

Is Kamala Harris a “Natural Born Citizen?”

“PROVE IT”

by [Joseph DeMaio](#), ©2019



(Jun. 25, 2019) — One of the Democrat wanna-be candidates yearning for the opportunity to get bludgeoned by President Trump in the 2020 general election is Sen. Kamala Harris. You will recall from her classless performance in the now-Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh Senate Judiciary Committee hearings, she believes that the mere allegation of a crime – and particularly a sexual assault crime – is sufficient to warrant a conclusion of guilt in the alleged perpetrator.

Due process and the presumption of innocence – let alone actual proof or competent evidence of the actual commission of a crime – are principles of law which are foreign to Democrats in general, and seemingly altogether alien to Ms. Harris in particular. Interesting trait in a lawyer..., no?

These circumstances make it all the more ironic and hypocritical – par for the course with Democrats, of course – that Harris, a former San Francisco District Attorney and California Attorney General, would now claim that, because of her “prosecutorial” experience, she is the best situated candidate among the Democrat field to “go after

Trump” once she is elected to the presidency. She has even analogized her zeal to pursue President Trump with a reference to a [“rap” sheet](#) concocted against the president.

But here’s the juicy part: she recently promised a crowd of supporters in South Carolina that she would “prosecute the case against Trump on the debate stage” prior to the election, if she were the Democrats’ nominee. Please..., please..., D’s..., nominate her and put her on stage next to Trump. Your faithful servant would pay a big-time sum for tickets to be in that same room when the questions begin flying.

One of the first questions that Trump should pose to Harris (regardless of whether it is ‘on topic’ as dictated by the moderators) is this: “Are you eligible under the Constitution as a ‘natural born Citizen?’” Her answer would likely be: “Seriously? You’re going to the ‘birther’ nonsense again? Of *course* I’m eligible. I was born in Oakland, California.” Trump (or whoever the moderators might be) should follow up: “But when you were born, were your parents already U.S. citizens?” Her likely response: “That doesn’t matter. I have it on good authority that anyone born here, regardless of the citizenship of their parents, is a natural born Citizen.” Trump should then grin and say: “Prove it.”

P&E readers, you see where this is going, right? As your faithful servant has attempted to explain over the years, it was the demonstrable intent of the Founders, for anyone willing to see, to absolutely restrict eligibility to the office of the “Chief Magistrate” – the President – to a “natural born Citizen,” and *only* to someone who met the criteria for same. That restriction, adopted by the Founders in Art. 2, § 1, Cl. 5 of the Constitution, was taken from § 212 of *The Law of Nations*, the seminal work of one Emmerich de Vattel, a 17th Century jurist and philosopher. In order to be a “natural born citizen,” as opposed to a “native born citizen” or a “naturalized citizen,” both of one’s parents must be, at the moment of the person’s birth, citizens of the country where the birth occurs.

DeVattel’s work, as recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court, was continually in the hands of the Founders as they labored over the drafting of the Constitution and was the work “most widely cited in the 50 years after the [American] Revolution.” *See United States Steel Corp. v. Multistate Tax Commission*, 434 U.S. 452, 462, n.12 (1977).

As it turns out, [Kamala Harris](#) was born to a Tamil Indian mother, Shyamala Gopalan Harris, and a Jamaican father, Donald Harris. Given that one Barack Hussein Obama II continues to refuse to remove the dark cloud of constitutional ineligibility still hanging over his usurpation of the presidency, Ms. Harris might expect similar problems.

Bear in mind, Monsieur Obama’s “original Hawaiian birth certificate,” thought by many to be (and likely in reality) a computerized forgery, listed his father as being a citizen of Kenya, not the United States. Thus, even if the .pdf image of a document posted to the Internet which he claims is his “real deal” birth certificate were treated as “authentic,” he would *still* have been ineligible. The fact that his mother (some would even question that “fact”) was a U.S. citizen in 1961 is irrelevant: because his father was never a U.S. citizen, he was, as we say “from the get-go,” ineligible to hold the office of the president.

The fact that he *occupied* the office illegitimately merely recognizes that he “got away with it.” So far..., that is.



Returning to the eligibility of Ms. Harris, because the available public records fail to confirm that both her mother and her father were, on October 20, 1964, naturalized U.S. citizens, her eligibility remains very much in doubt. The several deeply flawed and deceitfully structured Congressional Research Service (“CRS”) Memos and Reports from [2009](#), [2011](#) and [2016](#), seeking to prop up the purported (but false) legitimacy of Monsieur Obama as a natural born Citizen, will not help her. Memo to P&E readers: as noted [here](#), the 2009 CRS “What to Tell your Constituents... Memorandum” has been scrubbed from the Scribd.com website and is no longer accessible there, but you can learn about what it said [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#).

Nor will the Harvard Law Review Journal’s “On the Meaning of Natural Born Citizen” magazine [article](#) by distinguished law professors and practitioners Mr. Paul Clement and Prof. Neal Katyal be of any assistance to her. As explained [here](#), the Clement/Katyal commentary suffers from the same misinterpretations of the Founders’ intent as do the CRS documents, but without the deceptive alterations of language committed by personnel in “the repository of the Nation’s best thinking.”

Long story short: unless Ms. Harris can prove that her parents were already naturalized U.S. citizens when she was born in Oakland back in 1964, her claim of constitutional eligibility is as flawed as that of Barack Hussein Obama II. Who knows, maybe as the Democrats’ 2019 Circular Firing Squad Extravaganza (*aka*, the Democrat Primary Debates) gets under way, these questions will be posed by one or more of Ms. Harris’s Democrat rivals instead of President Trump. Think of it: how great would it be to watch Elizabeth (“Pocahontas”) Warren delve into Ms. Harris’s constitutional eligibility? Wow... time to buy some popcorn and soda pop... this could get *really* entertaining.