

## Is Suri Cruise A Natural Born Scientologist?

Analogies are useful in grasping a principle that is applicable in a similar situation but which is not as crystal clear to the mind because of confusing counter-explanations. The running dogs of Barack Obama have fielded every kind of half-baked explanation they can come up with to “explain” that he is a natural born citizen as the Constitution requires of the President and Vice-President. Their purpose is and has been to use sophistry (false but convincing logic) in order to appear authoritative in their deceitful position, but if that doesn’t work they resort to playing the authoritarian and attempt to shut-down the conversation, stifle debate, have the last word, and sit, like a 500 obese women, on the opposition by crushing them with quotes of authoritative but philosophically ignorant opponents who perpetuated the error of generations that came before them.

But an excellent analogy makes their false ideology evaporate like water drops on hot asphalt. The situation of the divorce of Tom Cruise and Katie Holmes provides just such an analogy in the form of the nature of their daughter. What is she? She’s an American [but what makes her an American? She could have been born anywhere in the world while Tom was making a movie abroad and Katie was with him. Would their child born abroad be a foreigner? Would she need to be “naturalized” when she reached adulthood? Or was she born an American just like her parents, and by the very same principle, namely the principle of natural membership? Did she not inherit the nationality of her parents? Did inheriting their citizenship naturally not put her citizenship above and beyond the authority of Congress to legislate and regulate? If anyone foolishly argues otherwise, then they need to answer the question that I’ve digressed from]

Is Suri Cruise a natural born Scientologist? Or a natural born Catholic? Tom believes she was born to be a Scientologist like her father. Her mother has no such belief. There’s a conflict because there’s a natural division. Division is what happens when something is divided, and in this analogy, it’s not the citizenship of their child that is divided by parents with conflicting nationalities, it’s her religious background.

The mating of conflicting natures, or clans, or nationalities or religions can never produce a uniform, harmonious combination. Whereas combining identical natures does not even produce a combination. No more than when you combine water with water. That is not a combination. Combining water and oil (to produce salad dressing) is a combination.

Examples of conflicted combinations are everywhere in human history and consciousness, from Samson and Delilah, to Romeo and Juliet, to Loyalists married to Patriots, to Hatfields married to McCoys, to Muslims married to Hindus, to atheists married to believers, to Sunnis married to Shites, to communists married to capitalists, to whites married to blacks, to Scientologists married to non-Scientologists.

No such union can produce an off-spring that is a natural member of either of the parents’ groups because one does not inherit a uniform nature in the area of the conflict. One is born in violation of the Law of Uniformity, -which is the natural law that only members of the same species can produce new off-spring identical to themselves. Whenever that principle is violated in the non-biological realm, then the result will always be conflicted, and result eventually in confusion of some sort thanks to the compulsion of the parents to form an “unnatural” union.

Their child won’t be a natural member of either group because it will be a half-member of two competing groups, and half-members are never natural since half-natural is unnatural. A half dog-half cat wouldn’t be a natural dog nor a natural cat. Being both would make it unnatural. Just as being both male and female (a hermaphrodite) means that one is not a natural member of either sex. One is a hybrid, and no hybrid is ever natural. Nature does not produce hybrids. Humans can’t produce off-spring with apes, lions can’t produce off-spring with bears, birds can’t produce off-spring with reptiles. The same principle carries over into the social, cultural, racial, religious, and political realms, meaning that unnatural, non-uniform, dissimilar unions produce unnatural results because they produce unnatural hybrids.

Suri Cruise is no more a natural Scientologist, nor a natural Catholic than Barack Obama is a natural American or a natural Kenyan. A split, combined, bifurcated, dissimilar, non-uniform parental nationality inheritance produces a political hybrid which doesn't fully belong to either group.

Almost all of the various forms of conflicting backgrounds can be ignored by two people in love, but religion sometimes can't be because it goes to the core of what some people are, and what they want, (-almost need) for their children. One's inherited hybrid political nature rarely produces a nationality conflict, but there are enough nations on earth that are hostile to western civilization that dual-nationality as a source of conflict remains a very real possibility.

To avoid possible dire consequences due to a conflicting loyalty to a different nation (Britain) our nation's founders, especially General George Washington, choose to bar any person born with such a conflict from serving as the Commander-in-Chief of the American armed forces. He, more than anyone, had felt the deep sting of betrayal by his own trusted heroic fellow patriot General Benedict Arnold. If one who was born as an American (and fellow British subject) who led thousands of Continental soldiers in combat against the British Army and defeated them, and could have commanded half of the American forces, could become a traitor to the American Army and the war of Independence, then how much more easily could someone betray the future United States of America if they were domestically born but with a conflicted political background, (a foreign father) and raised abroad to be loyal to a foreign dictator?

There was no room whatsoever for error in who was allowed to hold the reins of power over the new nation's military forces. Any treachery from the supreme commander could destroy the nation and its future. To avoid any possible disloyalty, the founders decided that future Presidents, after their own generation had passed, must not only be an American, but must be a natural American by birth. He, -a free, white, educated male Caucasian Protestant of northern European descent,

must not be born (and presumably raised) by a foreign father with a foreign allegiance and a foreign homeland with foreign culture, history, and political ideas. He must be purely American and free of any possible foreign allegiance by being the son of Americans.

A foreign father, even a domiciled one, would disqualify one from holding the highest office. That prohibition disqualifies Barack Obama from being constitutionally qualified to serve as President of the United States. Even though those fathered by foreigners may be granted citizenship from birth, they are not natural citizens because they are alien-born citizens naturalized at birth. The difference is like that between fresh water and salt water. One is contaminated with an undesirable substance (salt or foreign citizenship and the attachments that come with it.) Salt water may be 98% pure water, but even a small amount of foreign substances makes it impure. So it is with American citizenship and its relationship to the Presidency and authority over nuclear weapons.

This is not some esoteric philosophy. It's common sense. But we no longer live in a world that knows what common sense is. A punitive penalty, -a punishment, is now referred to as "a tax", so when your parents spanked you, they were really taxing you. When you pay your income tax, it's really an income penalty, -an income punishment. ("When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, it means just what I choose it to mean -- neither more nor less." Mr. Dumpty, meet Mr. Obama.)

"Natural born citizen", like the words "tax" and "penalty" does not mean whatever someone says it means. Its meaning is not determined by the will of self-serving men, but by the unchanging law of language. Words mean what they mean, they don't mean something completely different. No one has the authority to ascribe a new meaning to them. While the meaning of words are not universally written in granite, they are at least written in sandstone, and have a firm and solid meaning that selfish men cannot legitimately change in order to make that which is illegitimate legitimate.

by a.r. nash july 2012