Natives, Tribes, & Citizenship Truths

Understanding the meaning of the presidential eligibility clause requires nothing more than being aware of natural roles that are assigned by blood connection, -by inheritance, -by parentage.

Nature has only three patterns defining the relationship between members of a species, including humans. One pattern is that of individuals being loners who do not live in a social group. The next pattern includes those that do.

The third is a pattern different from the second because the second is comprised of creatures having equal size and strength regardless of gender, while the third is comprised of members having different sizes and strengths, with the weaker being the females and the stronger being the males.

The first pattern doesn't exist in the human world except for the homeless, while the second and third do, and express the difference between the modern world and the world in which women are a form of property, -the world of dominant male-chauvinism and machismo

. The second pattern includes an anomaly in both the animal and human realms. Among elephant herds there are no males because they are driven away as teenagers since testosterone makes their behavior unacceptable, and so the pattern developed of excluding them.

In a welfare society, unwed mothers are excluded from welfare if a father is present to care for his own child. But without a job or career, fathers can't support their children so they abandon them to be raised by welfare-receiving mothers. That whole category of society is devoid of adult male father-figures.

But the third pattern of nature is the one most common among primates and many higher-level mammals, including lions, elk, walruses, cattle, etc. The male is the dominant sex, the protector of the females and children. He is master of the domain. That has been the common pattern in human society throughout the ages, including in the group that is a pre-cursor to nations; namely families, clans and tribes.

The male head of the family group is the ultimate authority because he is the one on whom falls the responsibility to sacrifice life and limb to defend his charges, his family, his people. With that assigned role, his position is preeminent. When a females accepts him as her mate, he becomes her protector and she becomes subservient to his leadership role. She takes his name and abandons her father's name. She becomes a part of him and his world and takes a vow of obedience.

If she is an outsider from another tribe, it doesn't matter in regard to their children because they are not what she was, instead they are what he is. She is subsumed by the blood connections of his family sphere. She takes pride in what he is and accomplishes, as do their children who also draw identity and pride in the ancestral heritage inherited from him, of which they are a part. His wife is woven into that fabric as a naturalized member of the family and tribe.

But if a female native marries an outsider who co-habitates with a tribe not his own, their children will not be in the same circumstance because their father is an alien. Their mother takes on a connection to him, and he is connected to another people, and thus also are their children; dual and conflicted identity and loyalty. He could take his brood and move out of the tribe and go back to his own people, while the children of the male native father have no other people since the former tribe of their mother is foreign to them and they to it. She is no longer an attached part of them, having been naturalized by marriage and motherhood into her husband's clan or tribe.

Her sons can one day be the Chief, but the sons of the outsider father can never be Chief because they are not pure-blood natives of the tribe. They do not belong to it exclusively. They are not natural members but are members by permission of the tribe because its membership is passed from father to child, -not from mother to child. That's the natural pattern, and that's the way it was in

1787 when the Constitution was written. It has never been constitutionally altered except that now daughters can also be Chief.

Native-born citizens are to natural born citizens what fraternal twins are to identical twins. The common perception of twins is that they look alike, and yet there are exceptions, as in when they are not the result of one egg but of two. The result can not only be that they don't look alike, but they can even be different races and genders.

Years back there was even a case of a mother who gave birth to a white baby and a black baby at the same time. And recently in the news was a case of a mother birthing two sets of twins at once, -one in 300 million odds. Those children exist against the same odds as Barack Obama's presidency.

Suppose that one set of those twins were identical, and let's say beautiful girls, while the other set were fraternal twin boys, -with one being albino and the other being black. No one would look at them and think that they were all the same, -that they were indistinguishable. Yet in the minds of the blind, the children of the descendents of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson are identical to the U.S. born children of Osama bin Laden because natural citizenship does not exist. They only recognize legal citizenship and think that being born in America makes one a legal citizen and therefore equal and indistinguishable in any way.

But children of foreigners and children of Americans are as distinguishable as those two very different hypothetical sets of twins. They were both born having membership in their family, just as natural and native-born citizens have citizenship from birth, but fraternal twins are not, and can never be, identical twins. They are different, but by nature, just as natural citizens are citizens by nature, but native-born children of foreigners are like a child adopted from a mother in the next hospital bed who didn't survive childbirth. It can never be a natural child of the mother and her family since an adopted child is not hers by nature but by law -even if from birth.

Clearly, there is a distinction between reality and perception about twins, just as there is in regard to the nature of the citizenship of the native-born. The children of Americans are not the same as the children of foreigners, -regardless of the common geographical location of their births or the equality of the character of their devotion to their country. Children of foreigners may well have a greater appreciation for being an American because their parents have made them conscious of how pathetic life was in their homeland.

But the issue isn't a quantification of loyalty to America but of the reality of a real and natural difference in the character of their citizenship. One is natural national membership, -the other is man-made, artificial, legal membership which does not come by Right but by permission. It's not transmitted by life but by law.

It is indisputable that legal citizenship is not natural citizenship because natural citizenship exists in the total absence of any law, while legal citizenship is 100% dependent on law and without it, it would not exist.

For Obama, it's even worse since his citizenship is not the result of any law, but the result solely of an erroneous policy based on an erroneous understanding of a bastardized Supreme Court majority opinion that threw out over 100 years of national policy and Supreme Court precedence, and rewrote, in effect, the 14th Amendment and its meaning. That Supreme Court opinion is the law, but the policy that misconstrues it is not the law, and could be changed overnight.

Obama's citizenship is not a result of American law but of an American policy based on ignorance and the power of entrenched, institutionalized error. His citizenship is as rare and unnatural as is the albino white buffalo. He could not be farther from being a natural citizen unless he was not even born in America.

The nature & origin of his presumed citizenship is as cloaked in mist and mystery as is the nature of the white buffalo, and just as rare, but there is

nothing normal and natural about anything that is rare.

The rare is abnormal, aberrant, deviant from the norm, strange and unique, -just like Obama's pdf computer-crafted counterfeit birth certificate which was produced from real parts, but like Frankenstein's monster, had no origin in a natural source. The monster walks and talks but that doesn't make it a natural human being, nor does the superficial appearance of Obama's Certificate of Live Birth make it a true, unaltered, replica of a real hospital record, nor does his albino, white buffalo, presumed citizenship make him a natural or law-based American citizen.

A final point: There are three distinctly different positions regarding what a natural born citizen is; the one on the extreme left ignorantly declares that it means "a native-born citizen". The one on the extreme right erroneously declares that it means "a native-born natural citizen". While the one in the literal-language middle argues that it means only what it says and exactly what it says and nothing more and nothing less. In fact, it says more than it actually needs to say because the word "born" is implied by the word natural. One cannot be a natural citizen without having been born one, and so in that sense it is redundant to include the word "born" when using the word "natural".

But in the absence of the word "natural", the word "born" usefully modifies the word "citizen", since without it there's no differentiation between those who are citizens naturally and those who are naturalized since both are Citizens.

But even with the word "born", ambiguity still exists because it does not differentiate between those who are born as citizens naturally and those who are born as citizens by law.

One is a natural citizen while the other is a naturalized-at-birth citizen. What difference does it make what type of born citizen one is? Well, essentially none, and positively none as regarding one's rights and protections and obligations. In those regards they are identical, but there is one other category established by the Constitution and it is occupied by only two people out of over 300 million, and in it there is an exclusion made, -an exclusion found no where in American society or life except in regard to who is eligible to wield the power of the Commander-in-Chief.

Constitutionally speaking, that is the truth regarding the President and Vice-President alone, but not true practically speaking since others are also assigned to it, and they are those who guard the President, Vice-President and their families, and those who guard, maintain, control and launch American nuclear bombs. Only natural citizens are allowed to occupy those positions because, like the presidency, it's a matter of national security.

For the one unique position of the presidency, along with its back-up officer, the category of ***privilege*** contains a mandatory differentiation between those who are assigned the status of citizen by human mandate, and those who are born with the natural political nature of Citizen in the absence of any human mandate or judicial opinion. Only they are the true natives or natural members of the nation, while their brethren by law are not natural members because they inherited a foreign political nature from a foreign father, and are only permitted the status of Citizen by the permission of the laws passed by the representative of the natural members of the nation.

That permission could be withdrawn by a constitutional amendment and thereafter no person born in America with a foreign father would be considered a United States citizen, as it was for over 100 years from the founding of the nation.

But such an amendment could not be adopted in regard to natural citizens because they would have to be the ones adopting it. It would be a Bizarro World situation when the members of a group or a game adopt a rule that says they (or their children) are no longer members of their own group.

The framers of the Constitution had the opportunity to describe the citizen nature of a President in different words and yet they choose the words that they settled on. But they could have stated instead that the "No person except a native-born citizen shall be eligible…"; or "No person except a native-born natural citizen shall be eligible…", or "No naturalized citizen shall be eligible…"; and yet they did not accept those clearly understood descriptions because none of them says what they wanted to be said, -which was that all sons of Americans are eligible at 35 years of age to be President as long as they've lived in America for 14 years.

By requiring the citizenship of the President and Vice-President to be natural, they effectively barred the sons of foreigners from holding the highest and most powerful position in the nation since sons of foreigners are not natural citizens but are citizens by law, (if citizens at all) that didn't even exist until four generations later when the 14th Amendment was ratified, and which meant something that was assumed to be the age-old policy of the United States, but, being ambiguously worded, was altered by the Supreme Court's majority opinion about what the 14th Amendment means, (their Wong Kim Ark opinion of 1898) -an amendment and which was written for those denied U.S. citizenship because they were not born to citizens even though they were born in America, -they being freed slaves.

Clearly, those who are citizens by nature and those who are citizens by law are distinguishable, and that distinction was drawn by the founding fathers in regard to one and only one office, the presidency. And by that distinction, Barack H. Obama Jr. is an invalid, illegitimate, unconstitutionally President.

The distillation of the presidential eligibility clause and the 14th Amendment is as follows:

"Every person born subject to the political jurisdiction of the United States government is a citizen of the United States irrespective of birth location.

American children not begotten by fathers subject to a foreign power or to American citizenship statutes are natural born citizens irrespective of birth location. They are therefore eligible to the office of the President. But all other citizens are prohibited, including foreign-born naturalized citizens, statutory & derivative citizens, and native-born 14th Amendment citizens."

The 14th Amendment had no need to mention a requirement for birth in the United States because children of foreign fathers are only born subject to the jurisdiction of Washington if they are born within the United States. Therefore the wording of the Amendment is inherently redundant. By first requiring birth within the United States and then requiring subjection to the authority of the United States government it is requiring something that is impossible for those not born within the United States unless they are natural born citizens, -for whom the amendment was not written, and does not apply.

Placing an emphasis on native-birth distracts from where it rightly belongs, which is on subjection to the political authority of the federal government. That subjection is the basis for granting citizenship, not native-birth. But that subjection only exists if one born to foreigners (or a foreign father) is born within U.S. sovereign jurisdiction, although native-birth in and of itself does not make one subject. For that one must be legally permanently domiciled, meaning one must be a member of American society.

"All…and…are…" "All persons…and subject…are citizens." What's redundant is the first half. It could be dropped completely and rewritten as "All persons born subject to the United States are citizens thereof." That would have covered every person born in every state as well as federal territories.

Constitutional amendments can only revise the Constitution by mandating something that expressly nullifies, supersedes, alters or adds to the meaning of something in the Constitution or something that was universally accepted as the norm and status quo of the nation when it was ratified. The

14th Amendment makes no alteration in the meaning of what a natural born citizen is, nor did the Supreme Court in its Wong Kim Ark opinion since it did not address its meaning in its decision. No one who is a citizen via the Supreme Court's Wong opinion is eligible to be President because such citizens are not natural born Americans, even though they are native-born Americans.

Deriving one's citizenship via legal means that are dependent on birth within the United States or Congressional legislation or executive branch policy is the definition of not being a natural born American citizen. If native-birth is needed in order to obtain legal citizenship then it is solely because one was born with the alienage of a foreign father. Those without any foreign parentage can be born anywhere on the planet and are automatically American citizens because they are what their parents are.

There are different forms of legal citizenship. They include naturalized citizenship, statutory & derivative citizenship, and constitutional citizenship (via the 14th Amendment).

There is also a form of citizenship which operates outside of the law although it has the force of the authority of the government, and that form is citizenship by policy rather than law. That is the form of citizenship which Barack Obama is assumed to possess. His citizenship is not truly citizenship by national law but by national policy only since the law that is presumed to cover him does not in fact do so through his father nor through his mother.

Statutory citizenship is that mandated by Congress and doesn't involve naturalization. It involves non-citizens being granted citizenship outright without undergoing the naturalization process. It includes citizenship via the Civil Rights Act of 1866 (superseded by the 14th Amendment) and grants of citizenship to Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Guamians, as well as around a hundred thousand Vietnamese boat people who fled to America to escape communist persecution.

None of them were natural Americans but were made to be Americans by the exercise of legislative power, becoming legal citizens. In the individual level, statutory citizenship involves the off-spring of an American and a foreigner being born outside of the United States jurisdiction, as well as the citizenship status of American women who marry foreign men (a century ago the law stripped them of their citizenship).

But no legal citizen is eligible to serve as President. Only those who are NOT legal citizens are eligible, because only they are natural citizens of the United States. Their citizenship is passed to them by American parents apart from and in the absence of American law. They are the true natives of the nation, -not by native-birth but by birth to natives.

If the 14th Amendment were exclusionary, then it would not have used the opening words; "All persons" but would have instead employed language used in the presidential eligibility clause; "No person except...". Or used its same words but in negative terms: "All persons not born subject to the jurisdiction of the United States are not citizens of the United States.".

The inclusive language of the amendment has this as its skeleton: "All person born in…and subject to the United State, (meaning: born within American jurisdiction and subject to American authority at birth).

If couched in exclusionary terms that results in: "Any person born in the United States but not subject to its political authority is not a citizen of the United States."

What it doesn't say is: "No person born in the United States and subject to its central government is NOT a citizen thereof."

What it absolutely does not say nor mean is: "Any person not born in the United State is not subject to its central government, and therefore is not a citizen."

Or worse: "No person born outside the United States, even though subject to its jurisdiction, is not a citizen of the United States."

Or worst of all: “No person not born in the United States is a natural citizen of the United States, nor a citizen of any sort whatsoever.”
Its opposite is: “All persons born subject to the authority of the United States are citizens of the United State regardless of where they are born.” That’s the widest true blanket statement possible.

But the amendment was not focused on including natural citizens born outside the United States, nor on persons born within the United States that were not subject to its authority, (Native Americans, Gypsies, Martians, and foreign visitors and representatives) but was focused solely on those people who were both born in and subject to the United States. The Supreme Court said that the 14th Amendment said that sons of immigrants are subject and therefore are citizens.

But Attorney General Griggs surmised that the Supreme Court had opined that every citizen and foreigner born in the U.S. is subject (except children of foreign ambassadors), which is false and which the Supreme Court did not say. He turned "All persons...and subject...are citizens," into "All persons...are citizen" by overlooking both visiting and illegally-present foreign women and babies that might be born to them. That wasn’t a significant oversight until the southern border became the gateway for an invasion of foreigners not subject to the American government.

We’ve been stuck with Griggs’ error ever since, which allows “citizenship tourists” giving birth in the U.S. and a President who isn’t even a genuine American citizen -not by Nature nor by Law.

by adrien nash march 2013,
http://obama--nation.com
http://obamabc.wordpress.com