Summary and Detailed Proof Regarding the Natural Law Theory of Article II "natural born Citizen"

by
Jedi Pauly

In order to determine the true meaning and interpretation of Article II "natural born Citizen" it is essential to realize that Law is a study of Science and the legal context of Article II is a Political Context, making the investigation of the meaning and interpretation of Article II a subject of legal Political Science. Science is rooted in the Laws of Nature. Therefore, any scientific theory of Law that attempts to describe the Article II "natural born Citizen" must also be rooted in the Laws of Nature.

If we accept that we are dealing with science, then the rules that govern the scientific process of testable hypotheses that account for natural facts, which are used to formulate scientific theories, should also apply to determining the true meaning and interpretation of Article II "natural born Citizen" When we craft our theory, we wish to determine the true meaning by appealing to objective facts that exist in Nature and to the governing rules of Law and Nature that exist in Nature, so that the determination of the validity of the theory will rely on self-evident truth that is the basis of natural reality and is independent of human opinion.

In science, any theory that attempts to describe natural reality must explain or account for the facts that exist in Nature or else the theory fails. It only takes one provable fact that cannot be explained by the theory to show that a theory is deficient or incomplete and does not fully describe the entire reality of Nature.

With regard to the true legal meaning and interpretation of Article II "natural born Citizen" there are essentially only three theories that exist that account for all of the possibilities. We only need examine these theories to determine which one is most correct. The validity of any comprehensive scientific theory is determined by both its ability to account for the entirety of observable facts and for the entirety of governing rules that define Nature,

AND by the absence of contradictory evidence or facts or rules that would violate such a theory.

Of the three competing theories, two are publicly popular and one is little known. The correct theory, as I see it, is the one that I rediscovered and am describing. It is the one that is little known or publicly accepted, the Natural Law Theory.

Let us now state, in a summary fashion, the three Theories regarding "natural born Citizen"

1) The *Positive Law Theory* is the theory used by the government that relies strictly on the place of one's birth (jus soli) for the determination of who may qualify for the office of President under Article II. The soil jurisdiction of the U.S. is governed solely by the Positive Law jurisdiction of Congress and the Courts, and does not at all depend upon either parent being citizens of the United States at the time of birth of the offspring. This is the current governmental and majority popular opinion that formulates the belief that Mr. Obama is a lawful legitimate President since it is the basis of his Hawaiian birth, as is publicly reported and supported by Congress and the News media that is the reason that Obama is a legitimate President. We cannot say at all that the U.S. court system supports this Theory, because they have never addressed this issue in any court case so far in U.S. History. All court cases so far regarding this issue have been dismissed for lack of jurisdiction long before the merits of any cases have even been addressed. It also cannot be assumed that there is any case law that supports this Theory, because there is no case law in existence where this has ever been determined in political context for one who holds the Office of President strictly by soil jurisdiction, regardless of parentage, ever since the Sunset Clause of Article II expired.

2) The *Unity Theory* is the theory that is popularly held and promoted by those who hold that Obama is not legally qualified for the Office of President and therefore he is not a legitimate President. The "Unity Theory" says that Article II requires that a candidate for the Office of President must be both born on U.S. soil jurisdiction and also born to parents who were both U.S. citizen parents at the time of the birth. The "Unity" is one of soil jurisdiction and parentage which represents a unity of Positive Law (jus soli) and Natural Law (jus sanguinis) as defined by the Laws of Nature or blood inheritance. It cannot be said that the U.S. court system or case law supports

this Theory either, because again no court case or statutory authority has ever addressed or determined the Unity Theory.

3) The *Natural Law Theory* is the theory that is not so well known, which explains that as a matter of applied legal principles regarding the differences between Positive Law and Natural Law, that takes into account the political context of Article II, the term "natural born Citizen" in the Constitution is defined strictly by the Laws of Nature that define Natural Law by *jus sanguinis* that relies only on the blood inheritance of males (citizen father), because it is the males who naturally secure the citizenship and the natural sovereign political rights of the offspring via the Positive Law, since they are the ones who create the governments (Positive Law) in order to protect and secure the natural political rights of the offspring.

PROOFS

The Positive Law Theory Proof

We shall now show that the Positive Law Theory fails. All we need is a few facts that relate a few accepted doctrines or rules of law and political science that describe natural reality, and we shall see that we arrive at a contradiction that proves that the Positive Law Theory, which seeks to uphold Obama's legitimacy, contradicts natural reality, and therefore is a false theory, which proves conclusively that Obama is not a lawful President.

FACTS

1) The Declaration of Independence declares or implies that Sovereignty is a natural political right that is a function of the Laws of Nature that define Natural Law, not Positive Law.

2) There are at least two United States Supreme Court Cases that recognize and establish the principle in fact 1 above, and also define the sovereign relationship concerning political rights as flowing from the People to the government and not from the Government to the People. Here are the extract facts we need:

> *"Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but* ***in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts****." [Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356; 6 S.Ct. 1064 (1886)]*

and,

> "In Europe, the executive is synonymous with the sovereign power of a state…where it is too commonly acquired by force or fraud, or both…In America, however the case is widely different. **Our government is founded upon compact [consent expressed in a written contract called a Constitution or in positive law]. Sovereignty was, and is, in the people.**" [*Glass v. The Sloop Betsy*, 3 (U.S.) Dall 6]

3) There are only two types of *rights* in the universe. *Natural Rights* and *Legal Rights*. *Natural Rights* are derived strictly from the Laws of Nature and *Legal Rights* are strictly a function of man-made Positive Law. *Legal rights* are called *privileges*. *Privileges* or *legal rights* come from government. Natural Rights do not come from government or the Positive Law, and are not privileges, but are an endowment from whatever Creates the universe and the Laws of Nature.

4) The Constitution states "WE the People", implying that the government was created by the People to serve the People. (See 2 above). Since the People pre-exist the creation of the Positive Law (government), they obviously already possessed political rights. Thus their political rights can only have come from the Laws of Nature and must exist prior to the creation of any legal political rights that can only be created after the government (Positive Law) is established.

5) The purpose, intent, and meaning of Article II "natural born Citizen" was not to give up or abandon the pre-existing sovereign political rights of the People. (See 2 above)

The Central Hypotheses of the Positive Law Theory

1) Congress and the Courts are the sole sources of political rights for U.S. citizens, since only the place of birth or soil jurisdiction matters, and Congress has exclusive jurisdiction over territory as a function of the

Positive Law powers that have been delegated to the government by the People. See Congressional Research Services Memo link:

http://www.jedipauly.com/files/Members-of-Congress-Memo--Obama-Eligibility-Questions.pdf

2) Since territorial jurisdiction is governed solely by Positive Law powers of Congress, the political rights that are derived for U.S. citizens by 1 above are strictly legal rights only, and therefore are privileges.

3) 1 and 2 implies that one must be born into the privilege of qualifying for the Office of President. This would be similar to a Title of Nobility.

4) 1, 2, and 3 imply that the government is to be the body where sovereignty is vested, and thus certain sovereign political rights, which are only legal rights and not natural rights, are then delegated to the People by decree.

Logical Proof of Contradiction

1) The hypotheses 1-4 above prove that the relationship between the government and the People is in fact reversed from the actual facts that were previously stated above, because Hypotheses 1-4 imply that the government is the body where sovereignty is vested and certain sovereign rights are then bestowed to the People as privileges or legal rights only.

2) The hypotheses 1-4 above fail to explain or account for the facts previously stated that explain natural reality to be defined by natural political rights that are pre-existing and already belong to the People.

3) The Hypotheses 1-4 above imply that the People gave up their pre-existing sovereign political rights in the Constitution and its Article II, and became strictly citizen "subjects" of the Positive Law. This would define our political system to be that of a Monarchy form of Government, and not a Sovereign Republic of Sovereign citizens who only delegated certain sovereign powers to the government but retained their sovereignty as declared by the Supreme Court as quoted in the facts section above.

Conclusion

The above legal and logical factual examination proves by contradiction that the Positive Law Theory of Article II that attempts to define "natural born Citizen" in the Constitution by place of birth alone, and therefore support Obama as legitimate, fails and is therefore FALSE. This also proves conclusively that Obama cannot possibly be a legitimate lawful President, since his only claim to the Office is his place of birth in Hawaii, as his mother was statutorily defined to be too young to transfer U.S. citizenship at the time of his birth, and his father was never a U.S. citizen.

So far, without even relying on any correct theory that properly describes and defines Article II meaning, we have proven that Obama cannot be a legitimate President. We have also proven that Article II must be defined by something more than just the soil jurisdiction or by the Positive Law alone. The above proof is so self-evident and irrefutable, that it is just unbelievable that Congress, the Courts, Obama, and all the Nation's attorneys do not know that he does not qualify as a legitimate President. In the light of the above proof, it can be seen that the CRS memo from Congress is nothing but false propaganda designed to mislead the People. Also in the light of the above self-evident truth that is independent of opinion, that is so easy to determine, one can hardly accept that the efforts of the mainstream News and Press that have reported that Obama is legitimate because he was born in Hawaii, and that there is nothing to the reports that he is not lawfully qualified, are anything but deceptive propaganda designed to provide cover for Obama's and the Congress' criminal behaviors.

The Unity Theory Proof

The Unity theorists seem to believe that the Positive Law or Positive Law Theory are insufficient to determine or define the true meaning and interpretation of Article II "natural born Citizen", because they insist on a unity of soil and both parents as being what defines Article II "natural born Citizen". However, it is unclear if they even know objectively that Obama is not qualified under Article II for the reasons discovered above, because they seem to have no clue at all that their Unity Theory is not even necessary to prove that Obama is not legitimate, as we have just shown. The debate of

Obama's legitimacy, according to the Unity theorists, is defined by these following beliefs or hypotheses:

Unity Theory Hypotheses

1) The Constitution does not declare a definition of "natural born Citizen" in Article II, or any place in the Constitution or in U.S. case law. (This just so happens to be true and factual.)

2) They contend that U.S. Supreme Court cases, like *Wong Kim Ark*, which define a "natural born citizen" without regard to parents, contradicts Article II, since they insist that Article II must include both parents. (In fact, it is not a contradiction because "natural born citizen" in U.S. case law is not the same thing as "natural born Citizen" in the Constitution.)

Wong Case link:

http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/historics/USSC_CR_0169_0649_ZS.html

3) The Unity theorists contend that the reason that the unity is required is so that those who are to grow up to be candidates for the Office of President will be born without any foreign-owed allegiances. As if being born on foreign soil territory or having a foreign mother or father automatically causes one to be born owing an allegiance at birth to a foreign sovereign authority. This belief is rooted in the *non-controlling* statement by Judge John Bingham below, that I have borrowed from this web address:

http://naturalborncitizen.wordpress.com/

John Bingham, aka "father of the 14th Amendment", was an abolitionist congressman from Ohio who prosecuted Lincoln's assassins. Ten years earlier, he stated on the House floor:

"All from other lands, who by the terms of [congressional] laws and a compliance with their provisions become naturalized, are adopted citizens of the United States; all other persons born within the Republic, of parents owing allegiance to no other sovereignty, are natural born citizens. Gentleman can find no exception to this statement touching natural-born citizens except what is said in the Constitution relating to Indians." (Cong. Globe, 37th, 2nd Sess., 1639 (1862))

Then in 1866, Bingham also stated on the House floor:

"Every human being born within the jurisdiction of the United States of parents not owing allegiance to any foreign sovereignty is, in the language of your Constitution itself, a natural born citizen." (Cong. Globe, 39th, 1st Sess., 1291 (1866))

4) Finally, the Unity theorists contend that a definition existed prior to the existence of the U.S. Constitution and 1776 Revolutionary War for Independence, which is a direct substitute for Article II "natural born Citizen", which is in line with their Hypotheses 1 and 3. This believed definition is borrowed from a renowned French legal scholar who was the pre-eminent authority of his time on Natural Law legal theory. His name was Emmerich de Vattel. His work that the believed definition is borrowed from is called:

THE

LAW OF NATIONS

OR

PRINCIPLES OF THE LAW OF NATURE APPLIED TO THE CONDUCT AND AFFAIRS OF NATIONS AND SOVEREIGNS

Here is the web address to that work:
http://www.constitution.org/vattel/vattel.htm

In particular, they are referring to this statement taken from Book I Chapter 19 section 212 sentence two:

"The natives, or natural-born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens."

Hypotheses Summation

So these are the beliefs or hypotheses that describe the Unity Theory that attempts to explain the meaning and interpretation of Article II "natural born Citizen", who the Unity theorists like attorneys Orly Taitz (web search her numerous cases) and Mario Apuzzo (Kerchner v. Obama) and others support

and espouse. Furthermore, the Unity theorists contend that Obama was not actually born in the United States, but was in fact born in Kenya, which they cannot objectively prove since there is no available conclusive evidence of this supposed fact although the circumstantial evidence is compelling. They also point out that Obama's father was never a U.S. citizen, which does appear to be factual, since it has been publicly stated by Obama himself that this is true, and neither he nor anyone has ever denied or disputed that. As a result of the above hypotheses concerning the unity of soil and parents, including their belief that Obama was not born in Hawaii and did not have a citizen father when he was born, nor even ever had one, the Unity theorists contend that Obama is not lawfully qualified and is therefore an illegitimate President.

Now let us examine the serious problems with these cobbled-together hypotheses, that also utterly fail from a legal scientific perspective, to properly describe a valid theory of law regarding Article II meaning and definition.

Logical Proof of Omission

As we have said already, a scientific theory of law that properly describes legal reality and natural reality must be based on facts of Nature and include the Laws of Nature. The easiest and most obvious way to see that the Unity Theory is false is to realize that the sentence of Vattel that underlies Unity Theory Hypothesis 4 above is so badly taken out of context (and from an English translation of the original French, no less) that it utterly fails to observe the facts of the work that it is taken from. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 utterly fails to comprehend and include the Laws of Nature that are actually being described, if one were to just bother to finish reading the rest of the paragraph and the following Sections 215 and 216. The Unity theorists completely ignore the entire contextual philosophy of Vattel's work since it is contradictory to their hypotheses. Even the title spells it out clearly:

"PRINCIPLES OF THE ***LAW OF NATURE*** APPLIED TO THE CONDUCT AND AFFAIRS OF
NATIONS AND ***SOVEREIGNS***"

The entire discussion in the sections 212 and 215 and 216 etc. is all about the Laws of Nature that define political rights such as citizenship and other

political rights of Sovereign citizens. This fact is completely ignored by the Unity theorists and cannot be explained by their Theory because it contradicts them. The fact that the Unity theorists have taken the sentence entirely out of context has totally removed the application or the "applied" part of law, because they are not applying any legal principles to their hypothesis. In fact, they do not apply any legal principles of law at all to any one of the 4 Hypotheses above, meaning that their entire Theory is just supposition without any legal principles being applied.

Examine:

With Regard to Hypothesis 4

At this time, please read the first supplemental attached reference, "Analysis of Vattel's Relevance". The paper is entitled, "*He Blinded Them with Science: The Correct Scientific Analysis of Vattel's Relevance to "natural born Citizen*" by Jedi Pauly. From this document, you will learn of the details that contradict Hypothesis 4 and therefore contradicts the Unity Theory, proving that the Theory fails. (Or reference this link: http://www.jedipauly.com/articles/2010_11_24_correctanalysisvattel)

With Regard to Hypothesis 3

What Judge Bingham said is true, but again is taken entirely out of context. What Judge Bingham said is devoid of any applied principles of law to determine if it is necessarily inclusive as being defining upon Article II. Judge Bingham's statement is just a restatement of Vattel's observations of how Nature herself defines a native when there are no competing jurisdictions. Since there are no competing jurisdictions, there can be no foreign-owed allegiances.

To properly provide context to Judge Bingham's statements in order to determine whether they have any relevancy to Article II "natural born Citizen", one must examine the details of when one might owe a political allegiance. I have done this in my paper entitled "*The Unity Theory: Fact or Fiction?*" In that paper I show how the soil jurisdiction of a foreign state or a foreign mother at birth cannot possibly cause one to owe any allegiance to a foreign state that can interfere with Article II's purpose and intent, which is to protect loyalty and allegiance to the United States.

At this time, please see the second supplemental attached reference entitled "*Competing Theories*" by Jedi Pauly. (Or reference this link: http://www.jedipauly.com/articles/2011_03_02_competingtheories)

With Regard to Hypothesis 2

If one is an astute observer, one will observe that in the Constitution the term "Citizen" such as is used in "natural born Citizen" and in "Citizen of the United States" occurs numerous times. Then suddenly, the use of upper-case "Citizen" ends and the use of lower-case "citizen" begins (as in "citizen of the United States") in the 14th Amendment.

In every case in the Constitution where upper-case "Citizen" is used, it is only being used as a reference to a specific political class of Sovereign citizens who are recognized to have specific political rights. In all cases, it is not used to define a citizen, it is only a reference to a specific class of citizens that already exist and are defined someplace other than in the Constitution. The situation changes with the 14th Amendment, where now the Constitution is defining who shall be a citizen, and is not referring to citizens who already have defined pre-existing political rights.

The political rights of the class "Citizens of the United States" are not the same as the political rights of the class "citizens of the United States". The reasons for this are laid out in an attached paper with Supreme Court references, entitled "*Citizen*". The *Wong Kim Ark* Supreme Court Case uses "citizen of the United States" not, "Citizen of the United States" in its language. At this time please read the third attached reference document "Citizen.doc". (Or reference this link: http://www.jedipauly.com/articles/2011_04_07_citizenship)

Also, one may reference the following website, page "Appendix C", for more case law references that show that the political rights of the class "citizens of the United States" are only *derived* from privileges or l*egal rights* and are not *sourced* from the Laws of Nature and are different from the political rights of the class "Citizens of the United States" which are sourced from the Laws of Nature as Sovereign natural political rights.

http://usa-the-republic.com/mark%20of%20beast/AppendixC.htm

After the 14th Amendment was established, *Minor v. Happersett* [88 U.S. 162 (1875)] judged that not all natural born citizens prior to the 14th

Amendment even had the same political rights to be recognized in the States. The findings in *Minor v. Happersett* necessitated the 19th Amendment.

http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/historics/USSC_CR_0088_0162_ZO.html

Now, let us refer back to Unity Hypothesis 2's main point regarding *Wong Kim Ark*. The main issue with *Wong Kim Ark* is that it has no application to Article II "natural born Citizen" at all, because the *Wong* case is not even a case regarding natural sovereign political rights, but only *legal* political rights of the class of small-case "citizens", not of the class of large-case "Citizens". The term "natural born citizen" used in U.S. case law that defines 14th Amendment "citizens" is defined to be the same as meaning a "naturalized" citizen or a citizen "subject" of the Positive Law jurisdiction, as would be defined under English Common Law as one who is a "subject" of the king's Positive Law jurisdiction which is exercised by the soil territory that the king/government claims dominion over. *Wong* has absolutely nothing at all to do with naturally occurring Sovereign political rights.

The above investigation shows that, once again, there is absolutely no application of any law or recognized legal principles being applied to the underlying hypotheses of the Unity Theory.

Furthermore, this examination also further exposes the previous Positive Law Theory to be wrong, by realizing that *Wong* only defines "natural born citizen" and only does so strictly by the Positive Law powers of government, and *Wong* does not define "natural born Citizen" which is strictly defined by the Laws of Nature that define Natural Law.

The term "natural born citizen" from U.S. case law and the term "natural born Citizen" from the Constitution are actually legal Homonyms (sound and spelled and pronounced the same but mean something different). The former one, "natural born citizen", is a ***legal term*** that is defined in U.S. Positive law, and the latter one is just a descriptive adjective "natural born" describing a proper noun "Citizen", and is not a legal term. These terms are also legal Antonyms (***opposite*** sources of political rights, the former one *derives* rights from Positive Law only and the latter *receives* rights from Natural Law only).

With Regard to Hypothesis 1

The first Hypothesis of the Unity Theory is a true statement, but it is what is missing that makes it misleading and actually false as a basis for a theory. Since there are absolutely no legal principles of law being applied by the Unity theorists, they fail to discover that *Article II "natural born Citizen" is not supposed to be defined in the Constitution or by U.S. case law*.

Since they are not applying any recognized principles of law at all, there is no recognition by the Unity theorists of just what the Constitution itself is, an expression of *Positive Law*. If they would just realize that much, they might realize that one of the purposes of the Constitution and Positive Law is to secure the *unalienable* natural rights that are received from the Laws of Nature, that is the other remaining and *opposite* body of law to that of the Positive Law. The fact that the Positive Law is meant to secure the Natural Law rights is plainly declared in the Declaration of Independence.

"That to *secure these rights (*meaning natural rights), Governments (Positive Law) are instituted among *Men* (proper noun meaning males)" [emphases added]

If the Unity theorists only understood ***context*** as an established defining legal principle of law, they would then discover that "natural born Citizen" is already fully defined by the Laws of Nature as *a political right* (that is the legal *context* of Article II, after all) and is only declared in the *Positive Law* at Article II in the Constitution in order to be *secured*. Therefore "natural born Citizen" is not supposed to be defined in the Constitution or in U.S. Positive Law.

Conclusion

We have just shown that not one of the underlying Hypotheses of the Unity Theory has any principles of law applied to or in them. The Unity Theory is pure speculation. To call it a "theory" is being generous. A failure of any one of the Hypotheses would be sufficient to render the Unity Theory invalid, and we have shown that all 4 fail! This is not a proper theory at all, and no one with a rational thinking mind can accept this as a valid basis to determine the meaning and interpretation of Article II "natural born Citizen".

Natural Law Theory Proof

By the process of elimination, we have arrived at the only remaining possibility, since all that is left is the Natural Law Theory that describes Article II "natural born Citizen". I will now describe the logical proof and observable facts that forces one to accept the Natural Law Theory to be true and valid.

Proof Number 1

PROOF BY ELIMINATION

Logical Facts and Proof

1) The term "natural born Citizen" is not defined in the Constitution or in U.S. case Law or by any statute.

2) The Constitution and U.S. Case Law and Statutes represent the entirety of U.S. Positive Law.

3) The U.S. legal system is defined by both Positive Law and Natural Law.

4) Since Article II "natural born Citizen" is not defined anywhere in U.S. Positive Law, there is only one remaining possibility, it must be defined by Natural Law.

5) The Laws of Nature define Natural Law.

6) Due to 4 and 5, Article II "natural born Citizen" is defined by the Laws of Nature alone.

Proof Number 2

PROOF BY NATURAL OBSERVATION

We will incorporate Proof Number 1 into Proof Number 2.

Natural Self-Evident Observation Proof

Example 1. Suppose you have two children from the same mother, but different fathers. Suppose one father is a Noble King and the other is a

commoner. Then one child will be a Prince with a legitimate natural claim to the Throne and the other child will not.

Example 2. Now suppose you have two children from one father who is a Noble King, but the two children are from two different females. Both of the children will have legitimate natural rights of inheritance to the King's throne.

Examples 1 and 2 prove that it is the males who determine the political rights of the offspring, in accordance with Vattel and according to the Laws of Nature, and the females (mother) are not relevant or determinative under Natural Law.

Example 3. Now suppose that a King and his wife who is pregnant decide to go on a vacation, and they leave their home country and kingdom and go to another country. Now suppose that the wife goes into labor early and she has a son while on vacation in the foreign country. Back home, the child would be considered a Prince and will inherit from his father the natural political right to be a Sovereign representative of the Monarchy and be in line to succeed his father and one day become king. The young Prince might be entitled to the privilege of citizenship as a *legal right* obtained from the foreign country he was born in due to soil, but it will have no bearing on his *natural unalienable political right* to claim the Throne of his father's country.

We have now shown that the soil is not determinative with regards to natural unalienable political rights, and that the unalienable political rights come from the males. Now incorporate the conclusion at point 6 from Proof Number 1 above and read 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; "** [*Emphasis added*]

And now one may also understand why the Declaration of Independence says:

"... That to *secure these rights*, Governments are instituted among *Men*"...

Meaning males, because natural political rights come from and are secured by males.

Conclusion

Proofs number 1 and 2 above show us that Article II "natural born Citizen" is defined solely by the Laws of Nature. Furthermore, since Article II is a legal political context that is defined solely by the Laws of Nature, we are talking about natural sovereign political rights which are *unalienable rights*.

We have shown above that neither the soil (place of birth) nor the mother are determinative to realizing who secures these political rights to the offspring, but that it is only the male or citizen father that determines.

Since any political rights that are due to soil or a mother are just legal political rights and not unalienable political rights, those legal political rights can be gotten rid of. Since you can get rid of your legal political rights by voluntary consent, as they are not unalienable rights, you can also get rid of any foreign owed loyalties or allegiances by voluntary consent. That is why Article II provisions provide a 14-year residency requirement that uses *time* and *distance* (which are both functions of the Laws of Nature) in order to allow one to sever any voluntary foreign-owed loyalties and allegiances that might be due to voluntary political right privileges. The 14-year residency permits one to reclaim the natural sovereign political rights inherited from a citizen father and sever any foreign owed allegiances, since one cannot ever divest oneself of *unalienable* rights. This protects the sovereignty of the United States and protects loyalty to the Constitutional Republic.

Therefore, Article II "natural born Citizen" is just referring to a citizen who is born to a U.S. citizen father, so that the child will inherit the natural political right of U.S. sovereignty as an unalienable natural right due to the Laws of Nature, and the place of birth and the citizenship status of the mother are both irrelevant.

END OF PROOF