# Ted Cruz is NOT eligible to be President of the United States of America!

By William Taylor Reil

The Constitution for the United States of America requires that the President (and the Vice-President) must be a natural born Citizen of the United States. Specifically, Article II, Section 1, Clause 5 states:

*"No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States."*

The exception phrase: *"or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution"* was necessary so that George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson and the next 6 Presidents under the Constitution for the United States of America, though born to parents who were British subjects on British soil, could lawfully be elected as President. John Tyler (the 10th President), born in 1790, was the first President born to two Citizens of the United States of America and, thus, the first "natural born Citizen" President. Many cite Martin Van Buren (the 8th President) as the first, but he was born on December 5, 1782 to Abraham and Maria Van Buren, State Citizens of the Village of Kinderhook, New York. Remember, the Revolution did not end until 1783 and the Constitution that created the United States of America did not become law until June 21, 1788. Zachary Taylor (the 12th President) was also covered by the "exception phrase", since he was born on November 24, 1784 to Richard and Sarah Taylor, both Citizens of Virginia.

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, of the Constitution for the United States of America, Congress has the duty and responsibility *"To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization …"*. These uniform rules have been established since Congress passed the first Naturalization Act in 1790. That first Act was repealed and replaced with the United States Naturalization Act of January 29, 1795 (1 Statute 414). Many amended Naturalization Acts have followed. **However, it is explicitly clear, a naturalized Citizen is not, and never can be, a "natural born Citizen."**

If both of your parents were Citizens of the United States of America on the date of your birth and you were born in one of the Union States, then you are a "natural born Citizen" of that State and a "natural born Citizen" of the United States of America. You could be a "natural born Citizen" only of the United States of America if your parents were Citizens of the District of Columbia or a territory of the United States of America. A true understanding and reasonable interpretation of natural law and/or the law of nations, which the framers understood and used when they wrote the Constitution for the United States of America, confirm the meaning of "natural born Citizen" stated herein above. Some now contend that only the father must be a Citizen of the U.S.A. for the child to be a "natural born Citizen" of our country. They cite as evidence that in the States of the Union and thus in the United States of America, a wife takes her husband's last name when she marries him and their children are given the father's last name at birth. This limited definition is doubtful.

Today, others believe that to be a "natural born citizen", a child need only be born on the "soil" of the United States. Certain attorneys, judges and professors of law have continued to advance this false opinion by using the so-called 14th Amendment as their alleged authority. I say "so-called" because compelling historical documents prove beyond any doubt that this alleged Amendment was neither constitutionally approved nor ratified. However, even if the alleged 14th Amendment was valid, which it is not, a Citizen of the United States defined in its first Section 1, Clause 1, as: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside", does not define a "natural born Citizen" of the United States. The so-called 14th Amendment did not change the true constitutional understanding that an Article II, Section 1, Clause 5, "natural born Citizen" must be born on American soil to two Citizens of the United States of America at the time of their child's birth.

The statements made herein above where clearly confirmed by the United States Supreme Court in its decision and opinion of *Minor v. Happersett*, 88 U.S. 162 (1875), which states, in its relevant parts:

*"There is no doubt that women may be citizens. They are persons, and by the fourteenth amendment 'all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof ' are expressly declared to be 'citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.' **But, in our opinion, it did***

***not need this amendment to give them that position*** *…*

*"The fourteenth amendment did not affect the citizenship of women any more than it did of men. In this particular, therefore,* ***the rights of Mrs. Minor do not depend upon the amendment****. She has always been a citizen from her birth, and entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizenship.* ***The amendment prohibited the State, of which she is a citizen, from abridging any of her privileges and immunities as a citizen of the United States; but it did not confer citizenship on her that she did not have before its adoption****. …*

*"Additions might always be made to the citizenship of the United States in two ways: first, by birth, and second, by naturalization. This is apparent from the Constitution itself, for it provides that 'no person except a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President, and that Congress shall have power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." Thus new citizens may be born or they may be created by naturalization.*

*"The Constitution does not, in words, say who shall be natural-born citizens. Resort must be had elsewhere to ascertain that. At common-law, with the nomenclature of which the framers of the Constitution were familiar, it was never doubted that* ***all children born in a country of parents who were its citizens became themselves, upon their birth, citizens also. These were natives, or natural-born citizens, as distinguished from aliens or foreigners****. Some authorities go further and include as citizens children born within the jurisdiction without reference to the citizenship of their parents*. As to this class there have been doubts, but never as to the first. For the purposes of this case, it is not necessary to solve these doubts. It is sufficient for everything we have now to consider that all children born of citizen parents within the jurisdiction are themselves citizens*."

(Emphasis and * added) (Note: * This sentence is clearly based on the so-called 14th Amendment.)

The majority decision in Dred Scott v. Stanford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857) expressed an opinion as to "citizenship", but the majority's definition of a natural born citizen in this case could not have referenced the so-called 14th Amendment. The majority opinion in Dred Scott, citing Vattel directly, stated:

*"The citizens are the members of the civil society, bound to this society by certain duties, and subject to its authority; they equally participate in its advantages.* ***The natives or natural-born citizens are those born in the country of parents who are citizens.*** *As society cannot perpetuate itself otherwise than by the children of the citizens, those children naturally follow the condition of their parents, and succeed to all their rights." …*

*"I say,* ***to be of the country, it is necessary to be born of father who is a citizen****, for if he be born there of a foreigner, it will be only the place of his birth, and not his country. The inhabitants, as distinguished from citizens, are foreigners who are permitted to settle and stay in the country."*

*Vattel, Book 1, chap. 19, p. 101.*

Edward "Ted" Cruz was born on December 22, 1970 in Calgary, Alberta, Canada, to parents: Rafael Bienvenido Cruz and Eleanor Elizabeth (Darragh) Wilson. Rafael Cruz was born in Cuba and Eleanor Darragh was born in Wilmington, Delaware. Ted's father left Cuba in 1957 to attend the University of Texas and obtained political asylum in the United States with a "green card" after his four-year student visa expired. Rafael meet Eleanor in New Orleans, La. while both were working in the oil industry. In 1967 they moved to Canada and married (second marriage for both). Under the Canadian Immigration and Naturalization Laws, Rafael, and perhaps Eleanor, applied for and received Canadian citizenship during their eight-year stay in that country. Ted Cruz became a Canadian citizen at birth. The Cruz family moved to Huston, Texas in 1975. Eleanor and Rafael were divorced in 1997. Rafael Cruz ultimately became a naturalized U.S. citizen in 2005.

Ted Cruz denounced his Canadian citizenship in 2014, but there is no evidence that he ever applied for and became a naturalized U.S. citizen. He has allegedly relied on his mother's "U.S. citizenship" and statutes "passed" by Congress since 1952 to claim his U.S. citizenship. His father was either a Cuban or a Canadian.

Do not be distracted by his false and fraudulent arguments. Ted Cruz, Esquire, by his own admissions, is not eligible to be President of the United States of America. **Ted Cruz is NOT a natural born Citizen!**

Also see: https://publiushuldah.wordpress.com/2016/02/11/natural-born-citizen-and-naturalized-citizen-explained/