

Hybrid Natives Are Not Natural Natives (Obama is hybrid and not a natural Native)

There's a widespread common misconception that's preventing the American people from grasping the truth about the nature of the citizenship of Barack Obama. That misconception is that compliance with the citizenship requirements of the 14th Amendment [birth within the United States and full subjection to the federal government, -including the obligation to defend the nation if needed] is all that's required for presidential eligibility, but in fact it is not.

Birth within the United States is not an element of the three requirements that must be met in order to be eligible to be President. The first element [along with age and residency requirements] is that one must be a "natural born citizen". To be such does not involve place of birth. [Nearly all Americans are born in America, but a small percentage are born to Americans living overseas, -like John McCain.]

But a U.S. birth location does not necessarily make children American citizens by birth because their parents must not be foreign diplomats or tourists, or temporary workers/ students/ educators/ merchants/ athletes/ etc.

They are the exceptions to the 14th Amendment because they are under the sovereignty of their own governments. They owe allegiance only to their own homeland, -the land where they have their citizenship and to which they will return after a limited stay in the U.S. Such temporary guests are not "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States nor do they bear the responsibility of citizens and other permanent members of American society (immigrants) for national defense.

The Constitution requires that the President be a "natural born citizen". Why did some of the founders use "native-born" interchangeably with "natural-born"? Was there something that they were failing to understand about the difference between the two? Were they implying that a President must have been born within the United States, or worse, were they implying that almost

anyone at all born within the United States is thereby eligible to be the President?

[Finding the answers to these questions should one day be the chore of the United States Supreme Court when and if they ever are willing and brave enough to accept the adjudication of the issue of whether or not Barack Obama was constitutionally qualified to be the President.]

Some of the founding fathers may have conflated the term "native-born citizens" with "natural born citizens" because of the legal practice of the state in which they were born, raised, and educated, -a state which may have granted citizenship to native-born children of non-citizen immigrants. In such a state there was no difference between children born to Americans and children born to foreigners, -with one exception spelled out in their State constitution, and that was eligibility to the office of the Governor. Since he was in command of the State Militia, by state law he was required to be a natural born state citizen. Sons of foreigners were not to be entrusted with the martial power of the Governor's office.

Also, some congressional leaders may have used the terms interchangeably because of the root that they have in common. In their minds they may have been fully aware of that connection, and also realized that it bore no relation to place-of-birth.

By natural law one is the same as one's parents. Lions don't give birth to donkeys, Natural inheritance is an inviolable law of nature. Members don't give birth to non-members, nor do non-members give birth to members anymore than donkeys give birth to lions. If fathered by an outsider, one is not a natural member even if membership is granted by permission.

The most fundamental right in nature is property ownership, which begins with the wives and children of the Alpha male. Hence the basis of patrilineal inheritance by descent. The children belong to him and inherit what pertains to him, be it his nature or his name or his status or his possessions.

Place of birth is only an issue in regard to "The Divine Right of Kings". They had Lordship over

all born within their dominion because they had the power and authority to claim it. Every man was a pawn (or higher) on the chessboard of the King. Within his realm, people were born where their parents lived, and people lived within their group for generation after generation, marrying, and having children who were new natural members of the group.

But if one produced a child with a member of a foreign group, that created an unnatural situation. Such children aren't natives of their mother's group because they take after their father. The alpha male's ownership dominates the situation as long as he is in a central part of the picture. That's Natural Law in the social realm, analogous to that of the animal realm.

To be a natural born citizen is not based on American laws or judicial rulings. It is instead based solely on Natural Law. Natural Law involves a principle derived from nature and natural societies that aren't governed by written laws and bureaucracies. It is the principle of natural group membership.

Membership in any group is always the result of either being born into the group by birth to group parents, or membership by permission. The principle is self-evident in nature, so let's look at its application in human society.

A hypothetical situation provides a good illustration. If a pregnant Englishwoman sailed on the first ship to reach North America and she delivered there, her child would not be a native American. Only those born of the native indigenous people were natives of the new world.

Before that principle could be naturally applicable to children of Europeans and their descendants, it required many, many generations of births in the new world, to the point that they no longer had European attachments.

Certainly after over 100 years of a colony's existence, its citizens, (the descendants of earlier settlers), would fit the description of being native-born Americans. By then they were clearly the new indigenous population. They were the new

natives and the new world was their one and only homeland.

Their children were natives by birth in the homeland to parents who were indigenous members of the colony, -being the new natural natives via birth to native parents.

All of the descendants of the early settlers would be natives by birth, (natural-born natives), whereas those who joined the colony by immigration were not born as Natives. They would be allowed to join and would be members, but they would not be natives because they, like their parents, were foreigners.

Their children would also be members, -being so from birth, but they would not be Natives either because they also were not born to Natives. But the grandchildren *would* be Natives because they would be born to native-born members. They would be natural members by birth to native-born members who were members at birth, -not by immigration, -meaning they were never foreigners. Thus it could be said that they would be Natural Natives, -like those with much longer ancestry in the colony.

If an Asian or African, or Indian immigrant with no connection to anyone in the colony fathered a child with a native colonial woman, their child would not be a natural native of the colony, but would be a hybrid. It's membership would be dependent on its acceptance by the members.

If the father was very foreign, such as American men in Vietnam, then the hybrid children might be rejected by society, as they were in Vietnam, requiring their transplantation to America. Those Amer-Asian children were not natural members of Vietnam nor America because of the conflicting nature of their parents' background, nationality, language, and race.

Children born in America to Amer-Asian parents would not be eligible to be President because they would not have been born to parents who were American citizens unless they obtained citizenship via naturalization law prior to their child's birth.

Naturalization makes one the same as natural citizens except for being ineligible to be President,

-or qualifiable to guard the President, -or to guard, access, control or launch nuclear weapons.

In a group or colony, if the natives wished to protect their group from hybrid members who might harbor an affinity toward and loyalty to the group of their outsider-parent, they would require that no one could be their chief except a natural-born native son, not a hybrid-born half native.

In the group that became the union of the sovereign states of America, they put such a stipulation into their foundational charter. It substituted the word "citizen" for the word "native". So it reads "No person except a natural born citizen...shall be eligible to the Office of the President;".

Half-native half-foreign hybrid citizens are not natural citizens. And no native-born foreigner-fathered person with hybrid citizenship is eligible to be the President of the United States.

Obama Sr. was a natural citizen of Kenya. Obama's mother was a natural citizen of the United States. Their son was a hybrid citizen whose American citizenship was not via the natural inheritance of his father's political nature. Therefore his citizenship was not natural citizenship by descent from citizens, but was citizenship by administrative law policy, -policy established to accommodate un-natural situations involving outsiders producing off-spring with insiders.

The children of Barack Obama Jr. are natural born Americans because they were born to American parents, but their father was not. His father, Obama Sr., was an outsider, a temporary visitor, not even an immigrant, and therefore it was not possible for him to father a natural native of the United States.

Barack Obama Jr., for lack of a native American father, is not a native American son, but is merely a native-born hybrid. By birth he was not a natural member of the American nation, therefore he is not a natural born citizen of the United States nor a constitutionally eligible President.

by a.r. nash april 2012
obama--nation.com