

Slaves, Half-breeds, Transexuals, and Obama

Perfect Natural Citizenship Analogies

There are two opposing views of the words the Constitution uses to describe what sort of citizen an American must be in order to be President. One side lumps them all together and calls them a phrase, -or describes them as the more fanciful; "term of art".

The other view sees them as what they are, just simple everyday words, -two of which are adjectives that modify a noun, -all of which can be understood perfectly as individual words.

These differences in view can be represented thusly: Naturalborn-citizen or Natural-born-citizen or NBC, -as opposed to: natural, born, citizen.

As the individual words that constitute the string are used, the purpose of the whole comes to light.

"No person, except **a citizen**,.. shall be eligible to the office of the President,..". Unacceptable as being overly susceptible to foreign influence since it includes foreigners naturalized into Americans.

"No person, except **a born citizen**,.. shall be eligible to the office of the President,..". Unacceptable as being overly susceptible to foreign influence since it includes children of foreigners naturalized at birth into Americans.

"No person, except **a natural citizen**, ..shall be eligible to the office of the President,..". Unacceptable as being overly susceptible to foreign influence since it includes foreigners naturalized into Americans, -all of whom are considered natural Americans because of a fundamental American fiction of law.

By that fiction, foreigners do not become naturalized citizens, they become natural citizens. They then must be treated the same as those born as natural citizens.

That is the regrettable reason why if they become terrorists, their American citizenship (like that of the surviving Boston bomber) cannot be stripped from them. If it could, then they could be shipped off to Guantanamo prison. But natural citizenship cannot be revoked because it was never granted in the first place. It was inherited.

But the fiction of law prevails over the wishes of the American people because it follows the natural law of natural membership, -combined with the

fictional authority of government to fundamentally alter a persons political nature via the power of the Oath of Allegiance and Renunciation.

Natural membership is real. It is something into which one is born, just as one is born into their own family as a natural member, -and not a legal member via adoption.

The power of government cannot replicate such natural membership by birth, but it can and does try to imitate it via the invented fiction of law.

But it is nothing more than a pretense that everyone agrees to for the sake of the equality and dignity of new Americans who are totally sincere and willing to forsake their previous attachment to their homeland and its government in order to become Americans.

There has never been any downside to it until the advent of terrorism and the rise of Obama to the position of presidential candidate.

That fiction of law does not apply to him but it influences the ignorant public's view of who is eligible to be President. The common thinking is that everyone born in America is eligible to serve as President because all are equal, but all are not equal, -hence the wording of the Constitution's eligibility clause.

"No person, except a **natural born citizen**,..shall be eligible to the office of the President,..". Acceptable because it is free of all foreign influence. What does the addition of "natural" add to "born citizen"? The answer is clear by reversing the order of the two words "natural" and "born" (a born natural citizen).

"No person, except one **born a natural citizen**,..shall be eligible to the office of the President,..". Acceptable because it eliminates all possibility of foreign attachment. Any American born as a natural citizen, and not merely made into a natural citizen by the legal fiction, is 100% American.

President BAIR-ak o-BAM-a (the correct pronunciation) is only half American. The other half is foreign. As such he is constitutionally forbidden to serve as the United States President.

Government has the right to support the fiction that all types of natural-ized citizens are natural citizens, but what it cannot do is foster the notion that it has the power to make natural citizen into natural citizens. That is not a mis-typed statement. An perfect analogy will explain.

A surgeon has the ability to take a prepared male and remake him into a female, but that female, although apparently identical in every respect, was not born as a natural female, just as naturalized citizens, including those naturalized at birth, were not born as natural citizens.

That is transparently clear, but what is confusing in the minds of some is the idea that government has power to make something that already naturally exists. Just as no surgeon has the ability to make a woman into a woman, the government has no power to make a natural citizen into a citizen.

The femaleness of born females is not the result of surgery. So also, the American-ness of natural citizens is not the result of the power of government to grant citizenship. Neither legislation, nor policy can grant nor alter that which already is pre-existent.

For that reason, no such legislation nor policy exists. Government cannot make natural citizens into citizens because they were born being citizens. They are the 97% of the nation who are its natural members because they were born of members. They are citizens by nature and not by law.

It was natives like them that originally created the law which was needed to deal with people who were not natural citizens because they were foreigners or born of foreigners. -Or...were born of a foreign father.

Some folks have a warped view of citizenship because they have a warped view of the nature and scope of the power of government. The true nature of citizenship, -as something that is natural in ordinary conditions, is illustrated by the relationships involved in slavery.

The slave plantation is the perfect analogue to the territory of the nation. The slave owner is a perfect analogue to the government. The slaves are perfect analogues to citizens. Now here's the comparison: suppose that a slave woman gives birth on the plantation. To whom does the child belong? To the parents only, or to the slave owner?

By natural rights the child belongs solely to the parents, but by property rights it belongs to the slave owner (the government). Similarly, citizens "belong" to the nation because they are born as members of the society to which their parents belong.

But what clarifies the nature of citizenship is the case of a slave woman who gives birth in town and not on the plantation. To whom does the child belong? To the slave parents only? To the town? Or to the plantation owner?

The answer is obvious. It belongs to Atlantis. No, wait, that can't be right. But it makes as much sense as thinking that it does *not* belong to the plantation owner, which is analogous to thinking that an American child born just over the border (or even over the sea) does not belong to the nation of its parents, -that it is not a natural member of their society and country.

Such a warped view asserts that government action is needed in order to make an American child into an American citizen due to its birth beyond an invisible boundary line. Such a view includes the unspoken assumption that the child does not belong to the parents and their nation through them, -that the child inherits nothing from them other than the father's name.

That's equivalent to the child of a slave mother belonging to another slave owner because the mother was visiting another plantation when she gave birth. Such a view has no place in any logical mind, and yet seemingly reasonable people adhere to it like there is no flaw at its heart. Understand this; just because government has sovereignty over the territory of the nation does not mean that it has sovereignty over the membership of those who created the government in the first place. They and their progeny are natural members in perpetuity for all generations.

They are outside of the sphere of government authority because they created the sphere in the first place. Just as God himself is not contained nor confined by the world of his creation, so natural members of a country, by creating a nation to protect their interests, do not become dependent on its authority or permission when it comes to their membership in that created nation.

They are the creators, the government is their creation. The government that they created cannot tell them, -its creators, that their membership in the nation of their creation is dependent on it. That would be like God having to ask Adam for permission for Eve to co-inhabit the Garden of Eden with him.

Sally Hemmings: An Analogue to Dual-citizenship

Sally was a cross of two opposite worlds, -a bridge between two disparate realities. A hybrid being that was neither exclusively one nor the other. She was the slave daughter of Thomas Jefferson.

Her mother, a slave, was the half-sister of Jefferson's deceased wife, having the same slave-owner father. Her existence provoked the question: "To which world did she naturally belong?"

Well, the question is the wrong question because it presumes that there is an answer when there is no answer since she was not a natural member of either world. She was not a natural slave because she was the daughter of a freeman, and yet she was not a natural freeman because she was the daughter of a slave. That made her the perfect analogue to dual-citizens.

Dual citizens, being hybrids, do not naturally belong to any nation because they are the product of two different nationalities. Another extreme example is that of "a half-breed".

The child of a white father and an Indian mother was not a natural member of either world. The Indian tribe of its mother could not accept it as a full-blood brother or sister because it had a whiteman as a father.

Similarly, the white world would not accept it as a natural white person because it was born of an Indian, and those two opposite worlds did not mix.

Similarly, dual-citizens are born of two different worlds and thus are not natural members of either. A worse case scenario is when the nations of the parents go to war, as happened in America when the South seceded and went to war against the North, and brother fought against brother. A mother from the North and a father from the South did not produce a natural member of either society. Such a son would be neither a natural Yankee, nor a natural son of the South.

[Would the citizens of the United States (the North) have chosen as President and Commander-in-Chief a former slave-owning Southerner with deep roots in southern history? How would that not have posed a potential national security risk? When it comes to choosing sides, it's all about which side you're from. If you are from both, then neither side can trust you.]

Suppose that Abraham Lincoln had exited his mother's womb on the northern side of the invisible, unmarked Canada-United States border and then mother and child moved back to the south side. Would that have made Lincoln a national security risk? Would he have been "more American" if born on the southern side of the invisible man-made border when birth is an event that no child has ever remembered nor felt any innate connection to?

And yet sincere people want us to believe the unbelievable; to believe that it actually would have made a difference, or at a minimum, that the founding fathers were too stupid to recognize that it would

make no difference whatsoever. Why would any sane, thinking person believe such foolishness?

Why would the framers of the Constitution think that only slaves born on the plantation belonged to the slave owner? Why would they think that only children born within the ever-changing borders of a new nation, carved out of wilderness, belonged to the country of their parents? Well, they didn't. But they failed to state that in the Constitution because the number of people that it would affect was minuscule. Yet it absolutely could have affected Thomas Jefferson and John Adams who at the time were serving their nation as foreign ambassadors (Paris and London respectively).

By such lame thinking, a son born to them abroad would be assumed to not be an American and would need the approval of government to become one. The absurdity of such a view is self-evident.

The first Congress attempted to remedy that short-coming in the Naturalization Act of 1790 by ordering, in effect, all authorities, in particular all port authorities, to recognize American children born abroad as natural born citizens. That implied that they were more than merely citizens by government decree. It implied that they were citizens by nature and beyond the authority of government to bar or bless with citizenship.

But most importantly of all, it implied that they, like their domestically born brethren, were possible candidates for the Presidency, -something which the Constitution failed to address.

The citizenship of John McCain was not dependent on government authority because it was natural American citizenship since neither of his parents were foreigners. Therefore, it didn't matter where he was born or raised. All that mattered was that in order to run for the office of President he be 35 years of age and 14 years a resident of the United States.

But if Barack Obama had been born in Panama, he not only would not have been a natural born citizen, he would not have even been a citizen at all since his mother could not pass her citizenship to him by law since she was several months too young. But even native-birth can't make a half-breed citizen into a natural born citizen nor make one eligible to be the President.

By Adrien Nash June 2013 <http://obama-nation.com>