

The Reality of Native-Born Tadpole Citizenship

As I detail on my home page at obama-nation.com, and in several expositions, I discovered something important that was evidence of what I had been asserting endlessly but without any proof, -my basis being logic alone. It was the smoking gun that no one knew for sure existed. It was "buried" in an obscure internet page of the CIS (Citizenship and Immigration Service; formerly known as NIS). When I discovered it, it was like finding the Holy Grail.

After I made its discovery known on the internet, word of it spread and that was noticed by Obama's flying monkeys who then sent word to one of his minions with significant authority. That traitor then surreptitiously changed the URL-web address of the page so that thereafter all of the links to it were broken, resulting in "Page Not Found". But I managed to eventually relocate it.

What was the smoking gun that I uncovered? It was the delineation of citizenship terms into "naturalized, native and natural born". "Native" can only mean one thing, which is native-born, (-as opposed to natural born). It can't mean Native American -as in "Indian", and it can't mean pure native because that would be identical to a natural citizen as only natural citizens are real natives.

There is no such legal term as "Native Citizen" because "native", like "natural" is not a legal descriptor but a natural descriptor of the legal concept and term "CITIZEN". The legal version is "native born", so "native and natural born" refers to native-born & natural born, -but foregoes the unnecessary repetition of the word "born".

What's my point? It's that it is, and always has been, the rational and realistic policy of the federal government to distinguish between three very different groups of citizens. The United States government does not confuse the three variations. The naturalized are not the native-born, and the native-born are not the natural born. That is reality.

A foreigner is someone born in a foreign nation. By coming to America he does not become an American, nor do any children he brings with him. But if he and his wife are immigrants, and she produces a child in America, then the child is a native-born American due to the Supreme Court's opinion in 1898, (based on the 14th Amendment), regarding the citizenship of the native-born son of Chinese immigrants named Wong, .

When he, as an adult, produced an American child, it was not only a native-born American, it was also a *natural* born American, unlike its father. How so? Because it was born to an American father and not a Chinese father.

What that evolution describes is a progression from one thing to another. From initial pure foreign-ness to eventual pure American-ness. Like the evolution of frogs & toads. The first stage is entirely different from the final stage. The first stage, equivalent to a foreigner, is that of the polliwog. It has no limbs and is like a fat-headed fish.

The human version can become a citizen via an artificial process known as naturalization, -which is intended to make-over, or convert, a foreigner into a facsimile of a natural American. Naturally, nature can't do such a thing, and so the polliwog gradually changes by growing arms and legs.

No one would argue that a tadpole is a toad anymore than one would argue that a polliwog is a toad, because its body is distinctly different.

Once it has evolved fully, it no longer has the characteristics of a polliwog. Those characteristics, -like those of a foreigner, are completely gone.

In national life, just as in nature, it takes three stages to convert outsiders and their off-spring into natural born natives of America. The immigrant is equivalent to a polliwog. The children of immigrants are equivalent to tadpoles. The children of the children are equivalent to toads. The change is then complete. The original nature has been completely remade.

Polliwog --- Tadpole --- Toad ; Foreigner --- Native born American --- Natural born American. Three generations. The grandchild has no connec-

tion to the foreign-ness of the grandparents, but its father does because he was raised by them.

But the grandchild was raised by an American. So it was with my own natural born mother, her native-born mother, and her foreign born grandparents. If my grand uncles were born to my great-grand parents before they became Americans, then they would not have been eligible to serve as President even though they were native-born.

When a son of traditional conservative Saudi immigrants looks up at mommy and daddy, he sees people who are very different from Americans. He sees their foreignness and is exposed to it all throughout his childhood and youth. If he attends an American school, he becomes Americanized.

But if he attends a Wahabi Islamic school for 12 years, -isolated from exposure to American culture, -for better and for worse, then he will not become what would be described as Americanized. He would instead be bound to and assimilated into the foreign culture of his parents. Two very starkly different cultural and national orientations.

He clearly would not be purely American. He would be like the young tadpole, -barely different from the polliwog. With only tiny new limbs. Or, with complete brain-washing, (acculturation) into Saudi cultural and religious values, he might be purely a polliwog like the parents, -but not in a nationality sense since he would be an American citizen.

But if he was schooled in American schools, then he would become Americanized and would one day produce a child that would look up at him and not see a Saudi but see an American, -one who would be steeped in American values if he attended school before the 1970's (or if he attended a parochial school where he might learn values still).

So it is clear that just as immigrants are not natural Americans, neither are their native-born children. But the children of the native-born *will* be natural Americans. Their citizenship nature is natural, unlike that of their parents who are the in-between generation,..the tadpole generation,..the native-born generation,..the bridge between total foreignness and total American-ness.

Mere birth within invisible, conceptual American borders does not a natural citizen make, but it does make a native-born citizen. If a Brown bear gave birth in the Arctic, its cub would not be a Polar bear. It would have to mate with a Polar bear, and produce a hybrid off-spring, (which was something that seems to have happened in the strange case of a giant slain white bear that could not be identified as any known species) and that off-spring would have to mate with a Polar bear to produce a cub with a close resemblance to a Polar bear.

The change from one thing to another completely different thing cannot be accomplished in one stage of change. It requires two; -two generations of change in order to go from pure outsider to pure insider. The middle stage is "tainted" by foreignness, and that is why the founding fathers barred it from the position of Commander-in-Chief. Only a pure American can serve as President. Not a naturalized American, and not a half-natural American whose citizenship is totally dependent on the permission of law. If one's citizenship is dependent on American law then one is not a natural American but is a legal American only.

So does that mean that Barack Obama is only a native-born American and not a natural born American? Actually, he is neither due to Congressional misunderstanding of the boundaries of the Supreme Court's Wong opinion which resulted from a misinterpretation of it by Attorney General Griggs in 1898.

Without an American father, no one is a natural American even if they are a legal, constitutional native-born American. So Obama is not that, but is he a legal constitutional 14th Amendment native-born citizen instead? Actually, his situation falls between the legal cracks because, by implication, the 14th Amendment as construed by the Wong opinion, requires parents who are immigrant, and Obama Sr. was not an immigrant.

American mothers are not addressed by the jurisdiction requirement of the 14th Amendment since women were not subject to the responsibility of

citizenship, although they were the beneficiaries of its civil benefits. They weren't obligated to take lives in combat nor risk their life to protect the nation, * nor allowed to vote nor serve in any high office. Clearly, they weren't, as the amendment requires, subject to the (full) federal jurisdiction of the U.S. government, and so, like foreign visitors, were incapable of producing a child that was subject through them. Single immigrant women were not even allowed to become naturalized citizens except in rare cases.

Thus, the 14th Amendment did not apply to Obama Jr. through his father or his mother, -regardless of a native-birth. He was an exception to the general rule that applied to all children of all immigrant fathers.

So is he then an American citizen through his American mother? U.S. citizenship was never transmitted from mother to child by law until years after the ratification of the 19th Amendment around 1920 which gave women the right to vote. Before Congress passed statutes allowing that, citizenship passed exclusively from father to child, being as he was the head of the household. Even a foreign wife automatically became an American, like him, by marrying an American.

Citizenship passing from mother to child has never been natural citizenship and the past cannot be erased nor be altered by changes in society in the present. In 1788 when the Constitution was adopted, no child in any state could inherit its nationality through its mother. All natural Americans had American fathers without exception.

But for Obama, it's even worse than that, because the mid-20th century laws that allow citizenship through the mother only pertain to births outside of the United States. They do not mention the situation of birth to a foreign father within the United States. So his nationality was not conveyed to him through his American mother nor his non-American father, nor through the 14th Amendment.

So what is the source of his citizenship? There is none in American law, but that doesn't rule out administrative policy. Since Attorney General Griggs' mistake in 1898, which erroneously assumed that all children born in America are born subject to the jurisdiction of the United State and are therefore 14th Amendment citizens, the policy that he established affirming that error has remained in place and become petrified in essentially all venues of jurisprudence; -from law schools, to the field of immigration law, to the immigration service, the State Dept. and the judicial system. It is all a massive accretion of precedential error. It has become as harden as bone.

There is no authority and no court that would dare attempt to challenge it nor correct it. In fact, they consider it heresy, although without knowing exactly why, other than that's just the way it is and has been since before they and their parents and grandparents were born.

Yet if the 14th Amendment meant what it has mistakenly been construed to mean, (every native-born person is an American) then its wording is completely superfluous in the sense of the false presumption that every person born in America is subject to the American government; "All persons born in the United States, or naturalized, AND subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the state wherein they reside."

-so if everyone was automatically subject, then why the need to require in its wording that which was already always a fact? Answer: Because of Native Americans and foreign ministers, (and foreign visitors).

Neither they nor their native-born children were subject to the American government as are American citizens. Although they were born "within the jurisdiction" of the United States, they were not "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States.

Why were foreign minister not subject? Because they were not Americans, -nor were children born to them in America, because they were not in the role of citizens nor immigrants but were in the role

of guests. Guests are exempt from the duties of residents, and it doesn't matter if they work for a foreign government or are visiting from a foreign nation for a day, a week, month, or a year. As long as they are guests, they are not subject to the responsibilities of residents, i.e., citizens and immigrants (who are required to defend the nation, -as every foreigner must swear to do in order to become a naturalized citizen) and thus are not among those whose native-born children are covered by the citizenship provision of the 14th Amendment.

So, like the pivot mechanism of a rudder, A.G. Griggs changed the course of American nationality law without the authority of Congress, the Supreme Court, or the President, and it will never be changed back unless and until sanity (i.e., knowledge and wisdom and integrity) returns to the governance of the nation. That will never happen because it would require the passage of a constitutional amendment similar to the 9th Amendment, which reads: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

That is similar in nature to the 10th Commandment, -the one unrelated to behavior; "Thou shalt not covet". It is an order as to how people are to think, -or not think. "shall not be construed", meaning shall not be *mis*construed by ones warped, ignorant, misinformed, misguided or dishonest thinking into calling a pig a pony.

A new amendment would have to order the government to change its thinking, to cease and desist from enforcing Griggs' misconstruence of the Supreme Court's opinion regarding the 14th Amendment and the citizenship of children of non-immigrant and illegal-resident foreigners, and throw out a century old policy not authorized by that limited court opinion.

But it technically would not require an amendment since the Attorney General and the President have the authority to correct administrative errors if they so choose, -which they would never do because the result would be that Obama becomes

recognized as not possessing legal American citizenship. That would be political suicide. But it would be just that simple to do, -even a judge could do it (though none in American have the nerve) just as a federal court ruled that Obama's policy of appointing members to the National Labor Relations Board while Congress was still in session was an unconstitutional policy. Just because the executive branch operates as if their policy is legitimate, does not make it legitimate. The Law is the law! And by the Law, -not policy, Obama is not an American citizen.

But...even if his father was an immigrant and thus subject to the full weight of American authority over citizens and immigrants, or even if his mother gave birth overseas and thereby passed her citizenship to him, he still would not be what the Constitution requires of the President, which is that he be "No person except a natural born citizen".

Having an immigrant father would have made him a real, native-born Legal citizen (1866 Civil Rights Act), and a Constitutional citizen (1868 14th Amendment). Or, if he was born in his probable birth location of Vancouver, Canada, that would have made him a provisional citizen, but nothing at all could have made him a natural citizen because just as a tadpole is not a toad, -so also the 2nd generation is not the third generation. A half-&-half citizen is not an exclusively-100%-American citizen since only native-born members of American society can produce native natural members such as Obama's children. They are real natural born Americans and eventually eligible to serve as President, but their father is not because at best he can only be considered to be a tadpole native-born citizen.

by a.r. nash february 2013 obama--nation.com

PS The inability to discern between native-born and natural born is like the inability to discern between fonts with serifs and those without. They all are of the same or similar languages and identical letters, meaning the same thing, but one lacks what the other possesses, just as "natural born"

Americans have something that “native-born” Americans don’t, namely American fathers. Here's the difference: without serifs; ABCXYZ, and with serifs: ABCXYZ and ୩୫୬୭୮୯୧୨୩.

Believing that everyone born in America is eligible to be President (except children of foreign ambassadors) is as erroneous as believing that first names come first and last names come last. It seems to be a fact but that view is limited to a narrow ignorant outlook which fails to take all the facts into account, namely the fact that over one billion Chinese, -and perhaps Japanese and Koreans as well, position the surname first and the given name last. Thus the most famous name in the citizenship debate, Wong Kim Ark, is in the opposite order from Western names, with the surname being Wong, -not Ark.

Thinking that something is true does not make it so, and assuming that one’s assumptions are correct does not make them all correct. Facts and discernment are essential to finding the truth, and even a child can discern that a tadpole is not a toad, just like a native born citizen is not a natural born citizen.

My final analogy is the comparison between the natural and the artificial. Image two planes, like two levels of a bunk bed. The lower plane is the fundamental, organic, natural plain. On it is found natural foods, drinks, stones, marble, wood, leather, gems, and metals. On the upper plain one sees artificial restaurant-window foods, plastic imitations of all sorts of things, particle board and plastic-based lumber, Formica, cultured marble, cement bricks and stones, metallic plastics, artificial sweeteners and flavors and drinks; soda, tang, fruit punch, fake hair, teeth, limbs, imitation leather, gems, pearls, etc.

Similarly, artificial citizenship is as unnatural as the imitation items on that plain. It’s purely man-made via laws and opinions of judges regarding those laws. But natural citizenship is of a natural origin. There is no input nor interference of man. Law and government are not needed for it to exist

because it exists anyway. It would not bear the label citizenship if not connected to a nation, but it would still exist in the form of natural membership because individuals do not exist as individuals but in groups, clans, and tribes. When the tribes are all consolidated into one union by the choice of the individual tribes/colonies/states, then the members become known as citizens because they all then bear a civic responsibility for the survival of their union and their people. And more than that, for the creation and perpetuation of their chosen form of government and their selection of representatives to administer that government.

Artificial citizens have no natural right to participate in that government, but by the magnanimity of the natural members, they are granted equal rights to them, -with the one exception that they are not allowed to be their supreme chief.

* The primary responsibility of citizens, as with fathers, is protection of the defenseless, meaning one's own family members, or one's own defenseless fellow citizens. That responsibility is an obligation to be part of the protection and defense of the nation when threatened. You think that no one in the country has the authority to require you to shoot someone, and yet the government does possess that authority if you happen to be born male. The two things that are most fundamental to the men of every society and nation are the orders one must obey, unless exempted, to take the life of enemy combatants; -to kill, and to place your life at risk in extremely dangerous situations. Without that authority, a nation's preservation cannot be assured.

Foreign guests of the government are not subject to that authority and therefore their sons do not inherit it, -even if they enter the world within the boundaries of the American nation. They can never be ordered to serve a country that is not their own because they are not subject to its jurisdiction, -unless their status changes by living in America through to the age of 18. Then they *must* register with the Selective Service.

