

## *Various Rejected Presidential Eligibility Requirements*

When the Founding Fathers composed the eligibility requirements for the office of the President, they did it with great deliberation, not wanting to make any mistake that might endanger the future survival of the nation, nor an unwise choice that might result in serious harm due to a nefarious President with a secret foreign loyalty acquired via indoctrination by a father who was a foreigner and a loyal subject of a European King.

A potential for great harm was embodied in the powers that the President would command because his office would be combined with that of the Commander-in-Chief of all military forces; Army, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, and state militias in time of national emergency. Therefore it was imperative that he be incapable of possessing any loyalty to any nation other than the United States, -the nation of his father.

If the United States was not the nation of his father, then it would not be his nation alone but only one of two to which he might be loyal, and that possibility was not a situation that was free from any possibility of disloyalty to the United States.

They therefore choose the only circumstance that was free of the possibility of disloyalty, and that choice was the one that precluded all citizens born of foreign fathers, -meaning those born with either no inherited U.S. citizenship, or born with state-granted "son of the soil" citizenship, which at least one state (Virginia) granted to the children of its immigrants. So to be safe, they wrote the statute with the exclusion of anyone who was born to a foreigner, meaning a father who was not a U.S. citizen (either by birth or via naturalization).

They confronted various ways that they could write the eligibility requirement, including the following:

- 1 Any person born within the sovereign States of America shall be eligible to the office of the President.
- 2 Any person born with citizenship in the union of the States of America shall be eligible to the office of the President.
- 3 Any person born a citizen in any of the united States of America shall be eligible...
- 4 No person except a born citizen of the united States of America shall be eligible...
- 5 No person born of a foreign father shall be eligible...
- 6 No person born outside of the United States of American shall be eligible...
- 7 No person except a son of citizens, or of immigrants who have declared their intent to become U.S. citizens, shall be eligible for the office...
- 8 No person except a natural born citizen of the United States shall be eligible...
- 9 No person except a citizen at the time of the adoption of this Constitution shall be eligible...
- 10 No African, Asian, Eastern European, Southern European, Catholic, Muslim, Jew, Hindu, Buddhist, nor son of such, nor any female, divorcee, adulterer, felon, blasphemmer, uneducated or property-less person shall be eligible to the office of President.

That is ten possibilities for who could be allowed to be President. Most of them sound pretty decent, and yet they rejected all of them, and most for the same reason; -they would have allowed the son of a foreigner to be President, -or worse. They would have required something totally impractical or impossible. Which ones were those? Eight and nine.

Eight would have required the impossible since the oldest person who was born as a natural citizen of the United States was only 11 years old when the Constitution was written. Everyone else was born as a subject of the British Empire, and only became a citizen of the United States via the "mass naturalization" of the Declaration of Independence. They were natural born Americans because they were born to Americans, and born in America. But they were not natural citizens of a nation that did not even exist when they were born. They were the ones covered by possibility # 9.

It allowed any person of the founders generation (not described in # 10) to be President, but required that they be alive when the Constitution was written. That generation would not live forever, so when they were all deceased, there would be no one left qualified to be President.

Since they could not allow natural born citizens to be President yet, (being as they were all children) it was necessary to combine the two requirements of both eight and nine, and the result is what was written in Article II, Section I of the Constitution:

"No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of the President, neither shall any person be eligible to that office who has not attained to the age of thirty five years, and been fourteen years resident within the United States."

So candidates would be from one of two allowed groups. One included not only the off-spring of foreigners, but also actual foreigners who had become naturalized by state governments. The other excluded both of those types of citizens and allowed only children of citizens to be President. They were the 98% who were not born to foreigners but to American fathers. They would be entrusted with the dangerous power of the Commander-in-Chief.

Children born to foreigners, even though considered citizens from the time of their birth in one or more States, would not be entrusted with that power. Rather, only those born *as* citizens would be entrusted, because they would have no connection to any foreign power, people, nation, or culture.

A concept that needs to be parsed, -a hair that needs to be split is that of the difference between being born *with* United States citizenship thanks to permission of the government, and those who are born without U.S. citizenship as a gift, but as an innate element of their political nature. They are the children born *as* citizens because they are born *of* citizens.

No one born of a foreigner is born *as* a citizen, but is instead, thanks to a Supreme Court misinterpretation of the 14th Amendment citizenship clause, born *with* U.S. citizenship. They are citizens *from* or *at* birth, not citizens *by* birth. Citizenship is something that they are allowed. Their national membership is bestowed by the rule of law, not by nature. That law can be changed via the amendment process. It is not permanent and immutable, as is nature, (and *political* nature as well).

It is citizenship by permission, -not by parentage. It is based on the place of one's nativity, not on one's nature because their inherited political nature is foreign. "As is the father, so is the son."

The U.S. Supreme Court opinion in Wong Kim Ark in 1898 resulted in children of foreigners being viewed as being U.S. citizens even though not previously recognized as citizens in many or most states. Previously citizenship depended on their father becoming naturalized, i.e., becoming an American. Then they acquired derivative citizenship through him. They were then legal citizens.

But those born *as* citizens, -born of citizens, were not citizens by U.S. law because no law governing their membership in the nation was ever written, nor was ever needed, nor could legitimately be legislated because it was bestowed by nature and was above the reach of human-devised authority. Natural citizenship is not "obtained", it is not "acquired", it is not "bestowed" by human law, but is, -like race and ethnicity, something with which one is born via the Principle of Natural Membership.

One cannot be something completely different from what one's parents are. One cannot be born a natural member of a group (or nation) in which their parents are outsiders, -foreigners. One can only be a natural member of the group to which their parents belong, just as in all natural animal groups.

Lions can't be born as natural members of the Zebra herd because they are not born with the Zebra nature. They are what their parents are. Lions. Same with foreigners. Their children cannot be born as natural Americans. To be an American requires the intervention of deliberate legislation or judicial ruling to grant something with which one was not born, and that grant can begin at birth.

From a 1795 discussion of "natural born subject":

"It is an established maxim, received by all political writers, that every person owes a natural allegiance to the government of that country in which he is born. Allegiance is defined to be a tie that binds the subject to the state, and in consequence of his obedience, he is entitled to protection..."

"The children of aliens, born in this state, are considered as natural born subjects, and have the same rights with the rest of the citizens."

~one response: "But 'subjects' are not 'citizens'; and we fought a war so that we could be transformed from 'subjects of the British Crown' to Citizens of a Republic!" Publius Huldah

#### *Splitting hairs & parsing ambiguity:*

"It is an established maxim, received by all political writers, that every person owes a natural allegiance to the government of that country in which he is born."

That sounds like a clear, straight-forward statement, but it is woefully confused and confusing thanks to the use of a wrong word, namely the word "*person*" when person is not actually meant.

It should have used the word "adult", or even more realistically; "adult male". Neither children nor maidens nor wives had any responsibility for the defense of the nation, and could not be called into national service in time of emergency or threat, but men and male youths could. So to couch the concept of "allegiance" correctly, it is necessary to recognize that no child or female "owed"

any government or any king any "allegiance" because they were under the jurisdiction of the male head of the household, and not directly under that of the government.

No child is born "owing allegiance" to anything. Its only obligation is to eat, sleep, and grow. It is not "owned" by the government via the concept of a natural parentally acquired loyalty being owed to the king in exchanged for the rights and protections provided by the government.

It is instead totally under the father's jurisdiction, and has no responsibility toward the government until reaching adulthood. Only then does the natural responsibility to help defend the nation and ensure its survival become an element of one's membership in the society and nation of one's birth.

"Allegiance is defined to be a tie that binds the subject to the state, and in consequence of his obedience, he is entitled to protection..."

Clearly that concept is not a direct transmutation from the code of a monarchical government established on The Divine Right of Kings to that of a free society established on the Natural unalienable Rights of Man. In an attempt to justify the reign of a single individual over all others who were his equal in every measure (Christians all) the concept of the "legitimate" rights of Kings was formulated. He was God's chosen authority on Earth and even the head of the Church in the case of break-away England, so his authority was characterized as divinely ordained, and people were therefore obligated to obey his dictates and edicts.

As a means of making such a requirement of obedience seem like a fair trade-off for some benefit, the benefit of "protection" was offered as a perfect basis for the "relationship" between subject and Lord. But the whole thing was just a conceptual concoction and could have had its wording reversed and yet still make sense, perhaps even greater sense, as in:

"Allegiance is defined to be a tie that binds the the state to the subject, and in consequence of the Protection the state provides, the king is entitled to his subject's obedience..."

In that wording, the Protection comes first, and obedience is a "natural" response of "owed allegiance" in gratitude and indebtedness for that pro-

tection. That justifies the monarch expecting obedience to his rule, -it makes the members of his kingdom subject to his will, making them his "subjects", but in time and with the hegemony of royal greed, that subjection came to be assigned not just while they lived and worked within his realm, but for an entire lifetime no matter where on earth they may have settled. Such a gross over-reach was evidence of the true motive behind the whole concept of "allegiance".

“The children of aliens, born in this state, are considered as natural born subjects, and have the same rights with the rest of the citizens.”

In reading that statement, it is easy to assume that he stated something that he did not in fact state. He did not state that the children of aliens actually *are* natural born subjects, but merely are to be considered as, or treated as, or equal to, but not identical to natural born citizens. In other words, their citizenship was essentially identical to that of natural citizens because there was zero difference in their rights and privileges. That was the same as the situation in England between actual natural subjects and children of alien subjects.

No difference existed in their relationship and responsibility toward the king's authority, nor their protection and rights. But England had one invisible difference from the individual states of America, -it had a national Army, a national Navy & Marine Corps, a national foreign service, and an office of national security.

Who they allowed to occupy the highest positions in the most critical offices involving national security and state secrets was of vital importance to preserving and protecting the Empire from its numerous enemies. The top leaders of the nation would not allow the sons of a foreigners to hold such sensitive posts because just one traitor could doom the nation. No one but a true "natural born" subject could be considered for such appointments. Such offices were not a right, -they were a unique privilege and privileges are not given to just anyone and everyone. They were reserved solely for those of whom there could be no doubt as to their loyalty, nor any reasonable possibility of disloyalty or treason. So while son's of alien subjects were treated as equal to natural subjects, in regard to national security a distinction was drawn and that distinction was very real.

But aside from the arcane, unseen, unknown offices and officers who filled those few positions, English subjects and American State subjects, i.e., citizens, were identical in the comparison between the natural citizen-fathered and the man-made alien-fathered members. Same rights and responsibilities. But...the Federal government was not the same as a State government. The national government included control of an Army and Navy, Marines and Coast Guard. It had top security posts that were just like those of England, with the Presidency being the greatest of them since it held the power of the Commander-in-Chief. Rules for who would be allowed to wield that power needed to be wisely chosen, and so they were, just as they were in England. No son of a foreigner would be entrusted with that great power. Only sons of Americans would be allowed.

That was not a narrow exception since 98% of American males were born to American fathers. So only the exceptions to the rule were ruled out. Only natural citizens were deemed as being trust-worthy with the power of the President. And that power was not a slight thing. King George said of George Washington something to the effect of "If he relinquishes power when his term is up, he will be the greatest man on earth."

In the relationship between nations, in particular England, power was central. How American power was used and for what purpose was central to whether or not the union would survive. So it was critically important that the person wielding it always be someone who would use it to protect the nation, and not compromise it in favor of a foreign monarch. Therefore no one born with a connection to a foreign monarch could be assumed to possess no loyalty of any kind to any government other than the United States.

Hence, they were required to be a natural citizen, -born of citizens, born *as* a citizen, and not a *dual* citizen, with dueling allegiances between two nations with two histories, two traditions, competing political philosophies, and potentially warring Armies and Navies. They must be what Barack Obama can never be. Their citizenship must be above the Constitution, and not due to some obscure statute that grants provisional citizenship to children of non-immigrant foreign men.