

[Posts via RSS](#) | [Posts via E-mail](#)

Search in site...

Submit Query

[Join with Fellow Citizens To fight for release of Obama’s vital records](#)

The Post & Email

Saturday, May 22, 2010 A.D.



[Sign the Petition! Demanding HI Govt. release Obama’s Birth Certificate](#)

- [Home](#)
- [Business](#)
 - [Our News](#)
 - [Economy](#)
- [Editorials](#)
 - [Fundraising](#)
 - [Letters to the Editor](#)
 - [You Investigate!](#)
 - [Blog of the Day](#)
- [World](#)
 - [Latin America](#)
 - [Europe](#)
 - [Africa](#)
- [Law Cases](#)
- [National](#)
 - [Internet](#)
 - [Interviews](#)
 - [Letters to Readership](#)
 - [People](#)
 - [Hawaii](#)
 - [Events](#)
- [Politics](#)
 - [Laws & Statutes](#)
 - [White House](#)
 - [Congress](#)
 - [Supreme Court](#)
 - [States](#)
 - [United Nations](#)
 - [Parties](#)
- [Science](#)
 - [Astronomy](#)
 - [Medicine](#)
- [Military](#)
- [Literary](#)
 - [Book Reviews](#)
 - [History](#)
 - [Philosophy](#)
 - [Poetry](#)
 - [Cooking](#)

- [Movie Reviews](#)

- [© 2009/2010](#)
- [About us](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Make a Donation](#)
- [Nominate a Blog](#)
- [Place an Ad](#)
- [Subscribe!](#)
- [Legal Fund](#)
- [Petition Hawaii Govt.](#)

The Senate defined “natural born Citizen” in 2008, and Obama didn’t qualify

DEMOCRAT SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY AND OTHERS “RESOLVED” THAT IT TOOK TWO CITIZEN PARENTS TO BE A “NATURAL BORN CITIZEN”

by *Tim DeJong*



Sir William Blackstone,
English law scholar whose
philosophy was based on
the Ten Commandments

(May 17, 2010) — The simple truth in evidence is Obama’s own declaration that he was born of a British father and is therefore not a “natural born Citizen.”

The [Constitution](#) is a modest document. Much of its meaning is in what is usually called common law. Some assume common law refers to [Blackstone](#) or English Common Law. The framers and many justices, Joseph [Story](#) among them, have referred to Vattel as our common law. Given that the first school of law established at a college in the Congress United (between the Revolution and the ratification) was that created at William and Mary by Thomas Jefferson, when James Madison was its president, and among its first students was John Marshall, and the stated structure of the curriculum was Law of Nations based upon [Vattel](#) and Adam Smith’s [Wealth of Nations](#). Can there be any doubt about the intent of the framers when justices including subsequent Chief Justice John [Marshall](#) cited Vattel when quoting “born on the soil of parents who are its citizens?” When the principal author of the 14th amendment, John [Bingham](#), cites Vattel “about which there has never been doubt,” the meaning of “natural born Citizen” is confirmed for at least the twentieth time.

James [Madison](#) said:

I entirely concur in the propriety of resorting to the sense in which the Constitution was accepted and ratified by the nation. In that sense alone it is the legitimate Constitution. And if that be not the guide in

expounding it, there can be no security for a consistent and stable, more than for a faithful exercise of its powers. If the meaning of the text be sought in the changeable meaning of the words composing it, it is evident that the shapes and attributes of the Government must partake of the changes to which the words and phrases of all living languages are constantly subject. What a metamorphosis would be produced in the code of law if all its ancient phraseology were to be taken in its modern sense. And that the language of our constitution is already undergoing interpretations unknown to its founders, will I believe appear to all unbiased Enquirers into the history of its origin and adoption.” Madison’s words define “the time-honored canons of statutory interpretation.” The words of our framers citing Vattel, and the subsequent use of the term coined by Vattel, “natural born Citizen” – not “subject.”

Framer Dr. David [Ramsay](#) pointed out in 1791:

A citizen of the United States means a member of this new nations. The principle of government being radically changed by the revolution, the political character of the people was also changed from subjects to citizens.

The difference is immense. Subject is derived from the Latin words, *sub* and *jacio*, and means one who is under the power of another; but a citizen is an unit of a mass of free people, who, collectively, possess sovereignty.

The Constitutional power to define “natural born Citizens” was not intended to be left to the states. It was our common law, understood by every jurist of the time in the most quoted, the most cited, and the most important legal document in the framing of our Republic. The Law of Nations was the most cited legal reference by almost a factor of four between 1789 and 1821 (followed by Bynkeshoek and [Pufendorf](#)).

The notion of “sovereign legal instruments” is a new twist.” We don’t need “sovereign legal instruments” to tell us that the four chief justices and dozens of justices of the Supreme Court who cite Vattel on “natural born Citizen,” and hundreds who cite Vattel on other legal matters (try to count the Vattel citations in James [Wilson](#)’s Philadelphia Lectures) have established our common law. There are well over 100 terms used in articles and amendments not defined in the body of the document. That was intentional. Madison, above, determined to keep the Constitution concise. A major role of the Supreme Court is to interpret the Constitution’s provisions.

Some of those submitting smoke are actually being paid by the White House, which in itself is a frightening testament to how close to tyranny we are.

Of course one could turn to that great legal scholar, Sen. Patrick Leahy, who agreed with former judge and HSA Secretary Michael Chertoff in 2008 when Chertoff said, “It is my understanding that a natural born citizen has two parents who are citizens.” This was, of course, part of the plot culminating in Senate Resolution [511](#) to insure that John McCain would be perceived as eligible to run against Obama, thereby silencing any questions about Obama’s failure to satisfy the “citizen parents” attribute of natural born citizenship.

Clever law professors such as Larry [Tribe](#), for whom Obama was a research assistant, and whom Elena [Kagan](#) pardoned after Tribe was exposed as a plagiarist, will try to confuse the issue, but our framers said it simply and clearly, citing Vattel. A natural born citizen is born on our soil of citizen parents. Obama is ineligible, and if we have to have another revolution to return to the values which make our republic great, we will prevail.

Read the original sources. They are understandable. When [Wong Kim Ark](#) is raised, that is a common Obot smokescreen. Horace [Gray](#) was appointed by the only other usurper to sit in the White House, Chester [Arthur](#), and his decision only applied to citizens, not natural born citizens. It is a confusingly-written document, but eventually cites *Minor v. Happersett* in which Vattel is cited. Since Wong Kim was never presumed to be a natural born citizen – he was born in San Francisco but of non-citizen parents – natural born citizenship was not at issue, and not determined. Some think Gray was creating smoke to protect his appointee.

Someone found an article written in a New York newspaper in 1789 describing a visit to George Washington’s New York office. Washington hadn’t yet entered the office when the reporters were admitted. Being reporters they noted that Washington, on his his first day as president had one book open on his desk,

Vattel’s Law of Nations. Law of Nations is a readable compendium of what was described as natural law drawing from and citing philosophers from Aristotle to Vattel’s contemporaries. Read it online or from Amazon or the library. Several of our framers, including Alexander [Hamilton](#), describe it as our common law.

© 2010, [The Post & Email, Inc.](#) All rights reserved internationally, unless otherwise specified. To read more on our copyright restrictions, see our Copyright notice on the subheader of every page, along the left margin.

The Post & Email

**IF YOU LIKED THIS REPORT, CLICK HERE TO DONATE \$1,
TO REIMBURSE OUR REPORTERS FOR THEIR EFFORTS.**

Possibly Related Posts:

- [» Defense Secretary's Answer to Ft. Hood Shooting: Tighter gun control](#)
- [» Only when the chips are down do you really know!](#)
- [» Editorial: Sept. 18, 2009 — Patriots: 'Tis the season to be Pac-ing!](#)
- [» What is a "Birther"?](#)
- [» Where are the American Patriots?](#)



Categories: [Editorials](#)

Tags: [Adam Smith](#), [Blackstone](#), [Bynkeshoek](#), [Dr. David Ramsay](#), [Emmerich de Vattel](#), [George Washington](#), [James Madison](#), [James Wilson](#), [John Bingham](#), [John Marshall](#), [John McCain](#), [Minor v. Happersett](#), [natural born citizen](#), [Obama](#), [Obama's eligibility](#), [Pufendorf](#), [Senate Resolution 511](#), [The Law of Nations](#), [U.S. Constitution](#), [Wealth of Nations](#)

59 Responses for “The Senate defined “natural born Citizen” in 2008, and Obama didn’t qualify”

1. *mr.smith* says:
[Friday, May 21, 2010 at 1:16 PM](#)

There must be someone, with stature, on board with this in order for it to go further. Someone big enough and loud enough to not be quieted on the subject. Recruit this person and move forward, arrest him

[Reply](#)

2. *reality* says:
[Friday, May 21, 2010 at 12:29 PM](#)

From Wong Kim Ark:

“Considering the circumstances surrounding the framing of the Constitution, I submit that it is unreasonable to conclude that “natural-born citizen” applied to everybody born within the geographical tract known as the United States, irrespective of circumstances, and that the children of foreigners, happening to be born to them while passing through the country, whether of royal parentage or not, or whether of the Mongolian, Malay or other race, were eligible to the Presidency, while children of our citizens, born abroad, were not.”

This is the DISSENTING opinion in this case. That means the side that lost. He is ADMITTING that the majority opinion in WONG KIM ARK says that born in the U.S. means natural born and eligible for the presidency. That is the problem....no cases say that u need 2 citizens to be parents....and hundreds say the opposite.

[Reply](#)

3. *James* says:

[Thursday, May 20, 2010 at 2:17 PM](#)

The eligibility lawsuit in Indiana: “Ankeny et. al. v The Governor of Indiana, Mitch Daniels” challenged BOTH Obama and McCain’s right to receive Indiana’s electoral votes on the grounds that neither was a natural born citizen. The original trial court and the Indiana Court of Appeals both disagreed and the Indiana Supreme Court refused to review the lower courts’ decisions.

<http://www.in.gov/judiciary/opinions/pdf/11120903.ebb.pdf>

[Reply](#)

o *TexomaEd* says:

[Friday, May 21, 2010 at 12:16 AM](#)

In the Ankeny v. Indiana case, the court issued a lame judicial attempt at defining the “natural born citizen” clause. They failed miserably, and this failure is very encouraging. Their arguments were weak.

Their main argument was that citizens are only born or naturalized, and that all born citizens are natural born citizens. The court failed to note that there are three classes of born citizens:

1. 14th amendment citizens – Persons born on US soil to alien parents domiciled here, according to the SCOTUS Wong Kim Ark case.
2. Statutory citizens – Persons born abroad to US citizens are citizens by federal statute.
3. Natural born citizens – Persons born on US soil to parents who are citizens.

All of the above are citizens, but each class has their citizenship bestowed through different circumstances. Some require the 14th amendment. Some require a statute. But natural born citizens require neither, for their citizenship is self-evident to all. The citizenship and allegiance of natural born citizens at birth is 100% American – these are the citizens that our Founding Fathers wanted for future presidents.

[Reply](#)

4. *reality* says:

[Thursday, May 20, 2010 at 10:35 AM](#)

The resolution did not say you need 2 citizen parents to be Natural Born...it said since McCain had 2 citizen parents, it did not matter that he was born out of the country and that he was natural born. that is all. can anyone read.

[Reply](#)

o *yo* says:

[Thursday, May 20, 2010 at 12:39 PM](#)

unreality.

here’s what it says:

“Whereas John Sidney McCain, III, was born to American citizens on an American military base in the Panama Canal Zone in 1936: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That John Sidney McCain, III, is a ‘natural born Citizen’ under Article II, Section 1, of the Constitution of the United States.”

[Reply](#)

5. *MeJane* says:

[Wednesday, May 19, 2010 at 4:27 PM](#)

CAN OBAMA'S INELIGIBILITY BE PROVED THROUGH MCCAIN'S INELIGIBILITY?

What I want to know is why haven't any of the current lawsuits gone after McCain to prove his ineligibility as candidate, a 14th amendment citizen and not a natural born one? It is easier to disqualify McCain in terms of Article II. His records are available; no one is protecting him (as Obama is protected) but resolution 511 and the complicit RNC.

Northern District of California Judge William Alsup ruled in the case of Robinson v. Bowen, filed by an elector pledged to third-party candidate Alan Keyes seeking an injunction to keep McCain off the November ballot. Two other challenges claiming that McCain's birthplace in the Panama Canal Zone in 1936 disqualifies him under the Constitution have been dismissed on standing because Keyes' did not bring the suit. Please note the case was not thrown out on merit.

I believe Keyes' in particular still has standing for a new case against McCain, one that could set up a landmark precedent proving that McCain was unqualified to run for the office of President. Indirectly this would affect Obama because it would legally define the natural born citizen clause in Article II. This would give cases against Obama much more strength as it would set up a legal precedent. While you cannot keep McCain off of the ballot obviously because there is no remedy for that as that is in the past it can be proved that financial injury occurred and election fraud was committed which hurt Keyes' chances during the election by running against a fraudulent candidate. The people who voted for McCain in effect had their votes nullified by voting for an illegitimate candidate. The financing of McCain's campaign was fraudulent and collected under the false pretenses that McCain was a natural born citizen, as per Article II of the Constitution. Had McCain been disqualified, (as he should have) and as this would have been addressed late in the campaign, the Republican's would not have recovered, giving all others in the race, especially those on the Conservative third party side, namely Keyes, a greater chance of winning than he ordinarily would have in our two party system, again proving injury. If McCain had been disqualified Keyes' candidacy would have come into play and being of African American descent would have made the election more on an even keel, neutralizing Obama's "historic" candidate status. How do you rectify such a damage, maybe the entire election should be nullified? Certainly and without a doubt monetary damage was done to Keyes' and the Republican's who donated money or time to either candidates campaigns. Presidential campaigns are not inexpensive to run, they require work, time and money which was a wasted effort on Keyes' part and the part of anyone who contributed to or worked on his campaign or the McCain campaign for that matter because of this fraud.

I believe that Resolution 511 was brought forth by the Progressives in Congress to give Obama cover. By protecting McCain's ineligibility vulnerability Obama was also protecting his own vulnerability. If McCain were found to be ineligible, then so would Obama. Obama needed a way to get the Left off of McCain's ineligibility because eventually if they succeeded in proving their case and it would have been his undoing as well. Resolution 511 also made Obama vulnerable because of the two US citizen parents portion of the resolution, which he signed and co-sponsored, but he lacked the very same stated qualification to be natural born according to that Resolution. He was evidently willing to take that risk to protect McCain that also in the long run protected himself. Resolution 511 is Unconstitutional Congress has no enumerated Power to change the meaning of the words, "natural born" in Article II.

Another factor that damages McCain and this goes for all of our representatives is even though McCain was ineligible himself, McCain was duly notified of a potential problem with Obama's Article II eligibility. His failure to at least notify the President of the Senate under 3 U.S.C. § 15 was negligence, and a breach of contract to all Republicans . . . especially those who contributed time and money to his campaign. His unwillingness to do this protected his and Obama's crime.

If we can't get Obama, lets go after Progressive light McCain to get Obama removed.

[Reply](#)

o *AuntieMadder* says:

[Wednesday, May 19, 2010 at 8:28 PM](#)

Some guy named Cody Judy (in Utah, I think) filed an eligibility suit against McCain but the judge dismissed it because McCain lost to Obama. He testified last week at the Columbia trial held by