

U.S. Marines, U.S. Ambassadors & An Unconstitutional President

(~clarifying the natural citizenship issue)

There are three widespread delusions regarding U.S. citizenship, but they are of a subtle, unrecognized nature. They are due to common, seemingly common-sense assumptions, but those assumptions are the opposite of the truth.

The first erroneous assumption is that any citizenship that is not the result of the naturalization process is a form of citizenship which allows one to be the President.

The second erroneous assumption is that anyone born within the sovereign borders of the U.S. is a U.S. citizen and therefore the first assumption applies to him or her.

The third erroneous assumption is that anyone not born within the U.S. is ineligible to be President because they are in the same category as naturalized citizens.

There is also a fourth false idea, -one that eligibility to be President is tied to a concept (one lacking a logical basis), that the Constitution's reference to the President's required natural citizenship includes birth on U.S. soil. That idea is false because the concept is a mish-mash contrivance that conglomerates two opposite citizenship principles, -one natural and one artificial, or man-made.

The contrived concept marries the principle of natural citizenship with the feudal concept of boundary-determined citizenship. It takes the Constitution's eligibility requirement; "No person except a natural born citizen...shall be eligible to the office of the President" and pontificates that such citizens *must* have American parents *and* be born in on American controlled soil.

That's sounds reasonable and wise on its face, but in fact its face is not enough. An extraneous factor which complicates the issue is the rare but ever-constant exception to the rule. That exception is the nature of the national membership of babies born to Americans living in foreign nations.

Such foreign domiciled American parents are not less loyal, patriotic, or "American" than they were before moving and living abroad. They are still who and what they've always been, and if what they are is more than just an average American, then they may be even more pro-American than their fellow countrymen living in America.

I speak of those who represent America to the governments of the world, -our foreign Ambassadors, consuls, and representatives (along with their support staff. They are now in the national consciousness due to the murder of Ambassador Christopher Stevens in Libya, along with the former Navy Seals assigned to him.

The questions that no one ever asks is: "what is the nature of the citizenship of a child born abroad to such Americans? Is it the same as its parents? Or is it citizenship granted by the government, -without which it would not even be an American?"

Those questions go to the heart of whether or not a traitor to the constitution has been occupying the White House since January 2009.

The salient question is; "what is the nature of natural citizenship, and does Barack Obama possess it?" The issue of the nature of natural citizenship is related to two subjects; those born with a foreign father and those born to American parents but in a foreign country.

Clearly, those two possibilities have little in common since one is related to blood and the other to borders. Are natural citizens those born to American citizens or simply those born on the land of American citizens? Or...are both necessary? The only way to deduce the correct answer is to recognize the principle involved in producing a natural citizen.

Those highly educated, intelligent attorneys who insist it is *both* are oblivious to the principle on which natural membership is based. But our founding fathers were not, and they had a more down-to-earth understanding of the basis of natural citizenship and how it impacted Americans in the real world. They weren't thinking about the arcane subject of American children born abroad when they were laboring

on writing the new constitution of government, but they never thought for a moment that American sons, such as one hypothetically born in Tripoli to Ambassador Stevens or the ex-Navy Seals accompanying him were ineligible to be considered as presidential material no matter how great the sacrifice of their father, or themselves in serving their country.

The founders saw no difference in American sons based on the soil on which they were born. Rather, the difference between American sons was a reflection of what kind of father they were born to. A foreign father or an American father? A father holding and defending American values and the United States Constitution, or a father suffused with foreign ideas of government and total subjection to it? -A father that embraced individual liberty or one that bowed deeply in subservience to the government and its right to be lord & master of all?

Did the citizenship of one's father make any difference to the founders? None whatsoever when it came to serving in the U.S. Government and military as long as they had become American citizens, -unless one was the one in millions who might be elected to be the Commander-in-Chief of all of America's federal and military forces, -along with being the President and head of all the government departments. Only then did it make a difference, -and that difference was clear and absolute.

When it came to the power of the head of all United States military forces, the founders recognized a difference between a citizen born of an American father, even if born in Tripoli, and a citizen born of a foreigner, an alien, with no organic natural connection to the United States by blood.

One was an American by nature, while the other was an American via the human contrivance of positive law passed on the behalf of such alien-born children. One could be presumed to be a loyal American, while the other would have a cloud of doubt hanging over his head, even though born somewhere that was within U.S. sovereign borders.

The founding fathers were not ignorant fools who were unaware of the reality of the danger of such a scenario, but in their minds and era it was related to children of British privilege who were staunchly loyal to the King of England, instead of Islam.

If a British noble or aristocrat or loyal subject brought a child into the world in the United States, that child was not an American because the father was a subject of a foreign power and not subject to the political authority of the United States over its citizens and immigrants.

Such a child not only was not a natural born citizen, it was not a citizen at all. But it could have been a native-born citizen in one or more of the sovereign states (-where citizenship was determined, and perhaps granted, to "sons of the soil").

But the federal government did not recognize such citizenship as natural citizenship so such a citizen would not be eligible to be the President.

The federal government recognized four types of citizenship, and they are analogous to the four types of American servicemen.

Let's connect them thusly; The Marines are equivalent to natural born citizens.

The Army is equivalent to naturalized citizens.

The Navy is equivalent to "native-born" citizens, -those with foreign fathers.

And the Air Force is equivalent to derivative citizens, -those children or wives who obtained citizenship upon the father/husband becoming naturalized. Their citizenship was derived from his.

[As for the Coast Guard, it could be equivalent to provisional citizens, -minors, born abroad to foreign fathers and American mothers who later divorced. Their citizenship depended on them living in the United States to fulfill the required provision of a naturalization statute.]

The insight gained by this analogy is that just as all members of the American military services are American servicemen and women,

they are not all U.S. Marines. There is a difference. They all have the same rights, but they do not all have the same privileges. They are essential equal, but some are more equal than others, -just as natural citizens (the 97%) are eligible to be President, but the other citizens are not.

Similarly, the U.S. Marines have a special role, and honor, and that is to guard the Embassies of the United States, as well as to guard the President himself in the White House, and to provide him helicopter transportation.

When the bodies of Ambassador Stevens and his three bodyguards were received back home, it was the Marines only who had the honor of attending to their caskets, and supplying the brass band to commemorate the ceremony.

There was a reason for that, -it wasn't some undefined happenstance capricious reason either. It was based on a principle (they are the force responsible for guarding Ambassadors), just as the mandate that the President be no one except a natural born citizen is based on a principle of nation security, unquestionable loyalty, and allegiance to American values and America's Constitution.

But in our liberalized, lax, unfaithful culture, loyalty and fidelity to our Constitution is a thing of the quaint and stuffy past. And so we've seen an unconstitutional candidate be elected to the presidency, and not one national voice in the main stream media or government made a peep.

No senator fulfilled his duty to vet and reject an "unqualified candidate", nor did even one Supreme Court Justice, including the Chief Judas, say a word when it came to swearing in someone who was forbidden by the Constitution to hold the office. If that is allowed to happen again, you can safely assume that constitutional law is nearly dead.

by a.r. nash sept 2012

~for a pdf version visit here: obama--nation.com