contrary to well-established understandings of the legal differences between these two competing jurisdictions, since the Natural Law jurisdiction is a superior and controlling jurisdiction over that of the Positive Law jurisdiction. The Unity Theory relies upon making all three elements, the soil jurisdiction of the State, the mother's jurisdiction and the father's jurisdiction, to all be of equal weight when this is not at all supported by Law or natural reality and this is the source of the theory's conceptual failure because Nature and well-established legal principles show us that these three elements are not equal in applied Law.

For example, let us look at how the proponents of the Unity Theory deal with a foreign mother or foreign soil, and then we will show that there is a natural inequity between males and females under the Laws of Nature when it comes to securing political rights which is ignored by the proponents of the Unity Theory, and cannot be explained by their theory, which defect conclusively proves the Unity Theory to be wrong, and has caused the

proponents of the Unity Theory to disregard the Declaration of Independence and the Laws of Nature as fully described by Vattel.

The Unity Theory requires that the mother must be a U.S. citizen of some sort at the time of the birth of the child (any will do according to them, either naturalized or natural-born, as long as the naturalized citizenship occurs prior to the birth of the child --which apparently satisfies the tenets of the Unity Theory according to its proponents). There have been a few Presidents elected past the time of the Sunset Clause of Article II who were born to foreign citizen mothers that, according to the proponents of the Unity Theory, is dealt with by the fact of marriage to U.S. citizen fathers which caused those mothers to become naturalized citizens before the birth of the child, so therefore the Unity Theory is satisfied and this would insure loyalty to the U.S. under the Unity concept. However, there is a problem with this idea.

Just because a foreign female marries a U.S. citizen male and takes on her husband's citizenship does not mean that she loses her native citizenship, because her native country might recognize dual citizenships. Even though the U.S. might not recognize her dual citizenship status, the foreign jurisdiction could still be a conduit for her children to develop foreign citizenship and loyalties. Likewise, the same applies to a foreign citizen father who naturalizes in time to be a U.S. citizen before his child is born.

Since the goal of the Unity Theory is to deny foreign influence through "unity" of all jurisdictions under the U.S. jurisdiction at the time of one's birth, how does the Unity Theory protect the children of naturalized citizen parents from foreign influence if the foreign jurisdiction recognizes dual citizenship? The answer is, it cannot --and we have just encountered our first failure of the Unity Theory. The solution to this dilemma is found in the Natural Law Theory that describes Article II, which realizes that any foreign influence due to retained foreign citizenships will be statutory in nature only and inferior to the Natural Law jurisdiction of a native father and therefore they can be dispensed with by repatriation of the child to live in the U.S. for 14 years which permits the child to sever any foreign statutory influences caused by any voluntarily accepted Positive Law legal rights of citizenship and will permit the loyalties to the native father's country to be reestablished. The Unity Theory fails to explain this by ignoring the purpose and intent of the 14-year residency rule of Article II and the Laws of Nature or Natural Law jurisdiction as being superior to the Positive Law

jurisdiction, and the combined influence of both of these factors on the meaning of “natural born Citizen”.

What about foreign soil births under the Unity Theory such as children born to U.S. citizen military parents on foreign shores, for example? How does the Unity Theory protect the children from foreign influence and protect the political rights and loyalty to the United States in those circumstances? The answer once again is it does not and cannot. Observe….

According to the proponents and tenets of the Unity Theory, the extraterritorial extension of U.S. Positive Law to military bases on foreign shores is supposed to somehow protect loyalty to the U.S. and satisfy the tenets of the Unity Theory (the soil part) by essentially claiming the soil territory of foreign nations to no longer be their territory but instead is now sovereign U.S. territory. However, a simple examination of the laws governing sovereign territorial jurisdictions and the lease agreements governing U.S. military bases shows that U.S. Positive Law cannot supersede the sovereign territory of a foreign Nation unless sovereign territorial jurisdiction is ceded over to the U.S., which would mean that all the land that the U.S. military bases occupy no longer belongs to the native host Nation but is now part of the United States. This is rarely the case as the usual method is that the foreign Nation retains their sovereignty and ownership over the land that the U.S. military leases for a military base and concurrent joint jurisdiction is exercised by agreement similar to the way military bases operate within the States of the United States. One simple example can prove this.

I was born in Japan on a U.S. military air base and both of my parents were U.S. citizens. When I turned 18 the Japanese government sent me a letter from the Japanese embassy that offered me the legal right or “privilege” to Japanese citizenship. Not only does this prove that Japan retains its sovereign jurisdiction over the territory that the U.S. air base occupies in order to apply Japanese laws, but it proves that being under U.S. Positive Law jurisdiction at the time of your birth is insufficient to protect the child at birth from foreign influences. We have now encountered our second and more serious failure of the tenets of the Unity Theory. We have just proved that U.S. Positive Law that governs territorial soil jurisdictions is totally incapable of protecting those born under it from foreign influence. By logical extension then, the Unity Theory necessarily implies that the children of U.S. military parents who are born on bases that are on sovereign foreign

territory are not able to be qualified for the Office of President and are necessarily disenfranchised from their natural political rights just because their U.S. citizen parents are patriotically serving their country. If this seems absurd as being unfair and unjust you are right.

The solution to this intolerable situation is realized by abandoning the Unity Theory that has just been shown to be a failed theory, and again appealing to the Natural Law Theory of Article II "natural born Citizen" which by its tenets ignores the Positive Law as having any relevance at all and realizes that the Natural Law jurisdiction of a citizen father is what is controlling for Article II purposes. By the rules governing the Laws of Nature, a citizen father carries his superior controlling Natural Law jurisdiction with him wherever he goes, so that if you are born to a citizen father on foreign shores, you will receive the protection of your father's Natural Law jurisdiction to cause you to inherit your political rights as Natural Rights obtained from your father, even if he is not present at the time, and any legal rights of foreign citizenship due to foreign birth does not and will not compete with the Natural Political rights that are inherited from a father. Since any legal rights to citizenship are, once again, only a function of the Positive Law, any loyalty issues that may be caused by the foreign territory birth can be dispensed with again by appealing to the 14-year residency and repatriation provisions provided for in Article II.

A simple common sense example might help one to wrap their mind around this self-evident reality. Suppose a foreign king and his queen are on vacation in a foreign land and the queen gives birth to a son. The son might be entitled to the privilege of citizenship in the foreign country due to the Positive Laws governing the soil territory, but back home the child would be a prince and the rightful natural heir to his father's kingdom. The foreign birth cannot prevent the Laws of Nature that govern the father from allowing the father to secure the political rights of his offspring. The situation is the same for U.S. citizen fathers who have children born on foreign territory. It matters not whether the U.S. Positive Law jurisdiction is present at all.

We have just proved that the soil jurisdiction is not even a factor at all with regard to Article II, because the soil jurisdiction is totally governed by Positive Law only; and we have just shown above that Positive Law cannot protect one from foreign influence and therefore it cannot be relevant for Article II purposes if the purpose of "natural born Citizen" definition is to prevent foreign influence for loyalty reasons. Therefore, the Unity Theory

must be false because it requires Positive Law and control over soil jurisdictions in order to insure loyalty and allegiance that we have just shown by example cannot possibly protect one from foreign influences, which is contrary to or contradicts its own tenets, whereas the Natural Law Theory that describes Article II "natural born Citizen" only requires the Laws of Nature and 14-year repatriation in order to secure loyalty and political rights of the offspring and your place of birth does not matter. We have just proved that the Unity Theory is false using the scientific logic of proof by contradiction. So we have now shown not one but two failures of the Unity Theory, but the best is yet to come.

Now, let us examine the evidence and reality that there is a recognized inequity in the Law that the Unity Theory fails to recognize or explain when it comes to securing natural political rights that forces the definition of Article II "natural born Citizen" to only rely upon a native citizen father as the controlling requirement as to who can qualify for the office of President.

Where do we look to observe this fact of reality and Nature? The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are a good starting point, and then we will finish off by referencing the rest of Vattel's discussion on the Rights of Sovereigns and the Laws of Nature that is completely ignored by the proponents of the Unity Theory.

Here is the pertinent part of the Declaration of Independence that declares what was discovered to exist in Nature by the Founding Fathers, that declares there to be an observed inequity between males and females when it comes to securing natural political rights:

> "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,…"

If you carefully read this passage, you will notice that the first instance of the noun "men" is not capitalized. This is because it is being used as a general noun that is meant to convey the meaning that it is all of mankind which includes females, but in the very next instance of the noun when they are talking about who it is that secures the natural inalienable rights that are

being described, then the noun is “Men” and is capitalized as a specific thing meaning only MALES. This is prima fascia proof that there is a natural inequity in Nature when it comes to political rights because it is males who create the governments (Positive Law) in order to secure the natural political rights and it is males who secure these rights not females. Still not convinced? Need more proof? Let us examine the Constitution of the United States and reference the United States Supreme Court case of Minor v Happersett.

It is a natural fact of Nature that both males and females inherit equal natural political rights, but when it comes to securing these rights, that such rights might be used and the benefits enjoyed, males have a natural advantage over females, and females must apply to males to secure their natural political rights. How do we know this? The Supreme Court says so and the fact of the 19th Amendment and history proves it.

The Declaration of Independence makes it clear that the just powers of the government are derived from the consent of the governed (see above). It stands to reason that if you are going to derive just powers under the Positive Law by appealing to the consent of those who are governed by the Positive Law, then it only makes sense that only those who are empowered to give their consent can possibly be the ones that the just powers are being derived from.

However, everyone knows that females were not fully empowered to give their consent the same as males because females were not permitted to vote by the males in almost every State of the United States at the time of the Adoption of the Constitution, and for almost 150 years after, and the Minor case court points this out and declares that the political right of suffrage was not secured for females anywhere in the Constitution. This led to the necessity of the 19th Amendment in order to secure women’s natural political rights that were being denied to them by males in the States. And who was it that wrote and voted on the 19th Amendment so that females could realize their natural political rights that pre-existed but were not recognized? You guessed it, males again. Want more proof? Who signed the Declaration of Independence that was the claim to secure the sovereign political rights of the Colonies? Right again it was MALES, not one female signature. Who led the Colonial armies against the all male armies of the British who fought to secure the rights? Was it Georgina Washington a female? I think not.

I could go on and on throughout history with more examples and show you that it is a natural fact that by the Laws of Nature, males are at a natural biological advantage when it comes to securing political rights due to their superior physical strength that causes males to be the ones who, by the Laws of Nature, secure our political rights, and it is not females. Now, with this inescapable fact of reality in mind, read the rest of Vattel beyond the first sentence of Section 212, and it is clear that it only requires a citizen father to secure your political right to be President because it is males who secure these rights. Here are direct quotes from Vattel that further proves this, which conclusively proves that the Unity Theory is invalid because it does not even comprehend or explain this natural inequity that proves that the Natural Law jurisdiction is superior and controlling over that of the Positive Law.

"…children naturally follow the condition of their fathers, and succeed to all their rights." Section 212 of Vattel

"The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children." Section 212 of Vattel

"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." Section 212 of Vattel

"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;" Section 215 of Vattel

This conclusively proves that the Unity Theory is invalid because it fails to comprehend the Laws of Nature which are the only controlling laws governing Article II "natural born Citizen". Only by ignoring the Laws of Nature and ignoring the facts that we have shown above that proves that the Unity Theory cannot even accomplish what it reports to accomplish, can anyone even begin to entertain this failed Unity Theory. The Unity Theory is seen for what it is, which is legally-unsupported supposition, and the Natural Law Theory wins as the correct theory of law that properly describes the true meaning and definition of Article II "natural born Citizen" and preserves the correct relationship between Natural Law and Positive Law. I now will provide a correct legal outline of the proper legal theory

interpretation of Article II below for those attorneys that are interested in learning the truth.

Legal Outline of the Natural Law Theory of Article II "natural born Citizen"

1) The Constitution embodies only two jurisdictions from where authority is derived, a Natural Law jurisdiction and a Positive Law jurisdiction.

2) Article II "natural born Citizen" is a unique construct that is not defined in English Common law, nor in U.S. Positive Law, but is defined solely in Natural Law by the Laws of Nature and simply declared in the Positive Law at Article II in order to be protected. Article II "natural born Citizen" derives its authority solely from the Natural Law jurisdiction of the Constitution as meaning one who is born a native sovereign of the country. Sovereign political rights are Natural Rights that are inherited from males (father) under the Natural Law jurisdiction, because it is males who create the Positive Law (government) to secure the natural political rights and membership in the father's society that is inherited. (Explained by Vattel, and declared as a self-evident truth of Nature in the Declaration of Independence.) This is probably due to the natural biological facts that under the Natural Law jurisdiction, males are physically superior in strength and aggression and no female could physically prevent a father from securing the political rights and membership of his children into his society.

3) When it comes to citizenship and political rights, the jurisdiction of foreign soil or a foreign mother are only considered to be a Positive Law jurisdiction in contrast to that of the father's Natural Law jurisdiction. The soil is obvious, because soil is always a Positive Law jurisdiction. A foreign mother might seem to be a Natural Law jurisdiction that is equal to the father's, but upon investigation you will see that this is not so. Whenever there is a foreign father, then the political rights and membership of the children in the mother's society are in question, and must be adjudicated and secured solely by the Positive Law via statute. Any citizenship or political rights must be defined by statutory authority due to the competing superior Natural Law jurisdiction of the father. The father's Natural Law jurisdiction is always considered to be the <u>superior</u> controlling jurisdiction and forces the mother and her offspring to be under the Positive Law jurisdiction for

describing or securing any political rights or membership in the mother's society.

Since the Natural Law jurisdiction is superior to and controlling over that of the Positive Law jurisdiction, it makes no difference where you are born or the citizenship status of a foreign mother, as both jurisdictions will only be Positive Law jurisdictions defining the citizenship rights or political rights, which will not compete with the father's pre-eminent Natural Law jurisdiction, no matter whether the father is native or foreign. Therefore your place of birth or the status of your mother are irrelevant as long as you have a citizen father.

4) Loyalty and Allegiance considerations. Any loyalties or allegiances that are derived from foreign soil or a foreign mother at birth are only statutory in nature due to the Positive Law jurisdictions that are controlling in such matters, and so they are not inherited loyalties nor allegiances from a citizen father due to the Laws of Nature for the reasons outlined above. Therefore, it makes no difference whether one is born into the Positive Law with foreign loyalties and allegiances or if one develops foreign Positive Law loyalties and allegiances after birth through migrating to some other country. Both situations are easily remedied by the repatriation requirements of Article II, that requires one to be born a native citizen of the country which is secured solely by a citizen father under Natural Law jurisdiction (Vattel), and the 14-year residency requirement in Article II that causes one to sever any foreign loyalties or allegiances that are derived solely from the Positive Law jurisdiction and repatriate to reestablish the loyalties and allegiances that one was born inheriting from the native father as a function of the Laws of Nature which is the Natural Law jurisdiction. The word “Patriot” is derived from the Greek/Latin "patros" meaning "father", so to repatriate means to return to the land of your father and take up his loyalties and allegiances. This is what Article II requires and provides for.

5) The term "natural born citizen" that is defined under the 14th Amendment and by U.S. case law and Supreme Court decisions is only referring to "subject" status as in one who is "subject to the jurisdiction of" the Positive Law, and so it is only a Positive Law construct of a "legal right" or privilege, not a Natural Right; and any political rights that are derived from "natural born citizen" status are thus only legal political rights and not natural political rights. This term is defined and borrowed from English Common law as a citizen "subject" of the King/State whose authority is derived solely

from the King's/State's soil jurisdiction that the King/State claims dominion over. This is solely a Positive Law jurisdiction, as the King/State is not the source of Natural Rights, only of Positive Law "legal rights". This is what differentiates "natural born citizen" from "natural born Citizen". The former is a function solely of Positive Law and is a privilege of soil only, where a citizen father is not even required, and the latter is a function solely of Natural Law where by the Laws of Nature, ONLY a citizen father is required and the soil is irrelevant. Article II is a unique construct that has nothing at all to do with Positive Law or English Common Law, but rather represents the break with England and with the form of monarchy political system that caused an automatic involuntary allegiance to the King/State by being born under the King's/State's soil jurisdiction. Instead, the construct "natural born Citizen" is defined solely under Natural Law by the Laws of Nature in order to represent the Natural Sovereign authority that all People inherit and are entitled to, that was the purpose of the Declaration of Independence and the war of 1776 that secured the recognition of these natural sovereign political rights to be inherited from our fathers, that the King had refused to recognize.

6) One can see that not only is there a big legal difference, as defined by the Constitution and by Supreme Court cases, between "natural born citizen" and "natural born Citizen", as just outlined in 5 above, but also between "Citizen of the United States" and the 14th Amendment "citizen of the United States". The term "Citizen of the United States" is referring to a sovereign State Citizen. The term "citizen of the United States" is referring to a citizen "subject" of the State that is declared in the 14th Amendment to be a citizen "subject" of the State jurisdiction, as in a ward of the State, and not a sovereign State Citizen who is not a "subject" of State jurisdiction without voluntary consent and who is not a ward of the State. Here is a link with Supreme Court references that helps to clarify this distinction: [url=http://usa-the-republic.com/mark%20of%20beast/AppendixC.htm]appendix[/url]

As you can see, a correct understanding of the Natural Law jurisdiction and the Positive Law jurisdiction --both of which are well-defined in law to be opposite and "opposed" jurisdictions, with the Natural Law jurisdiction being superior-- perfectly defines and describes Article II "natural born Citizen" as only requiring a citizen father who creates you, and your place of birth and the status of one's mother are both irrelevant. One need only claim the natural sovereign political rights that are inherited from the sovereign

citizen father in order to be a sovereign representative of the sovereign citizens of the country and then repatriate for 14 years to sever any foreign allegiances or loyalties, in order to qualify under Article II for the Office of President.