The Four Types of Unnatural Citizenship (including that of an illegitimate President)

The legitimacy of the presidency of Barack Obama rests on the meaning of three words. 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 this world 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 disputed or ignored by 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 a falsehood which 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 naturalized citizen, therefore he must be eligible to be President. This foolishness is patently false and even a child can explain why.

It's false in part because of the reality of what's called "derivative citizenship". It means that one's citizenship is derived from the citizenship of their parent or spouse. It was derived automatically when one’s father or husband became an American citizen via the naturalization process.

From the founding of the nation until after woman gained the right to vote, derivative citizenship could also have been obtained when a foreign woman married an American man. She would have been instantly granted U.S. citizenship.

Historically, American naturalization policy was not uniformly applied because it was administered by state judicial authorities due to the need for an oath before a magistrate, instead of delegated to the executive branch (which would be expected to follow the law). But men who were judges didn't always follow the law because “the law” 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 chosen policy.

In 1898 that led to a returning native-born son of Chinese immigrants being denied entry back into his own country because the INS viewed him as an un-naturalized alien who would need permission of the government to enter and return to his own home. He disagreed and sued the government. The Supreme Court ruled against the Justice Department and applied the simple words of the 14th Amendment (“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside”) and thereby declared children of legal immigrants to be U.S. Citizens. That, for the first time, stated what the nation-wide policy would be.

So they were American citizens, but what kind 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 and thanks to the 14th Amendment are deemed to be citizens at birth by a form of automatic naturalization. It’s not derivative citizenship because the only citizenship derived from their parents is their foreign citizenship.
The United States Immigration Service website that shows that there are three distinct types of citizenship is located here:

[When one of the high-ranking Obama supporters in the government learned of this page and that it was made known (by myself) to the “ineligibility community”, he deliberately committed the cardinal sin of the internet by changing its web address, -which broke any links to the page and made it appear as if it did not exist, -but eventually I managed to find its new address.]

It reads:
Interpretation 324.2

Reacquisition of citizenship lost by marriage.

Repatriation: ~ ~ ~ ~
(7) Restoration of citizenship is prospective....

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 or natural-born citizen.

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, ~ ~ ~ ~ ~
[near the bottom] 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 not natural citizens can be sub-divided into subclasses:

1. Adults/ parents who are legal permanent resident aliens and become naturalized.
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, are naturalized automatically, -obtaining his new nationality.
3. 14th Amendment citizens legitimized fully by the Wong Kim Ark Supreme Court decision. They also form the 2nd type of citizens, -the class of the “native born”, -those who are naturalized-at-birth thanks to the ratification vote of the natural born citizens of America . They're born to un-naturalized legal immigrant fathers.

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 the son since the son is subject to the father and the father was subject to British jurisdiction, so the British Nationality Act of 1948 applied to both of them, -as stated on his election website before and after the 2008 election. Thus he wasn’t naturalized-at-birth by the 14th Amendment. If he could prove that he was born in the United States, it would not make him a natural born citizen but it would at least make him a citizen via naturalization statutes that convey citizenship through mothers.
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 types that they did was to distinguish between those foreign-born who acquired their citizenship via naturalization, (-direct personal process, or derivative naturalization), and those who acquired their citizenship at birth via the 14th Amendment (native-born), besides those who acquired their citizenship by no legal means whatsoever. Their citizenship was not "acquired", rather, it was **natural derivative citizenship**, -derived naturally from the citizenship of their parents. They constitute the 98% who are the natural born native citizens of America 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, organically, by birth to U.S. citizens. It's their unalienable right to be a member of the same nation (group) as their parents, -the group into which they were born. I say “the group” and not “the land” onto which they were born because their membership is not derived from the land but from their citizen parents.

So there are two distinct types of **naturalized citizens**, -those born **outside** the U.S. (the foreign-born) and those born **inside** the U.S (labeled "native born").

Both "native-born" citizens and “natural born” citizen are describable as "born citizens". But one is a **natural "born citizen"** and the other is a **naturalized "born citizen"**, and the distinction between the two is at the crux of the falsehood that Barry Obama is eligible to be President.

Also, one can say that born citizens can be classified as those who are citizens at or from birth, and those who are citizens **by** birth. **Citizens by birth** are those born as citizens. Their citizenship bares no reference to when they became citizens, but solely to **how** they became citizens (via their parents). By birth, -via birth, -through birth all mean natural inheritance from the parents. But "citizen **at** birth" is a reference to the point in time when a child born to immigrants becomes a citizen. They’re not citizens by birth, -they’re not citizens by nature, they’re simply provided citizenship from birth as a gift of U.S. law. That’s a hair the needs to be split.

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 naturalized at birth are indistinguishable from the "natural born" children of American parents. The lesson to be learned is that all "born citizens" are not alike.

One who is born to foreign parents is a natural foreign national 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. Thanks to the 14th Amendment that naturalization occurs automatically at birth if the father is a legal immigrant but is un-naturalized.

Such children can be called a "born citizens" or a "native-born" citizens, but their citizenship is not natural citizenship. It is instead **naturalized citizenship**. They aren’t natural citizens because citizens did not produce them, -foreigners did. A child born before the naturalization of the parents would be a naturalized citizen and ineligible to be President, but a child born after the naturalization of the parents would not be a naturalized citizen but a natural citizen, -having been born to parents who are citizens.

No one whose citizenship depends on law is a natural citizen. All those whose citizenship depends on law are naturalized citizens, even if that naturalization begins "at birth".
There remains one more variety of citizenship. It’s 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 “doesn't care” where a mother is when she gives birth. Her off-spring is still identical to her and its father. It’s their natural progeny. It’s whatever they are. Location is not relevant.

That’s the principle applicable in the political realm as well. If you’re a pregnant mother, and you gave birth just before returning 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? Would it need to be naturalized? Or would it merely need to be recognized for what it truly is, -an American by birth? The Immigration Service by statute recognizes such children as natural citizens and in need of no action to make them legal. They’re legal by birth.

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, Admirals, Generals, Sailors, Soldiers, Airmen, and Marines serving abroad. Are none of the children born to such couples outside our borders to be viewed as equal to all other natural Americans? Are they “foreigners” by nature and in need of complying with some naturalization statute in order to be Americans?

What if such a son was born to Mrs. George Washington or Mrs. Thomas Jefferson? Would the founding fathers have viewed him as less American and therefore constitutionally unqualified to serve his country in the office of President? To not grasp the absurdity of answering yes is to be out of touch with the real world and the perspective of the founding fathers.

Unfortunately, these are not ridiculous questions because there are lawyers with high visibility in the "ineligible" community who believe that a domestic birth is absolutely necessary in order to be a natural citizen and thus 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. They assert it as if it’s the only definition that’s constitutionally valid by being “more American”.

The truth is that to be a natural citizen only requires one thing, -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 off-spring born within the King's dominion belonged to him, -as his “natural subject” for life. That's jus soli (law of the soil), and has no place whatsoever in natural citizenship. It’s antithetical to American values about natural law and natural rights.

Adherence to a bastardized blend of jus soli citizenship with inherited jus sanguinis citizenship (law of blood) results in unjustifiably promoting the legitimacy of an unnatural 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 water, -they don't mix. It's a fools philosophy that argues that if one’s American 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’s an alien and needs to first be naturalized by government paperwork. 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 articulable natural principle nor to presidential eligibility. It doesn't matter if a million lawyers argue that the opinions of long dead "experts" argued otherwise, they can't nullify common sense and the principles of natural law.

In summary; Seven Rules of Natural & Naturalized Citizenship

1. No child of a foreign father can become a citizen except by naturalization.
2. No American is a natural American unless born to American parents.
3. A “natural born” American child is a natural citizen regardless of where he is born.
4. A foreigner cannot father a natural American because his children will either be foreign citizens only or be both foreign and naturalized-at-birth citizens. They won’t be natural native-born citizens but will be naturalized native-born citizens.
5. Anyone “native born” but with foreign parentage is not a natural American but a citizen by automatic naturalization. Their natural foreign citizenship was overlaid with acquired American citizenship by American law. They are dual citizens, not solely American citizens.
6. Citizenship acquired by naturalization, (whether automatically or via process) is not natural citizenship because it was not naturally derived. Rather, it was acquired via the acquiescence of the government and its laws, policies, and court decisions.
7. Any person with such citizenship is constitutionally ineligible to hold the Office of the President. Barack Obama is such a citizen. Consequently his presidency is unconstitutional.

But don’t tell anyone because no one wants to hear it, -it’s too unsettling. It raises way too many questions, -questions for which there are either no answers or there are only hard answers, -complicated answers, painful answers. And who needs anymore pain? Haven’t we had enough already?

Regardless of how much we’ve had, we haven’t begun to learn how much pain we have in store when the chickens come home to roost, -when the bills come due, -when the cupboard is bare, -when the piper needs to be paid. Then there will be no one willing or able to lend us the amount of money needed to keep the ship of state afloat. And Obama and his party are cutting ever-bigger holes in the bottom of the ship with every passing minute. Such a ship is destined for sinking. Such a tenuous house of cards will inevitably collapse unless one party regains control of all branches of government and sets things right by adhering to the Constitution. Unfortunately, that party does not exist and is very unlikely to exist in the future because change means pain and no one wants to inflict it. The American people are too dumb, too asleep, too indifferent, too self-serving, too self-absorbed, too distracted, and too concerned about only the present to even realize that there is a gigantic iceberg dead ahead, and if we don’t do everything possible to avoid it, we will have sealed our own fate via the course we have allowed our government to chose for us. We will have caused our own doom. And re-arranging the deck chairs won’t be enough to save us.
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