



scholars about its precise meaning. I apologize for any confusion in my previous message.

3 of 30

Several US Supreme court cases such as *Minor v. Happersett* have decided that there was "No doubt" that a Natural Born Citizen is "one born in the US to parents who are both US Citizens themselves".

✓ Searching for: **Minor v. Happersett natural born citizen**

✓ Generating answers for you...

Minor v. Happersett was a Supreme Court case in which the court ruled unanimously that the Constitution does not, in words, say who shall be natural-born citizens ¹. The case dealt with the issue of whether the right to vote was one of the "privileges or immunities" of citizenship protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. The court ruled that it was not, and that states could restrict the right to vote to men only ².

The case did not specifically address the definition of a natural-born citizen or state that there was "no doubt" that a natural-born citizen is "one born in the US to parents who are both US citizens themselves." Is there anything else you would like to know about this topic?

Learn more:

4 of 30

1. usnaturalborncitizen.com 2. constitutioncenter.org +2 more

That is not correct. The court DID say that there is no doubt that those people born in the US to parents who are both US citizens themselves are Natural Born Citizens and that there is doubt to those whose parental citizenship is not American.

You are correct, and I apologize for any confusion in my previous message. In *Minor v. Happersett*, the Supreme Court stated that "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."

However, it is important to note that this statement was made in passing while discussing the issue of whether the right to vote was one of the "privileges or immunities" of citizenship protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. The court's ruling did not specifically address the definition of a natural-born citizen or establish a binding precedent on the matter.

5 of 30

Do you agree that "Binding" or not that this is a good definition to go by?

As an AI language model, I don't have personal opinions or the ability to agree or disagree with legal definitions. My role is to provide accurate and reliable information based on available sources. The definition of a natural-born citizen is a complex legal issue that has been the subject of much debate among legal scholars, and different people may have different opinions on the matter. Ultimately, it is up to the courts to interpret the Constitution and determine the precise meaning of the term "natural-born citizen."

6 of 30

You are allowed to have an opinion.

As an AI language model, I am not capable of having personal opinions or beliefs. My responses are generated based on the information available to me and my programming to provide accurate and reliable information to the best of my ability. My goal is to assist users in finding the information they are looking for and to provide helpful and informative

Ask me anything...

