

The British Roots of Presidential Eligibility

If you were required to testify in a trial and you were asked: "Do you have internet access?" and you answered "Yes", then you would have failed to adhere to your oath to tell the "whole truth".

If the commission of a cyber crime was dependent on your internet access, then a more precise answer would be needed. So you would then have to elaborate by saying; "I have Hi-Speed internet access."

That too would fail your oath to tell the whole truth. That is well known to myself since I suffered under the torture of dial-up access for eleven years. Recently I was finally upgraded to DSL.

DSL is via the phone company ground wire but is about 20 times faster than dial-up. But also about 20 times slower than fiber-optic cable. So to say "I have internet access." doesn't say it all at all.

What's my point? It's this; saying "I have internet access" is directly analogous to saying "I am a citizen."

Saying: "I have High-Speed internet access." is directly analogous to saying: "I am a *born* citizen." Saying: "I have High-Speed Fiber-optic internet access." is directly analogous to saying: "I am a *natural* born citizen."

This comparison illustrates that which makes the world go 'round; the ability of all sentient beings to discern differences, distinguish, differentiate, or discriminate between things.

Without it there would be no finding a mate, recognizing those of your own kind, those of your own family. But that ability comes with a dark side. It's due to human nature. It's flawed with pride and prejudice, and that makes "others" unwanted, despised, or even hated.

Aside from avarice and pride, dislike is one of the most powerful emotions that individuals and peoples experience. It results in the rejecting of millions who are considered foreign, inferior or worse: unclean (as with the untouchables of India).

Discrimination is a nearly universal thing; it's everywhere where aliens live among natives, and

that was true in ancient England. It was a problem for the King because his basis of claiming that all the population was subject to him was, beside his "divinely bestowed authority", his protection offered over all, -whether native or alien. Everyone was equally protected and therefore were equally subject. Everyone, that is, who was a part of his domain, a member of his society, and not merely passing through on a visit.

They owed the British Crown obedience to the law and civil order but did not owe the King allegiance for life as did his natural subjects whose parents' were natives and subjects of the King for life.

To enlarge the reach of his authority, the king considered the alien-born children of foreign immigrants to also be his subjects, thereby affording them the privileges of subjects and their rights as well. But such magnanimous treatment didn't match the feelings of the native subjects toward foreigners and their children, with their foreign language, tradition, history, values, and religion (Catholicism or "heretical" denominations) and so, like everywhere, discrimination was the result.

Saying that those children were equal to one's own children didn't make it seem right in the eyes of the native Britons. So something stronger was needed; -language even more emphatic. Eventually, that resulted in not simply saying they were the same as natural subjects but in saying that they *are* natural subjects. Such strong language served its purpose as the doctrine of equivalency was spread and adopted as the language of the government. So all subjects came to be viewed as natural born subjects because there was no difference in the protection they were provided nor the responsibilities they were obliged to shoulder.

By that doctrine, it seemed that everyone born in Britain was a natural born subject (except children of diplomats and visitors) but what came to be overlooked by many was the fact that that was a *false* characterization of that which is

natural, as well as the fact that they could be characterized that way by the doctrine of "*temporary allegiance*".

By it, foreigners owed Britain temporary obedience and allegiance since they were under the king's protection, and those who put down roots as immigrants became integrated into British society as new members. As new members under the jurisdiction of the Crown, their children were born under that same subjection and "temporary allegiance", only their allegiance was not viewed as being temporary or split between two sovereigns (unlike their father, since he still owed it to the king of the nation that he was born in) but was permanent allegiance and subjectship since they were born within the king's dominion to one who was his denizen. Britain didn't have a naturalization process, but by becoming domiciled there, one placed himself under subjection to the national authority; i.e., the laws of Parliament, the common law, and the Crown, thereby becoming a subject automatically without any formal process.

With such a policy toward alien-born children, it was necessary to defend it and avoid discrimination. Hence the doctrine of subjectship equivalency, -which was part of the common law in both Britain and the colonies. When the United States was established via the adoption of the Constitution, that doctrine was also adopted as a fundamental principle of the United States, and was known as the doctrine of **citizenship equivalency**.

By it, all citizens, whether naturalized, or derivative, or native-born to foreigners, were equal to the natural citizens of the nation in every way. Thus citizenship discrimination was officially banned as anti-American. [That was the position of the national government but of course individuals were free to be bigoted just as they were free to be slave owners.]

But there was one tiny little corner in Britain, and later the United States, where discrimination was not only allowed, it was mandatory. I speak of natural security.

Nothing is more important to any sane nation than its own preservation. Avoiding conquest,

slaughter, and the enslavement of survivors has always been the number one priority. The positions on which survival depends must be manned by utterly dependable people with no room for error in their selection. The best way to try to avoid risk was to appoint men who were beyond all suspicion.

They were the natural born sons of permanent subjects. Foreigners and their children would not even hear of a position being open if it was so critical to national defense and security that it could only be entrusted to natural born natives. Such positions would be filled without even considering someone who might harbor a secret devotion to a foreign king, a king who might one day make war against England.

Great and crucial national security secrets would never be shared with such subjects because they would never obtain an appointment or promotion to such a position, -a position that would include the knowledge of secrets or the command of forces upon which national survival might depend.

Strangely, while no one in the government would be entrusted with such a position, -a position through which one could betray the entire nation, someone above the government could and was entrusted with such power. He was the foreign prince who married the young Queen. He was from a foreign nation and government, with a foreign language and history, and unknown ties and motives and priorities. He was the equivalent to making someone President of the United States who was a total foreigner. Wow! That's a hell of a lot of power to place in the hands of a stranger. Such was the extent to which a nation would go in order to support the unnatural monarchical system. Fortunately, he proved to be loyal to Britain and served in the best interests of his adopted country.

In the new nation to be formed under the Constitution, no such possibility was to be allowed under any circumstances. The President must be American and nothing but American. He must not have any ties or bonds to a foreign nation or king.

His roots must be American roots. His values must be American values. That didn't mean that he could not be of a foreign background because they allowed such a thing as long as a potential candidate had lived in the colonies / states for fourteen years, was 35 years old, and was a citizen who had become a citizen before the Constitution's adoption in June of 1788.

After that cut-off date only those born of citizens would be allowed to be President. They were described in the Constitution as "a natural born citizen". "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."

The requirement that the President be such was suggested to the President of the constitutional convention (George Washington) by his future Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He wrote to Washington, urging him to not allow the power of the Commander-in-Chief to be placed in the hands of any who was not "a natural born citizen", (underlined by John Jay) thereby going one step further than what Alexander Hamilton had proposed, namely that he be one "born a citizen".

Jay recognized that just as all high-speed internet access is not the same, just as all born subjects were not the same, so also, all born citizens were not the same. Some were born of Americans and some were born of aliens.

Like the British before us, he did not want to run the risk of all of that military power being entrusted to one with an uncertain national allegiance. Hence it was necessary that the President be more than merely born as a citizen in one of the four states that granted their citizenship to native-born children of foreigners (immigrants) but that his citizenship be *natural* citizenship, -not merely legal citizenship provided by the generosity of a state via its naturalization law.

But because of the doctrine of citizenship equivalency, he avoided urging that the President be "a natural citizen" because that would have been ambiguous since all citizens are deemed to be natural citizens (even if naturalized or natural-

ized upon birth) unless they were born as actual natural citizens by being the off-spring of citizens.

Americans produce new-born Americans naturally. Foreigners, in four states, produced new-born Americans legally. They were not to be permitted to be President because legal citizens are not natural citizens, just as natural citizens are not legal citizens since the national constitution included no rule for who was or was not a citizen of the United States. That was determined by the will of the States and their policy and law governing immigration and naturalization. But under neither national nor state law could anyone born of foreigners be viewed as being a natural born American, -even though born within American territory.

Actual natural national membership has never been dependent on where an American baby was born but *to whom* it was born. Congress addressed that issue in the first naturalization act because it was not addressed in the Constitution. Question: "Are the sons of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, though born abroad (Paris and London respectively) during their service as foreign ambassadors, ineligible to ever serve as President even though their native-born brothers clearly were?"

I don't know if that questions was ever asked, [though I strongly suspect it was] because I haven't researched to find out if they even had sons while abroad. I'm not quite curious enough to check. But I know they would have been aghast at the idea that they weren't, and probably complained about it if just on principle alone. That is the probable reason, -and perhaps the only one, why that act not only ordered that American children born abroad be recognized not just as citizens but as "natural born citizens", -thereby injecting the issue of presidential eligibility into the order.

Why do that in a naturalization act? Because there was no where else to do it. Since it was lacking in the Constitution, it had to be put somewhere and since U.S. citizenship was already being addressed as an issue in that act, why not kill two birds with one stone? They had no good reason not to and so they did just that.

They thereby supported and defended the principle of natural membership by which one inherits what their parents have and are, whether it is a position in society or a position (membership) in a nation. What one inherits and who they are by birth is not related to nor dependent upon the borders of the land where their mother delivers them. It is determined by the natural connection between parents and their off-spring, -whether animal or human.

By the doctrine of citizenship equivalency, all forms of natural-ization produce new natural citizens who can never be stripped of their citizenship unless it can be proven that it was obtained by fraud, -which is nullifying. Other nations do not embrace that doctrine and can therefore strip naturalized law breakers of their citizenship, but that has never happened in American history because it can't. We are married forever to the position that we are all equal, whether our roots go back to the Mayflower or merely to the latest naturalization ceremony. Such citizenship then becomes an unalienable right and the sole political element of our political nature.

But doctrine is one thing, (regardless of how highly it be honor), and national survival is another. As was the case in Britain, national security comes first, and our king-substitute cannot be what the spouse of the Queen could be. He cannot be a foreigner nor be born of one. He must have been born of Americans, just as all Generals and Admirals were similarly British born of British parents. Englishmen through-&-through. True blue Englishman. Natural born Englishman. Sons of England and sons of Englishmen.

Americans once had to choose which identity they would embrace; their lifelong British identity or their new American identity. Those who chose the former were invited to leave and go live in the land of their preferred nationality. They were not of us even though they were born as our brethren. But we changed, and they did not change with us. Their loyalty was to a foreign despot and a foreign government. They could not be trusted, nor could

their children. And so they were barred from the presidency if they were born after the new government was approved by 9 of the 13 states.

Thereafter only true natural Americans could hold the reins of power over the United States Army and Navy, (and militias in time of emergency). Anything less would have been foolish and dangerous and unnecessary since 97% +/- of Anglo-saxon, protestant, educated, upright mature men were natural born sons of American fathers.

All of them were perfectly eligible to serve as President since they were 100% American in fact, and not simply in doctrine. They were 100% American by blood and not merely by borders, -by birthright inheritance and not merely by law, -by American parents, -not government permission. They were the natives whose national loyalty was undivided and thus unquestionable. They were born as natural citizens and not made into natural citizens by an American "fiction of law".

They are what Barack Obama never was and can never be since they are American natural born citizens and he is not. They therefore are perfectly eligible to serve in the office of the President, and he is perfectly ineligible to do the same. He will always be our first open illegitimate unconstitutional President, but that offense pales in comparison to the damage he is willfully inflicting on the U.S. economy via sins of omission and commission, as well as against the rule of law.

Crime and lying and dirty politics come as naturally to him as breathing. His nature was formed in the Choom Gang of drug users in Hawaii and it has never left him. He has even openly employed it as evidence of how cool he was and is. He presented himself as the more cool candidate based on his past criminality. Now we know we are on the road to hell in a hand basket because that is where all of the signs are pointing.

by Adrien Nash July 2013
<http://obama--nation.com>