

Native Born Versus Natural Born

The greatest travesty in the political history of our republic was made possible due to a wide-spread lack of understanding of the meaning of the word natural, as used in Article 2, Section 1 of the US Constitution:

“No persons except a natural born citizen...shall be eligible to the office of the President”. Natural has long been erroneously conflated with and even used interchangeably with the word "native" because some in government throughout U.S. history have ignorantly failed to recognize the difference between them.

Native refers to the land in which one is born, -the land of ones ancestry, ones country, though not necessarily one's nation because nations and governments appear and disappear but countries are perennial, and the land is forever. To be born in a certain country usually makes one a native of the nation located in that country, but being a native is not the same as being a citizen.

Barack Obama Sr. was a native of the country of Kenya before it became the nation of Kenya. Moses was a native-born Egyptian, as was the entire Hebrew nation, but while he was a citizen of Egypt, they were not because they were not natural Egyptians, (while he was adopted).

He also was not a natural Egyptian because he was a natural born Hebrew, born to a Hebrew mother and father, and therefore a natural part of the Hebrew people who remained a separate and distinct people even though Egypt was their only home and had been for many centuries. But Egypt was the home of the Egyptians for many millennia and no one was not conscious of that distinction. So while the Hebrew nation/people occupied Egyptian soil, within the Egyptian nation (political entity), which occupied the country of Egypt (geo-political entity), the Hebrews were born into a society in which they were not natural born members even though they were native-born members.

The distinction between the land of ones nativity and the nation of ones citizenship is of paramount importance. The clearest evidence of that fact is the example of Kuwait. When the Iraqi army conquered Kuwait, it did not conquer the nation of Kuwait, only the country of Kuwait, because the nation of Kuwait fled into exile where it still existed until it was able to

return to the country of Kuwait and repossess the land. Any child born to a Kuwaiti abroad was not a citizen of the land of its birth but was instead a natural born Kuwaiti and part of the Kuwaiti nation because it was born from parents who were Kuwaiti. Kuwaiti citizenship was its natural inheritance by birth. No law was needed to make it so, it was so by virtue of its birth to Kuwaiti citizens.

German parents who delivered a child in Nazi occupied France didn't give birth to a French citizen but a German citizen because the child was German by birth to German parents, and thus a German citizen.

Now let's examine the meaning of the word Natural. That which is natural come by nature. Nature in the organic sense is biological, not geographical. You could draw geographical boundaries on the moon, or Mars, but there is nothing of organic nature on either because they are lifeless barren wastelands. For something to be natural it has to come from nature, not geography, nor politics.

Whatever is natural is beyond the power of any law-making or law-enforcing entity to change, just like unalienable rights with which humans are born.

So the association of the word natural with the word born refers to a natural, parental blood-connection, not a geographical association. The association of the word native with the word born refers to a geographical association, and not a natural connection. So it can be said that the land of ones nativity is not always the same as the nation of ones citizenship although it generally, almost universally, is.

The definition of a country as a delineated geographical entity is different from what constitutes the nation that occupies that geography, and both can change over time. Germany, leading up to WWII felt that areas in other nations were a natural part of the country of Germany, and so, by invasion, they took steps to make those areas in reality to be part of the nation of Germany.

But time proved that countries are one thing and nations are another and they don't always and forever overlap perfectly. So nativity, the country of ones birth, is not synonymous with the nation of ones citizenship.

What happened to Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia also demonstrates this point. Having citizenship in either of those countries by reason of native birth or natural born citizenship eventually became void be-

cause both the countries and the nations ceased to exist. Then citizenship was determined by geography or choice. This split happened because natural born members of various groups didn't mix into a new hybrid group with a new identity. The split wasn't because of where individuals were or were not born, but because of who they were born to. One's membership in a group came by the nature of their parentage, not their nativity.

Lastly, there's the example of Native Americans, native Australians, and slaves. The Native Americans and Australians were truly both native-born and natural-born members of their nations/peoples and their country was the land that they belonged to by geography *and* parentage. Whereas slaves were not native born members of any group since the soil that they were born on was irrelevant and immaterial to anything in a legal or cultural way. They were natural born Africans *and* natural born slaves since those were the only things that they inherited from their parents.

When an American or Australian native couple (Indian or Aborigine) was transported to Britain during the colonial era, and gave birth to a child there, that child would be a natural born member of their tribe-nation even though the land of their nativity was not the same as the land of their racial and ethnic and cultural origin. Was it the legal position of the British government that such a child was under the jurisdiction of the crown and not their parents, even though they were only visitors? That's not reasonable, fair, nor justifiable.

Children born to parents of a group are natural born members of the group by inheritance from the parents, regardless of where they are born. The Vikings traveled and settled far and wide. Their offspring were Vikings regardless of whether they were born in their native homeland, or in Greenland, or in England, or in Europe or Russia. They were born Vikings. The framers of the Constitution required that the U.S. President be a natural member of the national American group -that group being: Citizens of the United States.

They required that the President's citizenship be citizenship obtained naturally by birth to American parents. In other words, his citizenship had to be citizenship that he inherited, citizenship that came not by law or statute as a gift of the government, nor from

the geography of national boundaries. If geography was meant to be required, it was meant to be in addition to natural citizenship, not in place of it.

They meant to insure that his loyalty was solely to the United States via his parents being loyal citizens of the United States. That is the reason why they put that requirement: Loyalty (-assured by birth to American parents) ahead of the 2nd requirement: maturity (35 years of living) and the 3rd requirement: residency (14 years in the United States). Loyalty by natural citizenship was the only way to insure that a native-born Loyalist dual-citizen was not empowered with the command of the United States military by reason of election to the Presidency, which he could use to the harm of the republic and its citizens.

Were it not for that prohibition, then in theory the pregnant wife of the King of the British Empire could visit the United States, give birth here, and 35 years later his royal heir could run for and be elected to the office of the President. That would be a bloodless coup.

That possibility, in the form of lesser versions involving British royalty or aristocracy, was anathema to the founding fathers, -a worst-case scenario nightmare. But by requiring the President to be not just a native-born citizen (which for many generations required the father to become naturalized), but instead a natural born citizen, -born to Americans and not foreigners, the framers of the Constitution made such a dangerous and possibly seditious situation impossible.

And that prohibition was never knowingly violated by the American political process until everyone who knew better remained silent when Barack Obama found himself with a chance for a shot at the American presidency and took it. They are complicit in his violation by the cowardly sin of silence as they stood by while the Constitution was openly violated as if it didn't even exist.

When the leadership of a nation is composed entirely of people who are cowards, or ignorant of their own fundamental law, what hope can there be that such people will save us from the ever-increasing loss of fundamental liberty and the fiscal avalanche that we're heading toward?