

The True Meaning of Article II “natural born Citizen”

Note: In this discussion, "natural born Citizen" is a specific proper noun title usage of "Citizen" and means "natural born citizen of the United States", a title, hence the capitalization of "Citizen" in my writings and in Article II, because you always capitalize titles in the English language. Whereas "natural born citizen", with a lower case "citizen", means "citizen" as a general noun usage, so that "natural born citizen" is referring to a general concept, or referring to other countries which are republics with citizens who produce their own natural born citizens. Only the male U.S. citizen from a State of the Union can have sex to create a natural born Citizen by his sex act, whereas any male citizen of a republic can have sex to create a natural born citizen of the father's country. I will endeavor to keep the upper and lower cases separate for clarity. Also be aware that, in general under U.S. law, the general noun "citizen" can be referring to either a naturalized citizen or a natural born Citizen, and care must be taken to provide the proper legal context when reading codes, court cases, and rules regarding citizenship so that when one encounters the word "citizen" by itself, one can comprehend which one of the two different types is being referred to, because they both don't have all of the same political rights recognized under U.S. law. In general, naturalized citizens are recognized to be treated the same as natural born Citizens EXCEPT with regard to the Office of President or Vice President.

U.S. Jurisprudence is supposed to be based upon both Natural Law and Positive Law

As a matter of the science of jurisprudence, the legal system is supposed to recognize and be both Natural Law and Positive Law, and is supposed to recognize that they are two separate and distinct jurisdictional authorities under the science of jurisprudence, two halves of the law which compromise two opposite and opposed jurisdictional authorities, each with the power and ability to be the source of rights and to create citizens, who can both be recognized to be citizens at birth. The Natural Law half is the superior and pre-existing jurisdictional authority which comes before and ahead of the Positive Law jurisdiction, and which the Positive Law jurisdiction is not permitted to violate because that is defined as a 'crime'. Only the citizens who are created out of Natural Law authority are declared in Article II to be able to be President. The citizens who are created with Positive Law authority are banned in Article II in order to prevent monarchy and religious forms of government.

The legal system and the jurisdiction of the courts in the United States is recognized in the Constitution in Article III, Section 2, as mandated to be BOTH Natural Law (called the "Law" jurisdiction in Article III, Section 2), and Positive Law (called "Equity", "Admiralty", and "Maritime" law in Article III, Section 2, which are all branches of Positive Law).

The "Law" jurisdiction is essentially referring to Natural Law, i.e., referring to violations of the political Laws of Nature, which are to be protected in the Constitution by the nbC clause, by the

criminal code in Title 18, and by the 1st Amendment, and by other due process and equal protection clauses in other parts of the Constitution and its Amendments. The "Law" jurisdiction is essentially referring to the criminal code (violations of the political Laws of Nature) or violations of the laws of the United States which deal with securing the natural rights of the People in a Republic, so that it deals with that which are violations of the Laws of Nature (Natural Law), and any violation of a Constitutional provision or Constitutional issue or U.S. code regarding securing natural political rights for natural persons. This is entirely the purpose of the Constitution, and what the Constitution in multiple places is meant to protect. That is the "Law" jurisdiction, the criminal code, codes dealing with Constitutional issues and securing natural rights for natural persons. In contrast, Positive Law (Equity Law, Admiralty Law, and Maritime Law) deals with civil law only, violations of that which is agreed to (contract law, meant to secure natural rights and property), and basically has punishment for malum en se mostly removed, i.e., has the criminal jurisdiction removed (punishments under violations of the Natural Law removed, except in Admiralty which still carries corporal and capital offenses and punishments derived from offenses to the Laws of Nature). Which is what contract law is (Equity Law, Positive Law, only without the criminal jurisdiction punishments and jail time), the opposite of Natural Law, the opposite of the "Law" jurisdiction that does include the punishment of the criminal code and capital punishment for malum en se violations of the rules.

If they did not teach this to you in law school, and if you do not realize this fact of the U.S. legal system, and how these two jurisdictional authorities exist, how they form the basis of the science of jurisprudence, and are separate existing jurisdictions, jurisdictions which are opposite and opposed to one another, but exist side-by-side and work hand-in-hand to make up a complete objective legal system, then you do not even have the basic legal education to even begin to comprehend the definition of natural born Citizen, let alone read a statute or the Constitution and comprehend them. It is impossible. I know that multiple Harvard Law School professors have gone public with videos on YouTube over the last 7+ years and shown themselves to be incompetent fools who do not even comprehend this basic knowledge of American jurisprudence, and are thus incapable of explaining the law governing nbC status. Which is so very easy to explain once you comprehend and accept that your legal system is supposed to be both Natural Law and Positive Law, and you realize that nbC status is defined under Natural Law only, not under Positive Law, and is just secured and protected under Positive Law in Article II by declaring the natural law right. With this understanding, then everything becomes easy to comprehend in terms of Natural Law (the "Law" jurisdiction in Article III, Section 2), the production of natural born Citizens by natural procreation from males who are already U.S. citizens of a State of the Union, and Positive Law ("Equity" law jurisdiction of Congress under immigration and naturalization) producing decreed naturalized citizens at birth out of natural born SUBJECTS of their Positive Law jurisdiction which only applies to the offspring of non-citizen fathers or unknown fathers, or to the offspring of male citizens who are also indigenous natives of Guam or Puerto Rico or of any federal territory or possession.

Here is a clue. Under English Common Law, which is the legal system under the monarchy form of government, they do not have "citizens", only SUBJECTS and natural born SUBJECTS of the king and government. The SUBJECTS and natural born SUBJECTS are born as subjects of the king's Positive Law authority at birth, and are adopted into the king's society of commoners, and granted some of the rights of citizens by decree with Positive Law authority, but

are not actually bona fide “citizens”. They are actually called “commoners” under English Common Law, not “citizens”. This is where we get our laws governing immigration and naturalization, which are codified into the 14th Amendment for those who are natural born SUBJECTS of immigration and naturalization at birth; which does NOT include the offspring of foreign ambassadors, NOR the offspring of U.S. citizen fathers who come from a State of the Union, unless the father is unknown. Even though these natural born subjects are granted some of the rights of citizens from the king (Congress) at birth, it does NOT include the right to be the head political leader of the country. A foreign non-citizen father is not recognized to have any right secured by Article II, to pass on to an offspring the right to be the head political leader of the country (King or President), as such a right is reserved for Royalty only under English Common Law, i.e., for the king and queen and their offspring and family only. And under U.S. law, the right is reserved only for the male who is already a U.S. citizen from a State, and his offspring. And for the female citizen and her offspring, but she must take steps to secure the right for herself and her offspring by her choice in husband/father of her offspring. In order to be a natural born SUBJECT of the king and government at birth, you only had to be born on the king's soil or born to a mother or a father who was a SUBJECT of the king/queen, and then you were also born as a natural born SUBJECT of the king/queen and their government.

We retained that aspect of the English Common Law and monarchy government, and separated the soil and mother from the male father of a State of the Union, who is now recognized to be a “citizen” who can have sex to produce natural born Citizens, not a “subject” who has sex to create natural born SUBJECTS. And we retained the female and soil for Congress to use, in order to determine natural born subject status for those offspring of non-citizen fathers. Thus we granted Congress the authority to apply their jurisdiction based upon soil birth or birth to a citizen mother, to apply to those who are born as natural born SUBJECTS of Congress' Positive Law authority at birth, which used to be an authority which belonged to the king and/or queen and their government, the authority which was taken away from the monarchy and granted to Congress. And now, that authority only applies to the offspring of non-citizen fathers, or unknown fathers, offspring born on the soil under the 14th Amendment as SUBJECTS, or born to a citizen mother as SUBJECTS of a statute passed in 1932 for those offspring of U.S. citizen females who make offspring with non-citizen males and are also born outside of the soil jurisdiction of Congress, or born to the offspring of the male indigenous natives of the federal territories and possessions under the 14th Amendment, or born under other authorities governing the federal territories and possessions. And Congress just grants naturalization (citizenship) at birth by declaration in the 14th Amendment, or by statute, to those offspring. Those are Positive Law citizens, citizens born of Equity Law, not citizens who come from the Law jurisdiction declared in Article III, section 2, i.e., the citizens born of Natural Law, i.e., the one's who arrive as citizens due to natural sexual procreation from among the population of existing U.S. State citizens (males) and are just declared in Article II in order to secure the Natural Law right of inherited citizenship and inherited right to be the head political leader of the country, which is a recognized natural right under U.S. law, not a legal right. Congress does not grant the right to be President, which is not even a power or authority they even have to grant to people because that right is a natural right, not a legal right, and Congress is not the Creator of Nature, the source of Natural Rights! CONGRESS IS NOT GOD, and neither are the judges of this court!

The male Colonial Forefathers were all natural born British SUBJECTS, who all lived under English Common Law prior to 1776. That law did not recognize any right for the male subjects to be the head political leader of the country or to be able to pass on a right to be the head political leader of the county to their offspring created by their sex act. Therefore, they threw off English Common Law and declared that 'all men are created equal', meaning that all humans are politically equal at birth as a function of Nature (Natural Law), and thus any male and female citizen (but not a SUBJECT or natural born SUBJECT) can be the head political leader of the country and have sex and pass on that right to their offspring, and it is not just a privilege reserved for Royalty, but is a natural political right which comes from Nature (Natural Law).

So, our Founding Fathers realized that under a Republic with "citizens", it would be recognized that U.S. "citizens" who come from a State of the Union can be the head political leader of the country (President), and can pass on that right to offspring at birth who will be natural born Citizens, born free from Positive Law jurisdiction attachment at birth to define their membership rights or political rights in the society. They would not be natural born SUBJECTS who are born subject to the king or government for their political rights and membership rights in the society, under the English Common Law of the monarch; NOT secured in U.S. Positive Law (Article II) which is Roman Civil Law, not English Common Law! The right to be nbC status comes from Natural Law, and is just secured under Article II, which is Roman Civil Law and U.S. Positive Law. The right does not come from monarchic Positive Law, which is called English Common Law. The SUBJECTS and natural born SUBJECTS under English Common Law, have no recognized right to be the head political leader of the country or to pass on that right to an offspring. Any subjects who would even try to claim such a right are guilty of Sedition and Treason against the Crown and so are put to death.

Then it was left to the authority of Congress under Immigration and Naturalization to determine which of the offspring of non-citizen fathers from foreign countries, or of fathers who are not native to the States of the Union (like from Guam or Puerto Rico, or from any federal territory or possession, for example, which is treated the same as from a foreign country), which of those offspring are natural born SUBJECTS of Congress' Positive Law authority to adopt and grant citizenship via naturalization, i.e., by legislative decree, decreed citizens at birth by Positive Law declaration, naturalized citizens at birth created out of natural born SUBJECTS at birth. This is why it is declared in the court case of *Wong Kim Ark*, and in the law dictionaries that natural born SUBJECT is synonymous with naturalized citizen, and with native born citizen, one who is born a native of the soil jurisdiction and so dependent upon the soil jurisdiction of Congress for their right of citizenship. And this law is all inherited from English Common Law of the monarch. The terms 'natural born SUBJECT', 'naturalized citizen', and 'native born citizen' are all synonymous terms which are defined under Positive Law [see Supreme Court case, *U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark* 169 U.S. 649 (1898)], and defined this way in the Bouvier Law Dictionary 1856, 6th rev. ed., and also in the 1883 edition, and all refer to the offspring of non-citizen fathers or the offspring of citizen fathers indigenous natives of the federal territories and possessions, like Guam or Puerto Rico, for example, offspring born on the soil jurisdiction of the United States, or born to a citizen mother. Those are the natural born SUBJECTS of immigration and naturalization under the 14th Amendment or under a statute, who are just adopted and declared by legislation to be citizens at birth. These are naturalized citizens at birth and cannot be President, as a naturalized citizen is the legal opposite of a natural born Citizen,

which can be verified by simply reading the law dictionary definition of naturalized citizen in the Bouvier Law Dictionary, here:

http://www.constitution.org/bouv/bouvier_n.htm

When you read the definition of naturalized citizen in Bouvier's, keep in mind that any offspring of a non-citizen father or of a father who is a native of a federal territory or possession, is born as a political alien with respect to the offspring of U.S. citizen fathers who come from a State of the Union, because only the States and their citizens are a party to the contract called the U.S. Constitution! As a matter of contract law, Article II can only secure a right to be a citizen and a right to be the head political leader to pass from citizen father to the offspring at its birth for those fathers who are a party to the contract, which are only the citizens of the States. Not for the foreign male non-citizen and their county, who are not even a party to the Constitution, so it does not even secure any right for them at all! That was left to Congress under their new authority under immigration and naturalization to determine later, which offspring of non-citizen fathers can be citizens, which does NOT include the authority to grant the right to be President to SUBJECTS of Congress, which is already prohibited by Article II declaration. Eventually, almost 100 years AFTER the Adoption of the Constitution, we codified the English Common Law power to adopt foreign-made offspring and grant them citizenship based upon soil birth with the 14th Amendment, to apply to the offspring of any foreign non-citizen male, regardless of ethnicity, as prior to the 14th Amendment, Congress had unlimited authority to prohibit naturalization based upon ethnicity or skin color, which prohibited Blacks from naturalizing as U.S. citizens.

Regarding the citizen female and whether she has any right to pass on nbC status to her offspring created by sex: In the Supreme Court case of *Minor v. Happersett* 88 U.S.162 (1875), we are instructed that there are no political rights contemplated at all for females in the Constitution or secured for females in the Constitution, which is why we had to have a 19th Amendment in order to secure the natural political right of females to vote. Thus the Minor court declared that the nbC clause is only meant to secure nbC status for the offspring of the male State citizens. This is appropriate, is not an inequity towards females, and is all that is necessary in order to secure the right of the female citizen also.

By securing the right of the male citizen from the State only, then that automatically secures political equality for the female, because it places the power and authority under her own jurisdiction if she wants to secure nbC status for her offspring, as she must do so by her choice of male sex partner to father her offspring. She is free to have sex with any male U.S. citizen or non-citizen. If she produces an offspring with a non-citizen father or with a male from a federal territory or possession, then her offspring will be a natural born SUBJECT (naturalized citizen) at birth. If she produces an offspring with a male U.S. citizen who comes from a State of the Union, then she will have secured nbC status for her offspring.

Therefore, it should be obvious that it is unnecessary to secure a separate right for the female citizen in Article II, because just by securing it for the male only, this permits the female to be politically equal to the male and to secure nbC status for her offspring by herself. This is one of the reasons that it is declared in the Declaration of Independence that "...in order to secure these

rights, Governments are instituted among Men,” where this “Men” is capitalized to mean specifically MALES! The natural political order is that it is the responsibility of the males of the society to secure the natural political rights of the females and offspring of the society. But first you must secure the natural political rights of the males of the society with the Positive Law, and then the females and offspring can secure their own natural political rights via attaching to their citizen husbands and citizen fathers which then secures the rights of the female citizen, 100% under her authority and jurisdiction and ability to secure, once you secure the right for the male citizen first.

We can see the Natural Law in operation by the nbC clause because both males and females are born as natural born Citizens (*Minor v. Happersett*), because both males and females are born of U.S. citizen fathers who come from a State of the Union. And, both male and female U.S. citizens can secure nbC status for their offspring by their own free will and sex act. It is just due to the fact of natural biology that only females give birth to offspring, which dictates that only the female can give birth to either a natural born SUBJECT or a natural born Citizen, and the *Minor* court declared that the two types of citizenship are mutually exclusive, so that you can only be born one or the other at the time of birth, not both. Thus biology determines that females are not bound by their citizenship and are naturally dependent upon males and the father’s political condition in order to determine and secure the natural political condition of their offspring at the time of the birth. Only the male is naturally bound by his citizenship to only be able to make natural born citizens of his own country by his sex act. Females can naturally have sex with foreign males and create natural born citizens of other countries regardless of the citizenship of the mother, but male citizens cannot. Even if the male citizen has sex with a foreign non-citizen female, the offspring will only be a natural born SUBJECT in the mother’s country, but will still be a natural born citizen of the father’s country (as long as the father’s country is not a monarchy).

The entire point of Article II is to abolish monarchy and religious forms of government and involuntary subject status at birth, in order to eliminate any dependency upon the Positive Law of the government (King, Church, or Congressional authority) for our political rights and societal membership rights, in order to erect a Republic with citizens who have natural political rights recognized, which were not recognized under English Common Law, and declare the offspring of the U.S. citizen fathers who come from the State of the Union to be natural born Citizens, a function of Natural Law, i.e., natural sexual procreation, NOT born as natural born SUBJECTS (soil birth or birth to a citizen mother). This is so that a right to be the head political leader of the country can be recognized to exist and to pass on from father to offspring as an inherited natural right, NOT a BESTOWED LEGAL RIGHT (Positive Law only), i.e., WITHOUT the offspring having to be born a SUBJECT of Congress for their right of citizenship or right to be President, i.e., dependent upon Positive Law at the time of birth, for their right of citizenship and right to be the head political leader of the country (President). The nbC clause is meant to secure a right for the offspring of U.S. citizen fathers who come from a State of the Union to be recognized to be a natural U.S. citizen, offspring who can be born ANYWHERE ON EARTH TO ANY MOTHER and still not be born a SUBJECT of immigration and naturalization at birth, but be able to already claim citizenship and the right to be the head political leader of the country as inherited. Without having to go through immigration and naturalization, i.e., WITHOUT having to be born on the soil or be a natural born SUBJECT under the law, because under English Common Law,

SUBJECTS and natural born SUBJECTS have no recognized right under that law which permits them to be the head political leader of the county or to pass on that right to an offspring. And even under English Common Law of the monarch, that right must be inherited from the king (or queen, which shows us that the right of inheritance from the female only exists as an artificial privilege that is bestowed upon, and reserved for, Royalty females only). But under U.S. Positive Law (Article II), which is Roman Civil Law and Republican Law, and codifies the protection of the Natural Law right to be the head political leader of the county as nbC status, you must inherit the right from a citizen father who comes from a State of the Union; which any female can attach to in order to secure that right for their offspring, even if the female mother is not a U.S. citizen! The term "natural born" means born of natural procreation and inheritance, which follows the male citizen father as an observed natural order rule. See Vattel, *Law of Nations*, Book 1, Chapter 19, Sections 212 to 217, here:

http://www.constitution.org/vattel/vattel_01.htm

It does NOT mean created by legislation, i.e., by Positive Law, which only goes by the soil or mother and only applies to the offspring of non-U.S. citizen fathers, or to those who are offspring of fathers not from a State of the Union, or are unknown.

In this fashion, the Forefathers secured the natural principle that "... all men are created equal ..." to abolish and ban monarchy and religious forms of government. When it comes to the right of citizenship under U.S. law, the soil and the mother are only used by Congress under their Positive Law authority under immigration and naturalization in order to determine who is a natural born SUBJECT of their authority at birth, so that such can be naturalized by legislation and granted citizenship at birth as naturalized citizens by legislative decree (Positive Law citizens). Naturalization only applies to the offspring of non-citizen fathers, or unknown fathers, offspring who are born on U.S. soil or to a citizen mother, or to the offspring of the males from the federal territories or possessions, because only those groups of offspring are born as natural born SUBJECTS of Congress. Under U.S. law, the place of birth and mother are 100% irrelevant to claim nbC status; and this is 100% in line with Vattel's *Law of Nations*, Book 1, Chapter 19, Sections 212 to 217. The nbC is just born under the jurisdiction of the citizen father from a State who secures the right of his offspring's citizenship naturally and alone, with nothing but his own testimony legitimating his offspring to be a U.S. citizen; something that only the male citizen must do, because only males do not give birth to offspring, and so without a modern DNA test, males cannot rely upon the witness testimony of any other to prove whom their offspring are.

The mother never has to legitimate her own offspring. She and the courts always rely upon witnesses to the birth, or upon the lack of witnesses to the contrary, in order to legitimate her offspring, and her offspring is just granted citizenship by Congress if she makes that offspring with a non-citizen husband/father, such that the right to be a citizen for her offspring is 100% Positive Law and is secured by Congress alone, not by her or even under her jurisdiction to secure. [See *Nguyen v. INS* 533 U.S. 53 (2001)] The right to be nbC status is only under the authority and jurisdiction of the citizen father from the State of the Union to secure, which proves that the right to be nbC does not even come from Congress or from our mothers. If the female U.S. citizen or even a non-citizen female wants the jurisdiction under her authority, then

she must make that happen by her choice in husband/father of her offspring. That is what makes her naturally politically equal to the males. This can be easily verified by examining Title 8 USC Section 1409, which is the code governing the right to be a citizen at birth for the offspring of U.S. citizen parents when only one of the parents is a U.S. citizen, and the parents are NOT married. The code sets a different standard for male and female citizens, and places a compulsion only upon the male citizen to legitimate the offspring as U.S. citizens when the offspring is made with a foreign non-citizen mother and the parents are not married, because the act of marriage between a man and woman serves to automatically legitimate the offspring of the male husband/father before they are born. In contrast, the female U.S. citizen does nothing, and for offspring made by U.S. citizen females with non-citizen males out of wedlock, the female citizen never has to legitimate her own offspring and can just naturally rely upon witness to the birth to legitimate (birth certificate), and her offspring are just granted citizenship automatically at birth by legislation, proving that the Positive Law of Congress only attaches to the female citizen and her offspring made with foreign non-citizen males. With regard to male and female U.S. citizens who come from a State of the Union, the authority of immigration and naturalization can only ever attach to female citizens and their offspring, and then only if the female citizen chooses to create an offspring with a male who is not a citizen and/or not from a State of the Union. It never attaches to the offspring of the male U.S. citizen who comes from a State of the Union, except to declare that it is the male citizen and his testimony alone which is required to secure his offspring's right of citizenship naturally, because his offspring are already recognized to be nbC in Article II. This is all verified by the Supreme Court in the case *Nguyen v. INS* 533 U.S. 53 (2001). This is necessary in order to avoid the offspring of a U.S. citizen father from a State of the Union being a natural born SUBJECT, because natural born SUBJECTS do not have any recognized right to be the head political leader of the country under U.S. law, or under English Common Law, so that we are not defined as a monarchy and religious form of government which only has natural born SUBJECTS instead of natural born Citizens.

Once you secure the right for the male U.S. citizen from a State of the Union to be able to create a natural born Citizen offspring by sex, as codified in Article II, then the female citizen can secure nbC status for her offspring by her own free will and sex act. Thus the natural right to secure nbC status for an offspring, and the natural political equality of males and females to have sex and create a natural born Citizen offspring is secured equally, but not separately, because Nature makes females naturally dependent upon males to become pregnant. Females are naturally dependent upon the testimony of male citizens from a State of the Union, the only males who are even a party to the Constitution, in order to secure nbC status for their offspring. It is just a fact of Nature, a Natural Law, a natural political Law of Nature. When a female cannot depend upon a U.S. citizen male to secure nbC status, by default, or by assumption, like the father is not a citizen or is unknown, such that there is no known legitimization of the offspring as U.S. citizens from a known U.S. citizen father who comes from a State of the Union, then the female citizen must rely upon Positive Law and subject status (soil birth, or statutory authority which brings her offspring under subject status if the offspring is born of a foreign non-citizen father and not born on the soil) for the right of citizenship for her offspring to be granted as a legal right.

Now you can go read Vattel, *Law of Nations*, Book 1, Chapter 19, Sections 212 to 217, and you will discover that when Vattel says in sentence number two of Section 212, that the natural born

citizens are, "... those born in the country, of parents who are citizens", Vattel does not mean physically born in a country, but rather he means those who are politically born into their country as being naturally of the country or naturally born into their country as a natural member of the country due to natural sexual procreation from parents who are already citizens of the country; not citizens created by legislation, but citizens created by natural procreation from among the population of existing citizens. Of the two citizen parents, Vattel explains in the very next sentence and in the rest of Section 212 and other sections, that by the laws of Nature alone, i.e., by Natural Law, which is what the title of Vattel's book is about, it is the father alone and his testimony which secures the political rights of his offspring, and thus the offspring "naturally" follow the father and inherit his political rights in the society. We don't naturally inherit our political rights from females because we do not rely upon their testimony to secure nbC status. Under U.S. law, we do not even rely upon the testimony of the female to secure any right for her offspring to be a citizen at all, even to secure naturalized citizenship! Females are naturally dependent upon male citizens in order to secure nbC status for their offspring. We naturally inherit our political rights from our fathers; from males, not from females! Females are naturally dependent upon males to secure nbC status for an offspring.

Males are not naturally dependent upon females to secure nbC status for their offspring. Males are only naturally dependent upon females in order to create a natural born offspring, offspring whose political status as an offspring is independent of the female's citizenship. Males are not naturally dependent upon females to secure nbC status for their offspring, which they do alone with nothing but their own testimony when they legitimate their offspring as theirs. I just explained to you again, and above, how Natural Law and U.S. Positive Law both reflect this self-evident reality that Vattel is declaring, and shows how they both secure the right of inherited citizenship to come from the father alone. Now go read on past sentence number two in Section 212, and discover how Vattel goes on to explain that the place of birth and mother are not even factors in determining nbC status, which is also true under U.S. law.

I hope this helps you to understand the law better. I hope that you can now understand that law in the United States is supposed to be both Natural Law and Positive Law, recognized in Article III, Section 2, and that there are two types of citizens (natural born and naturalized) who are both recognized to be citizens at birth, but only the natural born Citizen, as declared in Article II, can be President. One type of citizen at birth is created from Natural Law authority out of the sexual procreation by male U.S. citizens who come from a State of the Union who just have sex and create more citizens with the sex act, offspring who are NOT born as SUBJECTS of federal authority under immigration and naturalization, and so do not have to be born on the soil or to a citizen mother for their right of citizenship claim, do not rely upon Positive Law or Congress for their right of citizenship, are NOT adopted citizens (because in the civil law, "natural born" means the legal opposite of "adopted", as in the sentence, 'Are those your natural born children (natural children) or are they adopted?') and thus nbC status is simply an inherited right of citizenship, a function of Natural Law authority, not a legal right of citizenship which is a function of Positive Law authority only. Thus nbC is a STATUS, a FACT of Nature, not an adopted citizen or a legal grant of citizenship. Either you are born of a citizen father from a State of the Union or you are not. It is NOT a bestowed legal right of citizenship which comes from Congress (soil birth). The term "natural born" means NOT born of legislation or born with subject status, as being born with subject status is not natural but artificial, under Positive Law,

which itself is artificial. Rather, nbC means a citizen born of natural procreation from a male who is already a citizen, without Positive Law authority attaching at all (soil or mother), as Vattel explains throughout Sections 212 to 217, his point being that we are naturally from, and belong to, the country of our fathers, not our mothers.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paul Guthrie". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "P" and a long, sweeping underline.

Paul Aaron Guthrie
7797 South Carefree Drive
Pendleton, IN 46064
317 485 4229

03/07/16