

This can be found at: <https://newswithviews.com/JBWilliams/williams296.htm>

Other related at: <http://Anderson4TheConstitution.com/1.DicksFairlyCompleteExplanationWithDefinitionOfNaturalBornCitizen.pdf>  
[http://Anderson4TheConstitution.com/3.NaturalBornCitizen\(SomethingExtraordinaryHappeningParts1&2-byDevvyKidd\).pdf](http://Anderson4TheConstitution.com/3.NaturalBornCitizen(SomethingExtraordinaryHappeningParts1&2-byDevvyKidd).pdf)  
<http://Anderson4TheConstitution.com/2.NaturalBornCitizen-HowDefinedByTheFoundingFathers-ORIGINAL-INTENT.pdf>  
<http://anderson4theconstitution.com/4.ANaturalBornCitizenIsATrueCitizen-JBWilliams.pdf>  
<http://people.mags.net/tonchen/birthers.htm>

# A NATURAL BORN CITIZEN IS A TRUE CITIZEN

## PART 1 of 2

By [J.B. Williams](#) December 11, 2014 NewsWithViews.com

Despite numerous efforts by our illustrious legal and academic professionals to use precedence and 1946 Rules of Procedure to alter or abolish the Natural Born Citizen requirement for the Oval Office found in Article II of the U.S. Constitution, using false history and tortured legal interpretations of 14th Amendment laws and cases pertaining to *naturalized* citizens, to avoid the need to amend in order to actually alter, the true meaning of the term Natural Born Citizen remains exactly as it was when our Founders chose the status as a requirement for high office in 1787.

In short, the term Natural Born Citizen is synonymous with the term “True Citizen.” Its point of origin is very well documented, as is the true meaning of the term and even the purpose should be obvious to every thinking individual with at least third grade reading and comprehension skills.

## HOW IT CAME TO BE IN OUR CONSTITUTION

- Our early settlers had left England and other parts of Europe because those countries had already experienced a shift away from Natural Law concepts to Common Law concepts, wherein men were making laws that infringed upon the Natural Rights of the people, not the least of which was religious persecution.
- Our very first “founding document” by our earliest settlers was the [Mayflower Compact](#). An effort to establish the New World on Natural Law concepts and the Natural Rights of a free people.
- By 1774, there was a growing division between members of the original 13 colonies and England due to Common Law statutes which again, were infringing upon the Natural Rights of settlers in the New World. It was about much more than a tax on Tea. This was the reason for our Founders split from British Common Law rule that resulted in the Revolutionary War to declare our independence from British rule and establish a new independent sovereign nation. The First Continental Congress was convened by the colonies to begin the separation with Britain and form a sovereign nation of our own, one that would be based upon Natural Law and Natural Rights.
- In April of 1775, the Revolutionary War had begun, as Britain attempted to force its Common Law statutes on the 13 colonies by sending troops to the New World, infringing upon the Natural Rights of our early citizens.

- The Second Continental Congress convened in 1775, to begin the work that would result in the writing of our [Declaration of Independence](#), which Jefferson wrote in just 17 days, once commissioned with the task.
- In October of 1775, Benjamin Franklin received three (3) copies of [The Law of Nations](#) from Charles W.F. Dumas. Dumas was a "person of letters" aka a well-read man, he was a Swiss publisher. He was also a Swiss diplomat to America at the time, on behalf of the Swiss government.
- Franklin placed one of the three copies of [The Law of Nations](#) in the New York Library, kept a copy for himself and gave the third copy to Thomas Jefferson, as Jefferson was writing the Declaration of Independence.
- On December 9, 1775, Franklin wrote a letter of thanks to Dumas, stating as follows: *"It came to us in good season, when the circumstances of a rising State make it necessary to frequently consult the [Law of Nations](#)."*
- On July 4, 1776, the 13 colonies ratified the Declaration of Independence, in which the preamble states as follows:
  - "When in the Course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, **the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them**, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." - You can easily see that the Founders were entirely focused on creating a new sovereign independent nation governed by The Laws of Nature, not British Common Law. Their understanding of Natural Law and Natural Rights came from [The Law of Nations](#), which Dumas had sent to Franklin during the founding period of the nation.
- On July 25, 1787, Founder [John Jay recommended in a letter](#) to members of the Constitutional Convention that the term "Natural Born Citizen" (synonymous with True Citizen) be placed in Article II as a requirement for the Office of President and Commander-in-Chief, stating that only a Natural Born Citizen of the United States would be eligible for high office. Members of the Constitutional Convention agreed, adding the condition to the document that would be ratified less than two months later.
- In September of 1787, the ratified U.S. Constitution included a Natural Law term Natural Born Citizen, synonymous with the term "True Citizen," as a condition for access to the Oval Office, in Article II. You can also find in Article I, the enumerated power of Congress to enforce The Law of Nations, which means enforce all Rights under Natural Law as defined in [The Law of Nations](#).
- Since then, there has been no amendment altering the original definition of Natural Law or Natural Born Citizen, nor has there been any amendment removing the Natural Born Citizen requirement for the Oval Office in Article II.

- On eight separate occasions, between 2004 and 2008, members of Congress proposed altering or eliminating the Natural Born Citizen requirement in Article II, failing in each of those attempts.
- To legally alter anything in the Constitution, there must be an amendment to the Constitution and that amendment must be very specific in wording, as to what is being changed, altered or removed. The amendment itself must also be in perpetuation of the original context and intent of the Constitution, and cannot violate the original text or intent, or the measure itself becomes “unconstitutional.”
- As a result, the term Natural Born Citizen means exactly the same thing it meant when the Founders made it a condition for access to the Oval Office in September of 1787.
- Upon being elected the First President of the new United States in 1789 under the new constitution, on October 5, 1789, George Washington withdrew the one copy of The Law of Nations from the library where Franklin had placed it in 1775, as Washington explained in his notes, in order to learn the foundations upon which the new system of government had been formed and in order to properly govern under those concepts in accordance with the Founders intent under the constitution.
- Washington never returned that copy of the book to the library. 221 years later, the staff of Washington's Mount Vernon Estate learned of this situation and replaced the book at the New York Library. No effort to collect the estimated \$300,000 in late fees was made.
- On June 15, 1804, the 12th Amendment clarified that the same Natural Born Citizen and all other Article II requirements for the Presidency applies to the Vice Presidency, as the Vice President may succeed the President to the Oval Office.

## **WHY IT WAS PLACED IN OUR FOUNDING DOCUMENTS**

The Founders reasoning for the Natural Born Citizen requirement in Article II is self-evident in the history of how it came to exist in our founding documents. In his letter to the Constitutional Convention, requesting the Natural Born Citizen be added as a requirement for high office under Article II, Jay explained his reasoning...

*“Permit me to hint, whether it would be wise and seasonable to provide a strong check to the admission of Foreigners into the administration of our national Government; and to declare expressly that the Commander in Chief of the American Army shall not be given to nor devolve on, any but a natural born Citizen.”* – [John Jay letter dated July 25, 1787](#)

The reasoning of our Founders or the “original intent” of our Founders was a matter of National Security. In this case, it pertained to the highest and most powerful political office in our new nation, the office of Commander-in-Chief, or President of the United States.

The Founders reasoning and intent was clearly to prevent anyone with natural foreign loyalties or entanglements due to dual, divided or foreign citizenship, from ever holding

the office of Commander-in-Chief. Therefore, as stated in Article II of the U.S. Constitution, *“No person except a natural born citizen, - shall be eligible to the office of President;” (or Vice President as of Amendment XII)*

The section which states *“or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution,”* pertains only to the Founders themselves, as they were all “citizens” of the United States at the adoption of the Constitution, but none of them were “natural born Citizens” at the adoption of the Constitution.

## **HOW THE LAW OF NATIONS DEFINES NATURAL BORN CITIZEN**

Many have argued that the U.S. Constitution does not define the term natural born Citizen. Of course, the U.S. Constitution, unlike most legal documents, does not have a definitions section at all. None of the words that appear in the Constitution have a definition attached to them.

This is due to the fact that the U.S. Constitution was not written in legal-ese, but rather in basic simple common English, that any person able to read could easily comprehend, avoiding any need for citizens to rely upon the legal interpretations of men to understand their basic Natural Rights protected by the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The ethical research of any subject requires an honest effort to seek truth, a complete study of all available information, when possible, a reliance on first source evidence, as opposed to second hand information or third party opinions which might be socially or politically motivated, and a recognition of and respect for the point of origin.

As the term was borrowed from Natural Law as defined by Emmerich De Vattel in the Law of Nations, we must refer to Chapter XIX Sections 212-220 of Book I to glean the true meaning of the term natural born Citizen, as it was used and intended by the Founders in 1787.

Contrary to the popular belief of many today who have not yet completed their research on the subject, Vattel did not define natural born Citizen in one sentence, or even one paragraph. Vattel spent nine sections of Chapter XIX defining natural born Citizen, and he

makes it very clear that the term is synonymous with the term “True Citizen.”

<https://newswithviews.com/JBWilliams/williams297.htm>

# **A NATURAL BORN CITIZEN IS A TRUE CITIZEN**

**PART 2 of 2**

By [J.B. Williams](#) December 11, 2014 NewsWithViews.com

Close and complete examination of Chapter XIX Sections 212-220 will eliminate all doubts and questions concerning the true definition of natural born Citizen, aka True Citizen. Upon inspection of all related sections, we find that Vattel has a common thread throughout concerning the meaning of natural born Citizen, or True Citizen. The following excerpts represent that common thread in order of appearance... the common thread in **bold** for ease of identification purposes.

1. “As the society cannot exist and perpetuate itself otherwise than by the **children of the citizens, those children naturally follow the condition of their fathers**, and succeed to all their rights.” – Section 212

2. “**The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children**; and these become *true citizens* merely by their tacit consent.” – Section 212

3. “I say, that, **in order to be of the country, it is necessary that a person be born of a father who is a citizen**; for, if he is born there of a foreigner, it will be only the place of his birth, and not his country.” – Section 212

4. “These are a kind of citizens of an inferior order, and are united to the society without participating in all its advantages. **Their children follow the condition of their fathers**,” Section 213 pertaining to “inhabitants” or foreigners allowed by the state to settle and stay in the country.

5. “It is asked whether the children born of citizens in a foreign country are citizens? The laws have decided this question in several countries, and their regulations must be followed. (59) **By the law of nature alone, children follow the condition of their fathers**, and enter into all their rights (§ 212); the place of birth produces no change in this particular,” - Section 215 pertaining to children of citizens born abroad, which refers back to Section 212.

6. “**The natural, or original settlement, is that which we acquire by birth, in the place where our father has his**,” – Section 218 pertaining to the settlements of naturals...

7. “We have observed above (§ 212), **that they have a right to enter into the society of which their fathers were members**. But every man is born free; and the son of a citizen, when come to the years of discretion, may examine whether it be convenient for him to join the society for which he was destined by his birth.” – Section 220 again refers back to Section 212, when attaching the natural rights of an individual to the natural birth father as it pertains to the individual right to withdraw from society once of legal age.

As you can see, a complete study of how the Law of Nations addresses natural born Citizen, True Citizen, is consistent in attaching Natural Birth Right Citizenship to the natural birth father.

**Some ask, what about the mother?**

As you can see, the mother is not mentioned as a means of passing natural born Citizenship to the child. Only the father is mentioned. Why?

In U.S. Law governing naturalization under the 14th Amendment, a mother can pass basic citizenship to the child at birth, but not natural born Citizenship under Natural Law. As a result, “These are a kind of citizens of an inferior order, and are united to the society without participating in all its advantages.”

In cases of married parents, all Natural Rights follow the blood of the father, including that of the family name, or surname, the family crest, family lineage and all natural rights of inheritance, including the natural right to inherit the citizenship of the father at birth by tacit consent, without any naturalization process.

This is because under the laws of marriage, two people become one entity, the father being the dominant legal figure within that union. The father is held most responsible for the actions of his family, to include his wife and his children.

Recent efforts, again by our illustrious legal and academic professionals, to alter even the age old definition of marriage have led to much anxiety and confusion over this very basic precept. The push for “equality” between genders and shifting gender roles have very much complicated this matter and frustrated many.

When the mother is not married, the condition of the natural birth father may or may not be known or documented.

However, when properly and ethically interpreting a document which is 227 years old, the definitions in force at the time the terms were used is the only correct definition, no matter how anyone feels about those definitions.

Our Constitution is written in stone, in the sense that it cannot be altered at all other than by amendment process. It does live and breathe, but only to the degree that society sees fit to amend the original Articles via the amendment process to meet with modern times. The amendment process was intentionally made very cumbersome to prevent people from altering our foundations of freedom and liberty on a whim for light or transient purposes.

The mere fact that some don't like it does nothing to change it. Even court opinions, or congressional legislation, or executive orders do not have the power to constitutionally alter anything in the Constitution or Bill of Rights, or supersede them in law. Such efforts are all “unconstitutional” on their face.

## **INALIENABLE NATURAL LAW**

It is not possible to change a condition which exists in nature. Our Founders wisely chose Natural Rights under Natural Law as the foundation for everything they created, because the Laws of Nature are constant, they are inalienable, they are beyond the power of man to regulate.

I was recently asked why I thought [The Law of Nations](#) has never been updated for modern use since its publication in the mid-1700s.... I answered... Because the Laws of Nature never change.

Some have no clue what the Laws of Nature are or how they affect their daily lives, much less why our Founders based everything upon these Laws. So, I often put the subject in terms that people can relate to by using the example of gravity, another law of nature.

Men can dislike, legislate against, rule against in the courts or order from existence from the Oval Office, gravity. The very best of scientists have never been able to alter or abolish gravity. At best, they have only been able to temporarily escape the effects of gravity. Yet sooner or later, what goes up will still come down. And that's because gravity, like natural born Citizen, is a condition which exists in nature and it is inalienable by men.

Because our Founders had no trust in the pursuits of men in power, they entrusted everything to the Laws of Nature, and provided in our Founding documents that our Rights are all Natural Rights, Rights that exist in Nature, of Nature's God, not of men easily manipulated via Common Law processes.

By 1823, Thomas Jefferson among other Founders had already witnessed the destructive nature of an unbridled judiciary, stating as follows;

*“At the establishment of our Constitutions, the judiciary bodies were supposed to be the most helpless and harmless members of the government. Experience, however, soon showed in what way they were to become the most dangerous; that the insufficiency of the means provided for their removal gave them a freehold and irresponsibility in office; that their decisions, seeming to concern individual suitors only, pass silent and unheeded by the public at large; that these decisions nevertheless become law by precedent, sapping by little and little the foundations of the Constitution and working its change by construction before any one has perceived that that invisible and helpless worm has been busily employed in consuming its substance. In truth, man is not made to be trusted for life if secured against all liability to account.”*

## **WHY DON'T MODERN LAWYERS KNOW THIS?**

In short, it's because they do not want to know it and even more importantly, they do not want you to know it...

The Rules of Procedure “unconstitutionally” installed in the U.S. Justice system in 1946 made it possible for lawyers to alter or abolish Natural Rights in their Common Law by simply legislating against them, ruling them out of existence from the bench, or ordering them out of force from the Executive Branch.

Since then, American Law Schools have not taught Natural Law of Constitutional Law. Instead, they have focused on how to infringe upon the Natural Rights of every American by using precedence and procedure found only in Common Law. They had granted themselves the power to change law, the Constitution and the Bill of Natural Rights, by

merely “setting a new precedent” or blocking public access to the proper justice system via “procedures of the courts.”

As a result, very few if any lawyers alive today know any of the truths presented in this essay on the subject of Natural Law and natural born. Further, even fewer want to know these truths and almost none of them want the American people to know this historic truth.

However, the truth exists... and it will not vanish, so long as the people grasp it, protect it and preserve it. They must, as the information provided herein is much greater than the subject of who can and cannot hold the office of President...

It is the Foundation of freedom and liberty, without which, the people of the United States will possess neither.

I have spent so much time and effort researching and writing on this subject for one single reason... I know that if the American people cannot get this one thing right, there is no chance that they will get anything else right in their efforts to defend the Constitution and regain control of their stolen Republic.

This is the lynch pin to everything. If the American people can get this one issue right and act swiftly to enforce it, they can save their country. If they cannot get this right, they will get nothing else right...For part one click below.

**Click here for part -----> [1](#),**

© 2014 JB Williams - All Rights Reserved

---

*JB Williams is a writer on matters of history and American politics with more than 3000 pieces published over a twenty-year span. He has a decidedly conservative reverence for the Charters of Freedom, the men and women who have paid the price of freedom and liberty for all, and action oriented real-time solutions for modern challenges. He is a Christian, a husband, a father, a researcher, writer and a business owner. He is co-founder of action organizations [The United States Patriots Union](#), a civilian parent organization for [The Veteran Defenders of America](#). He is also co-founder of [The North American Law Center](#), a citizen run investigative legal research and activism organization preparing to take on American's greatest legal battles. Williams receives mail at: [jb.uspu@gmail.com](mailto:jb.uspu@gmail.com)*

Web site 1: [www.PatriotsUnion.org](http://www.PatriotsUnion.org)

Web site 2: [www.VeteranDefenders.org](http://www.VeteranDefenders.org)

E-Mail: [JB.USPU@gmail.com](mailto:JB.USPU@gmail.com)