Natural Citizenship vs Citizenship by Substitution
(Four Types of Citizenship Acquisition)

The legitimacy of the presidency of Barack Obama rests on the meaning of the words "natural born citizen". U.S. Constitution Article 2, Section 1 : No person *except* a natural born Citizen,...shall be eligible to the Office of the President,".

Every other elected office, including the Supreme Court, is open to "Citizens of the United States", but not the presidency. The President must have been born as a natural citizen and not have acquired citizenship by any means other than by being the progeny of American parents, having been born into American citizenship by parents who were American citizens.

There's something you need to see. It's from a web page of the Immigration & Naturalization Service. It reveals a fact that has been refuted or ignored across all groups on which the public relies for leadership and honest information. The truth has been distorted and perverted to such a degree that now the truth is thought of as a fabricated falsehood. Those who believe in the falsehood that views the truth as a falsehood have been duped, and many have been willingly duped because the delusion they embrace legitimizes the presidency of their idol, Barack Obama.

What the website shows is that there are three distinct types of citizenship. A liberal lie argues that there are only two types; naturalized citizenship and natural born citizenship. Under this falsehood, (adhered to even by liberal judges and some ignorant Republicans) Obama *must* be a natural citizen because he is not a natural*ized* citizen, therefore he must be eligible to be President. This foolishness is patently false and even a child can explain why.

It's false because of the reality of what's called "derivative citizenship". It means that one's citizenship is derived from the citizenship of their father or mother. It was derived automatically after a parent became an American citizen via the naturalization process.

Historically, American naturalization policy was not uniformly applied because granting citizenship was delegated to the judicial branch of the States due to the need for an oath before an official, instead of to the executive branch. States judges didn't always follow the law because the law in some regards was really only the policy that the Immigration Service chose to enforce. So the government (Justice Department) would sue in a higher court if a lower court failed to follow its policy.

That led in 1898 to a native-born son of Chinese immigrants being denied entry back into his own country because the INS Immigration Board viewed him as an unnaturalized alien who would need permission of the government to enter and return to his own home. The Supreme Court ruled against the government and applied the simple words of the 14th Amendment to declare children of legal immigrants to be U.S. Citizens.

But what type of citizens? That's the question that many have failed to ask. That Chinese-American citizen, -Wong Kim Ark, was not a natural American citizen, nor a citizen via the naturalization process. He was a member of a third class of citizens, which is shown on the INS website as "native-born". They are the children born of foreigners who are deemed to be citizens naturalized at birth in a form of automatic naturalization.

Derivative citizenship could also be derived automatically when a foreign woman married an American man. She would have been automatically granted U.S. citizenship, [though that is no longer the case due to women's right to vote and a change in immigration realities].

http://www.uscis.gov/ilink/docView/SLB/HTML/SLB/itp.html
\ slb \ SERVICE LAW BOOKS MENU \ INTERPRETATIONS
[The Supreme Court decision that's discussed/interpreted was Afroyim v Rusk (1967)]

http://www.uscis.gov/ilink/docView/SLB/HTML/SLB/0-0-0-1/0-0-0-45104/0-0-0-48602.html
Interpretation 324.2 Reacquisition of citizenship **lost** by marriage.

Repatriation
(7) Restoration of citizenship is prospective . Restoration to citizenship under any one of the three statutes is not regarded as having erased the period of alienage that immediately preceded it.
The words "shall be deemed to be a citizen of the United States to the same extent as though her marriage to said alien had taken place on or after September 22, 1922", as they appeared in the 1936 and 1940 statutes, are prospective and restore the status of **native-born** or **natural-born citizen** (whichever existed prior to the loss) as of the date citizenship was reacquired.

(b) Naturalization . At one time or another since September 22, 1922, women who expatriated themselves under the circumstances set forth in INTERP 324.1 (by marriage to a foreigner) have been able to regain citizenship by means of a simplified form of naturalization,
[paragraph 6] The effect of naturalization under the above statutes was not to erase the previous period of alienage, but to restore the person to the status if **naturalized**, **native**, or **natural-born citizen**, as determined by her status prior to loss.
~~~~~~

As is seen, citizenship can be delineated into three types. Those who are naturalized can be sub-divided into three subclasses.
1. Foreign women who were naturalized automatically via marriage to an American man (no longer U.S. policy)
2. Foreign-born children of foreign fathers who, upon their father's naturalization, were naturalized automatically.
3. 14th Amendment citizens legitimized fully by the Wong Kim Ark Supreme Court decision. They form the second class of citizens, -the class of the native-born or "naturalized at birth" citizens.

They're born to *un*-naturalized immigrant fathers, -legal immigrants. [Obama's father was a mere Visa Card foreign student and not a legal Green Card immigrant so the 14th Amendment didn't apply to his son because they both were subject to British jurisdiction and not American, and thus he was not naturalized-at-birth, rather he was a British subject at birth since his father was a British subject.

Those 14th Amendment citizens are describable as **native-born** since they were born within the United States while the first two subclasses are the foreign born. The reason the INS listed the three classes that they did was to distinguish between those who acquired their citizenship by no legal means whatsoever (the natural citizens), those who acquire theirs via naturalization, (-either the direct personal process, or derivative naturalization), and those who obtrained their citizenship at birth via the 14th Amendment (native-born).
The citizenship of the natural citizens was not "acquired", rather, it was derivative citizenship resulting from the citizenship of their parents. They constitute the 99% who are natural born American citizens by birth.
Congress was given no authority to legislate in regard to the citizenship of those born to American parents and so there is no law through which they "acquire" citizenship. Instead, it's theirs naturally by birth to Americans. It's their unalienable right to be a member of the same nation (group) as their parents.

So there are two distinct types of naturalized citizens, -those born outside the U.S. and those born inside the U.S. Those born inside are considered both naturalized and "native-born".

Likewise, there are two distinct types of "born citizens". One is the natural*ized* citizen and the other is the natural citizen. One is a natural "born citizen" and the other is a natural*ized* "born citizen".
~~~~~~

Also, one can say that citizens can be classified as those who are citizens-at-birth, citizens-from-birth, and citizens-by-birth. Citizens *by* birth are those born as citizens. Their citizenship is not connected to any reference to when they became citizens, but solely to their parentage. By birth, via birth, through birth all mean natural transference from the parents to the child. But "citizenship-*at*-birth" is a reference to the point in time when a child born to immigrants becomes a citizen.

"Citizenship-from-birth" is essentially the same as "citizenship-at-birth" [see footnote]

The purpose of pointing out this distinction is to disprove the falsehood that a citizen at (or from) birth is the same as a citizen ***by*** birth. This falsehood is asserted in order to claim that those born to immigrants and natural*ized* at birth are indistinguishable from the "natural born" children of American parents. The lesson to be learned is that all "born citizens" are not "created" alike.

One who was born to a foreigner was a natural foreigner by birth and could only become a U.S. citizen (in effect a dual-citizen) by means of naturalization, i.e. by law, -not birth, -not nature. That naturalization could occur automatically at birth if the father was a legal immigrant but as yet unnaturalized.

Such a child can be called a "born citizen" or a "native-born" citizen, but its citizenship is not natural citizenship. It is instead natural-ized citizenship. It's the result of U.S. law which grants citizenship to one with politically mongrel parentage, i.e. one with an American mother and a foreign father. A child born later, after the naturalization of the father, would not be a naturalized citizen but a natural born citizen, -having been born to an American citizen.

The truth that needs to be recognized is that those who are citizens solely "at birth" are not natural citizens because citizens did not produce them, foreigners did. A man-made law (14th Amendment) and Supreme Court ruling (Wong Kim Ark) made them citizens, NOT natural law by which natural citizens are produced.

No one whose citizenship depends on law is a natural citizen. All those whose citizenship depends on law are natural*ized* citizens, even if that naturalization begins "at birth".

There remains one more variety of citizenship. It is that of the natural born children of Americans who happened to be out of the country when the mother gave birth. Their American child is not a native-born person but nature (and natural principle of natural law) doesn't care where a mother is when she gives birth. Her offspring is still identical to her and its father. It is her natural progeny. It is natural born. Location is irrelevant.

That is the principle applicable in the political realm as well. If you, -a pregnant mother, or your wife gave birth before you could return across the Canadian or Mexican border, would your child be any less American than any other of your American children? Would it be Canadian or Mexican instead of American? Would it be lumped in with children of foreigners and need a Visa to be brought into the country? Let's also consider the children of life-long public servants whose ancestry may date back to the Mayflower, servants such as Ambassadors, diplomats, Consuls, office workers, Admirals, Generals, sailors, solders, airmen,and marines serving abroad. Are none of the children of such American couples to be viewed as natural Americans?

What if the child was born to Mrs. George Washington or Mrs. Dwight Eisenhower? Would the founding fathers view it as less American and therefore illegitimate and unqualified to serve their country in the office of President? To not grasp the absurdity of answering yes is to be out of touch with the world and views of the founding fathers.

Unfortunately, these are not ridiculous questions because there are lawyers with high visibility in the "birther" community who believe that a domestic place-of-birth is absolutely necessary in order to be qualified to be President. They base that view on an upside-down misconstruence of an observation made by the the author of The Law of Nations, Emmerich de Vattel, which he wrote around 1758, and which they've come to view as holy writ, -an all-inclusive, all-controlling revelation, and therefore they haven't thought through the ramifications of the position they've adopted. And yet they assert it as if it is the only interpretation that is constitutionally valid.

The truth is that to be a natural citizen only requires two things, -two parents who are Americans. Where one is born is unrelated to nature and that which is natural. The location of one's birth is related to only one thing, and that is the illegitimate, morally repugnant philosophy of the Divine Right of Kings which held that any offspring born into the King's domain belonged to him, -his subject for life. That's jus soli (law of the soil), and has no place whatsoever in natural citizenship. It is antithetical to American values about natural law and natural rights.

Adherence to a bastardized blend of jus soli with jus sanguinis (law of blood) results in unjustifiably promoting the legitimacy of a Frankenstein hybrid-combination of two mutually exclusive principles.

It's all natural law or it's all the monarch-legitimizing quasi-religious philosophy supporting the right of Kings to be the boss of us all. No one has any business combining the two because they're like oil and vinegar, -they don't mix. It's a fools philosophy that argues that if a child is prematurely born just within the Canadian border then the Immigration Service has the legal right and constitutional authority to bar their child from entering the United States because it is an alien, or to view it as a naturalized-at-birth citizen, -making it therefore ineligible to be President. That view is absurd. All the children of Americans are Americans also, and natural Americans at that. Where they are born has no connection whatsoever to any articulatible principle nor to presidential eligibility, because they are natural citizens via birth to citizens. It doesn't matter if a million lawyers argue that the opinions of long dead "experts" argue otherwise, they can't nullify common sense and natural law.

In summary;
1. Naturalized citizens are ineligible to serve as President.
2. No child whose father is not a citizen can become a citizen except by naturalization.
3. Only a child with an American father is born as a natural American.
4. No American is a natural American unless he had an American father.
5. A natural born American child is a natural born citizen regardless of where he is born.

6. A foreign father cannot father a natural American because his children will either be foreigners or be naturalized-at-birth citizens, in other words; not natural born citizens but natural*ized* born citizens, (or natural*ized* native-born citizens, -not natural native-born citizens).

7. Anyone not fathered by an American is not a natural American but a citizen by the substitution of naturalization. Their natural foreign citizenship was replaced, -substituted via American law with American citizenship.
8. Citizenship by the substitution of naturalization is not <u>natural</u> citizenship because it was not naturally derived. Instead it was acquired via the acquiescence of the government and its laws, policies, procedures, and court decisions.
8. Any person with such citizenship shall be constitutionally ineligible for the Office of the President.

by a.r.nash feb. 2012 http://obama--nation.com

* *[-only distinguishable by reference to a hypothetical case in which the father becomes a naturalized citizen on the same day his child is born. If the child was born <u>after</u> he became naturalized, then the child was an American automatically *at* birth, *from* birth, and *by* birth, entering life as an American already. If the child was born *before* his father was naturalized, then he was a citizen (via the 14th Amendment) *from* birth (the day of birth) and *at* birth (the moment of birth), but he was not a <u>natural</u> citizen "***by*** birth" at the moment in time he was born because his father was not yet a citizen, but he could be considered to be a natural born citizen because his father completed the naturalization process the same day. So he was a natural citizen <u>from the day</u> he was born, but not a natural citizen <u>at the moment</u> he was born. It's hair that doesn't need to be split**]**.