

"Citizens at birth" Are Ineligible to be President

The presumed eligibility of Barack Obama to be President is contingent on multiple fallacies which date back to erroneous assumptions wide-spread in English common law. Obama's eligibility is constructed of a mountain of false presumptions, one piled on top of another until the modern false portrait of what determines presidential eligibility is arrived at.

One can debunk not only Obama's presidential eligibility but also his very U.S. citizenship itself, and do so by debunking the elements of that mountain of errors beginning either at the beginning or at the end. I've done both many, many times over, but one error can be debunked in a few ways I've never previously thought of, and that is the issue of the nature of citizenship "at birth" as compared to that of citizenship *by* birth.

The words "at" and "by" are used either with distinctly different meanings or with almost the same meaning. In the case of citizenship, they have a distinctly different meaning. "At" principally relates to time or timing, whereas "by" principally relates to location, but they often have an overlapping kind of use. Example: one can say "There's someone at the door", -which also means there's someone *by* the door. Similarly, one can say "I leave for school at 7 o'clock", -which also means that I leave for school *by* 7 o'clock, -with both words relating to time and not location.

But if one asks the question: "How is a new human being brought into the world?" The answer is "by birth", -not "at birth". Similarly, if one asks: "*When* does a new human being enter the world?", one cannot answer: "by birth".

This comparison can also be further illustrated by referring to death instead of birth. Suppose that a child of a race of immortals is getting a lesson about the subject of death. The teacher might say: "Humans are relieved of all of their pains and problems at death."

But the child doesn't know what death is and so is forced to ask: "how?".

The answer of course is "by death". Death is the means by which relief is obtained, and that relief occurs timewise *at* death. An event occurs *in* time, but it is not cause *by* time. It is cause by a natural process.

Let's also consider the opposite of dying: resurrection. If Christ rose from the dead, did it happen by time, or by life? The timing of his resurrection can't be ascribed as the cause of his resurrection. The cause has nothing to do with the timing since it would have been via a process, a power, a means, an event, -none of which are related to timing. He would in resurrection possess life via life, not via time. So being alive again *at* resurrection was not related to why he was alive again. He was alive again by something other than time.

So it is with citizenship *by* birth versus citizenship *at* birth. While all who are citizens by birth are also citizens at birth, it can't be said that all who are citizens *at* birth are also citizens *by* birth, because the citizenship of some of them, -a tiny fraction, is via a gift of the natural citizens of the United States who have allowed a deliberate misinterpretation of the 14th Amendment by the Supreme Court to stand as the law of the land, which made into "citizens at birth" all who are born in the United States to permanent domiciled Green Card foreigners. You could also describe them as obtaining "citizenship upon birth".

But the children of American parents never obtain citizenship. They are instead born being Americans by natural inheritance of their parents' national membership. Their citizenship is an innate characteristic of their political nature. Here's some eye-opening examples:

If an American couple brought a child into the world in an area controlled by Al Qaeda in Afghanistan, would the jihadis view it as an Afghan or as an American? If Ambassador Stevens had a child of his

with him in Benghazi, one that was born in Libya, would his murderers have viewed it as a Libyan or as an American?

His child would have been in everyone's eyes an American, including the U.S. government, because the child is what the head of the family is since it is his heir. [in the 5,000 year old tradition of patriarchal leadership, -and continuing in the U.S. from its beginning, that head is the father if he is alive at the birth. "Proles sequitur sortem paternam (children follow the condition of the father)].

If two pregnant immigrant sisters were on the verge of delivery, and one of them decided to have her baby at her parents' home in Mexico, before returning to her residence in the U.S., her child would not be a dual citizen because it would not be a naturalized-at-birth U.S. citizen, -being Mexican only. It could be barred from entering the United States if papers were not obtained, and it would grow up as an American foreigner, similar to American Indian before they were made U.S. citizens.

Similarly, if a Mexican woman was pregnant with twins, and one was born in Mexico prematurely, it would be Mexican only while its twin would be a dual-citizen of Mexico and the U.S., -being a natural citizen of Mexico and a legal citizen of the U.S., i.e., a citizen by law, -a "citizen *at birth*", and not a citizen *by birth* because of parents who were not Americans.

In the same circumstance but with an American mother and father, both children would be Americans also, -regardless of where each entered the world. Their citizenship is by right of natural inheritance, by the transmission of natural membership in the political group into which they were born, that being their parents' nation.

To avoid confusion and ambiguity, a citizen *at birth* needs to be distinguished from a citizen *by birth* unless one is focused on anything other than the presidency. Aside from the presidency, they are essentially equal and identical in all legal respects, but the qualification for the office of the presidency is not a legal matter. It's a constitutional matter and must be followed. No

one is qualified if they haven't lived in the U.S. for 14 years. No one is qualified if they haven't reached 35 years of age. And no one is qualified if they are not a citizen by birth, aka; a natural born citizen.

Natural citizens are Americans in the absence of the 14th Amendment; in the absence of the Wong Kim Ark Supreme Court ruling; in the absence of all Congressional naturalization statutes ever passed; in the absence of every Attorney General interpretation of law and Supreme Court holdings; in the absence of state law and colonial law and common law of England. And even in the absence of the United States Constitution. The natural citizens of the original States of the Union were citizens of their states by natural inheritance, by natural law, by patrilineal descent, by birthright, by jus sanguinis (Right of Blood), by natural membership, but children of foreigners were not, -nor were children of loyalists who were finally forced to choose which nation they chose to belong to; -to their home State or to the King of England.

The sons of the 98% who were Americans could one day be President. But the sons of foreigners could never be President, no matter where they were born or who their father was. That way, the power of the Commander-in-Chief could never devolve on one who might be a secret loyal royalist.

Four of the original States / colonies granted their citizenship to the children born of their immigrants. With immigration being highly encouraged in the new land of America, it was a fitting inducement for immigration, but those sons of foreigners were the source of confusion at the national level, if they ever had issue at that level, because the central government did not recognize dual-citizenship. One was either an American and only an American, or one was a foreigner. Dual citizenship was viewed as national bigamy. A man was either married to America or to a foreign power. Two Lords, or two allegiances weren't possible.

Since children of foreigners were born with the nationality of their foreign father, they were not viewed

as being Americans from the perspective of the national government unless and until they naturalized in the State of their immigration and/or residence in adulthood. That process included the total renunciation of all allegiance and obedience to any foreign power, making them Americans and Americans only.

[That oath has never changed, but it has been bastardized by conflict of nationality resulting from the Supreme Court ruling in the case of Wong Kim Ark, 1898. It declared a native-born son of immigrants to be an American via the 14th Amendment, but for that to make sense required the executive branch to make a 180 degree switch regarding immigrant men, -from viewing them as remaining mainly and fully subject to their own government, to instead being also fully subject to the U.S. Government, with their sons inheriting that subjection along with their foreign subjectship or citizenship, thereby producing dual-citizen sons.]

But regardless of their naturalization, they were not born being natural Americans because they were born being foreigners due to foreign parents. As such, at the federal level, even though they were citizens at birth in those four states which granted "sons of the soil" citizenship (as opposed to sons of blood), they were not eligible to be the President of the United States since where their true allegiance lay was unknown and unknowable, unless that is, they fought alongside of natural Americans during the Revolutionary War. Then they could qualify to be President also due to an exception made on their behalf in the Constitution's eligibility clause: "No person, except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of the President,..."

By the time of the adoption of the Constitution, all foreign veterans of the war had had plenty of time to become naturalized citizens and therefore were "citizens of the United States" and thereby eligible to serve as President.

But once the Constitution was adopted, no person would be eligible except those who were Americans by birth, -not Americans by law, by gift, by allowance, by permission, or national adoption, but by nature.

Natural citizenship is beyond all law because it is not bestowed by either law nor the Constitution. It is a result of natural transmission from citizen parents. Government does not give it and cannot take it away. It is above all government authority. It is one of our unalienable rights and as such is untouchable.

That can't be said about the citizenship of the children of foreigners because they do not enter the world as natural members of our nation.

But since our fundamental national citizenship doctrine views all citizens to be equal as a fiction of American law, their citizenship is also untouchable. But our laws and our Constitution can be changed. Citizenship can't be stripped from "citizens at birth" but that form of citizenship could be ended via constitutional amendment or Supreme Court correction.

By our grace, they are citizens *at* birth, but they can never be citizens *by* birth. They can be appointed to or elected to every office in our entire country, except one, and that is the Presidency of the United States.

[Also, they cannot be allowed to guard the President, Vice-President and their families, nor have access to nuclear weapons, nor to highly classified information or intelligence portals critical to national survival unless appointed by the President and approved by Congress. Those positions are reserved for national security reasons to only children of Americans.]

By A.R. Nash July 2013

<http://obama--nation.com>