

## Who Is An American Citizen?

You aren't. But you are an American and you are a citizen, so by what logic are you not an American citizen? By the fact that America is your country but countries do not have citizens. They, like families and tribes, only have members. Only nations have citizens and therefore, since you are a member of a nation, the United States, you are therefore a citizen of the United States.

A nation is a political entity with a government and a written system of law and justice. A country is a social entity with social, religious, and ancestral bonds uniting people. It is they and the land that they inhabit. With nations it is they and the government that rules them.

Nations have members and countries have members, but the members of countries are not called citizens while the members of nations are. Africa, an island-like continent (akin to the island continent of Australia with its aboriginal people), once was composed of many countries, but few of them were nations because their organization was purely tribal and not legal and formal and written and legislated and adjudicated.

They were not citizens of their tribe. They were *members* of their tribe. Only after a period of colonialization, during which the structure of government was constructed, did such countries become nations.

Barack Obama's "homeland" was once purely tribal, (the country of Kenya), then it became colonized by Britain, and regulated. Then shortly after his birth it became the nation of Kenya, -with its members becoming Kenyan citizens, -members of a free and democratic republic.

By its laws, Obama could have been allowed to become a permanent citizen of Kenya if at adulthood he took the oath of allegiance (which included renouncing his presumed American citizenship). He then would have moved from being a provisional citizen to being a permanent citizen. He wisely did no such thing.

Provisional citizenship is the only form of citizenship that is not "natural citizenship" because in America all forms of permanent citizenship are considered to be natural citizenship.

Yes, that is counter-intuitive because it includes all who were not born of Americans, nor even born in America. Nevertheless, it is true, -not because of any natural reason, but because of a legal tradition inherited from Britain.

By that tradition, (the legal fiction known as the doctrine of citizenship equivalency) no citizen is superior to other citizens. All are equal. In Britain, new subjects and old subjects, -those will long British ancestry or no British ancestry, were treated as equals before the law and under the same protection and obligation of obedience.

That was, no doubt, a policy dating back to empires of millennia past, in particular, the Roman Empire which had to treat all the people of all the nations it ruled with an equal hand to avoid rebellion. Equal justice for all. Its avoidance of inequality was necessary to prevent discrimination against peoples who were much less like the Romans.

It's application in Britain, as well as the United States, was for the a similar very same reason, -to. To avoid rebellion or disloyalty inspired by discrimination inspired by inequality. . [General Benedict Arnold felt discriminated against and that was the reason for his treason.]

Its application in law, if not in society, insured all naturalized foreigners, and immigrants' children were treated fairly and equally. Hence all of them possessed the same citizenship, the only form of citizenship (other than provisional citizenship which came later), and that was because of the traditional legal fiction of citizenship equivalency.

Many Americans who disliked the strong foreignness of Africans and Chinese and Gypsies and "Indians" did not want to see them become citizens because they would not be a lesser form of citizen but an equal form, and they did not believe that they there *were* equal, and therefore didn't want them to be treated as equals. That was the nearly universal mind-set throughout at least half of the nation, -if not more.

Eventually they (freed slaves but not Indians) and their children were made citizens by the application of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the 14th Amendment, or congressional statute. So the definition of who was considered to be a U.S. citizen changed, but the doctrine of citizenship equivalency never has and never will change because it is embedded in the civil rights guaranteed by the 14th Amendment and the Civil Rights acts. All citizens of the United States are equal, and they are all equal because they are all "natural citizens".

But underneath the skirt of the citizenship equivalency doctrine we can see two legs, not one. One is those who were born as natural citizens and the other is those who became natural citizens via the age-old fiction of law. Both types of natural citizens produced children and they were known as "born citizens" since they were born as citizens either *by* birth (natural) -or *from* birth (legal, adopted, naturalized).

One who is born a citizen by birth is one born of an American mother. Her child inherits either *her* citizenship or that of her husband (who is recognized, historically, as being the legal head of the family). The child born *with* citizenship *from* birth is one who is born of an American mother and an immigrant foreign father, or both a foreign mother and father.

Such a child's citizenship is via American law and not the law of nature, -or Natural Law. It is not an American *by* birth but only *from* birth since it is natural-ized by law *at* birth. It is therefore a dual citizen, sharing the citizenship of both parents if the mother is an American, or because of the 14th Amendment via native birth to legally domiciled immigrant parents.

So we see there are two kinds of natural citizens and two kinds of born citizens. And what did the framers of the Constitution choose as the type of citizen that would be allowed to command the United States military forces? Neither. Why neither? Because of the ambiguity inherent in those labels.

Their aim was to be very specific. Very focused.

And so they choose a combination of those words which conveyed exactly what they meant to require of a President. Namely that his citizenship be purely of the natural sort, the fully American sort, with no foreignness attached.

The Commander-in-Chief could wield such power that no risk could be allowed that he would or could harbor a secret affinity toward, -or loyalty to, a foreign King, government, or nation. If his only direct attachments, connections, bonds, were American, then that would be something that could never happen.

And so they selected words to describe just such a citizen. A citizen like 98% of the men of the country and nation. A citizen born of Americans, -born of citizens, one born as a natural American, a natural citizen, a born natural citizen, in other words, "a *natural* born citizen".

(underlining provided by future President Washington's Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Jay, who was the one to urge him to not allow the power of the Commander -in chief -Chief to rest on any who was not a "natural born citizen". And that's just the advice that he and the constitutional convention heeded and wrote into the United States Constitution.

~July 25, 1787, "Permit me to hint, whether it would be wise and reasonable to provide a strong check to the admission of Foreigners into the administration of our national Government; and to declare expressly that the Command in Chief of the American army shall not be given to nor devolve on, any but a natural born Citizen."

[Farrand's Records, Volume 3] LXVIII, page 61. John Jay to George Washington]

September 2nd, 1787

George Washington pens a letter to John Jay. The last line reads:

"I thank you for the hints contained in your letter"

In all of American history, that presidential eligibility qualification was never knowingly ignored and tossed aside until the nomination of Barack Obama by the constitutionally treasonous

Dumocrat Party, headed by Nancy Pelosi who knew full well that Obama did not meet the criteria set in the Constitution to be eligible to be the U.S. President. That's why she removed the statement of the candidate's constitutional eligibility from the Certificate of Nomination sent out to all 50 states for having his name placed on their ballots.

The treason and cover-up has continued ever since. Those who should be prisoners have taken over the prison, with the jailer-in-chief leading the insurrection against the United States Constitution.

Other than that, he's a great guy.

Let's go invite him for a few rounds of golf. And hey, why not make it in Miami, or Hawaii, or ... VEGAS!

-or AFRICA!!! It only costs about 100 mil.

(Life's a Beach if you are President, no matter how illegitimately you got there, so you might as well party,..er...I mean campaign, reveling in your popularity with all of your uninformed and blindly ignorant devotees, free of any care in the world. Trouble in Benghazi? Oh well, I'm going to bed. Got to be fresh and refreshed tomorrow in Vegas. Lots of glad-handing to do to get those check-books writing big checks for my reelection.)

by Adrien Nash Nash August 2013

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

PS. How can one verify what I state about the doctrine of citizenship equivalency? It appears that one can't because an internet search will produce nothing. How can that be? Because I came across it in a discussion by Congressmen or jurists in an old Google-scanned book. I don't recall if I even bookmarked the page, but I assume that I found the page via a search for some related subject.

The subject has never been written about in the era of digital typing so it only exists in the form of the images captured from old scanned book pages. With the publishing long ago being of a quality that makes Optical Character Recognition results too flawed, the old text can't be digitized and thereby subject to search. It would have to be transcribed into digital text. I don't recall if I did that, but assume that I didn't.