

Of Martians, Koreans, Kangaroos, and Natural Citizens

by Adrien Nash August 2013

Everyone at the forefront of the issue of Obama's eligibility to be President pushes a theory about what the Constitution's words mean regarding a necessary qualification to be President; those words being:

"a natural born citizen."

Those who adhere to an American transmutation of the bastardized definition of "a natural born subject of Britain" hold, like the royal dictator, that mere place of birth within his borders was sufficient to legitimize calling the child of foreign parents a "natural" subject of the King regardless of the fact that such a child was born of aliens, -an alien-born subject, and not Englishmen who were real natural subjects.

By their warped thinking, you can call the child of aliens "natural citizens" of the United States if born within U.S. borders, thereby tying a child's nationality solely to the same doctrine as that of the British Crown. Thus place-of-birth determines one's nationality, whether born of Americans or born of aliens.

The problem with that view is that place-of-birth has no place of any kind in natural membership. As a consequence, they must assert falsely that all citizenship is government citizenship via an established tradition that was slavishly retained even after we over-threw the entire monarchy system and the principles by which it was legitimized. In doing that, they had to throw out the baby with the bath water by rejecting the principle of natural membership as being applicable in the United States, -or so their position asserts in effect.

They based that absurdity on a Supreme Court ruling that did not related to the natural citizens of America at all but solely to children of immigrants, -foreigners.

They then took its opinion and declared that what applied to about 3% of the population applied also to the other 97% who were born of American parents and not aliens.

The baby that got thrown out was the principle of natural membership. It is a universal principle that within its parameters has no limits or boundaries. Its parameters do not include the membership that is gained by effort and achievement, including clubs of all kinds whose admission standards are based on criteria such as accomplishment or wealth.

Place of birth is not one of the criteria of natural membership in regard to human or animal relationships & societies except in the minds of those who adopted it as an imposed criteria.

No animal or human that ever lived was born as a member of its parents' group and species because of where it was born. It's nature and membership are, and always have been, organic and automatic by the immutable laws of life.

An example is the Kangaroo. Is an infant kangaroo a member of the kangaroo family because it was born in Australia? But all kangaroos are born in Australia so that fact must be central in determining its species, right?

That couldn't be more absurd. Where kangaroos are born is merely incidental to the concurrent fact that they are the product of kangaroo parents. Two facts: one is determinative and the other is irrelevant. But some argue that the law of natural membership doesn't exist, or doesn't apply in a sociological & political relationship fashion as it does with humans in regard to their family membership.

But as I've stated, the principle has no boundaries. Every creature belongs to the family or genetic group into which it is born via its blood connection to parents who are members. Such membership is natural membership. That principle extends and adapts upward in defining membership in tribes, countries, nations.

Can that principle be tested? If a kangaroo is born outside of Australia, is it born as a member of a different species? As everyone with a brain can testify, there are no exceptions to the rule. Parents of one species or breed do not produce off-spring of another species or breed regardless of birth location. So the principle of natural membership is without exceptions, -or exemptions if referring to human membership in non-biological groups.

But the belief that place-of-birth determines the nationality of the natural members of a society or country or nation is reliant on exceptions and exemptions because by its standards, they *need* to exist. I speak of children born to foreign ambassadors or invading armies. Place of birth is not the criteria for them being deemed to not be subjects of the king of

the land wherein they reside even though they are foreigners on his land.

How do they explain that exemption to the rule? They can't because the principle by which they are exempt is not a part of their theory of place-of-birth being supreme. Instead it is a part of the principle of natural membership which they are hell-bent on denying. By it, such exceptions are not members of the society of the nation where they are resident.

They are aliens and so they cannot produce children who are natural members of a society to which they do not belong, and may even be trying to destroy. It's all about membership. Such children belong to a foreign group so their membership is not determined by where they are born.

The thinking of most people is muddled by the perceived situation of American births being akin to the reality of North Korean births. What is that situation? Like in America with Americans being born in America, North Koreans are born in North Korea. But what is not stated in that simplistic and over-simplified statement is the fact that the reality of American births is not accurately described while that of North Koreans is.

What is that reality? It is that many Americans are not born in the United States because five million Americans live beyond U.S. borders, while virtually all North Koreans are born inside North Korea. (unless they have some married ambassadors outside of their closed nation. But why would they need them? They would need diplomats to deal with their cohorts in places like Iran perhaps, but where else?)

Even though it can be said that essentially 100% of North Koreans are born in North Korea, that fact is still not the reason that they are PRNK citizens. Their birth location is not the reason, but their PRNK parents are. Children born of North Koreans are North Koreans.

Mission to Mars

If a North Korean manned mission to Mars shuttled 25 married couples to the red planet, and they bore children there, what nationality would those children have after a return flight to earth after 10 years of life on Mars?

Would they be considered Martians or North Koreans? They weren't born in North Korea but so what? Would their parents' nation consider them to be aliens, -foreigners, stateless persons? Inhuman?

If the Mars crew was composed of Americans, and some of the women were impregnated by Martian men, what would be the nature of their off-spring if born in the United States after returning to Earth? Would they be natural born Earthlings? Would they be natural born humans? Would they be natural born Americans? Or something else...-something different?

Barack Obama is just such an alien-like child. His father was not a North American. He was not an American citizen. He was not an America immigrant. He was a non-immigrant alien, and as such, even if one considers his off-spring to be blessed with U.S. citizenship thanks to the 14th Amendment, one cannot defend nor logically propose the idea that such a person could father a wholly natural member of American society, and a wholly natural born citizen of the United States anymore than Earthlings could give birth to natural Martians or Martians could give birth to natural humans.

If a Martian couple, with the female pregnant, were to come to Earth with the crew, and she gave birth in America, would her child be a natural born American citizen, or something else? According to our insane national policy it would an American citizen, but that would not make it a natural citizen because that is something that law can't produce.

Only nature can do that via parents who are members of the country and nation when their child is born. Only the Law of natural membership can produce natural members, -not human law. All it can do is produce *legal* members, and that is all that Obama is.

Not being a natural born citizen means he is an unconstitutional President, -a fact well known to him and to the Democrat leadership that selected him and pretended the issue did not even exist. The Constitution did not even exist for that matter, and they could do anything that they wanted just as long as their choir, the prostitute media backed him and remained silent and complicit.

Folks, this is what it looks like when the inmates are running the asylum, -when the foxes are guarding the hen-house, when traitors within take over your country. They've succeeded because after generations of dumbing down the population in government schools, people are so ignorant of all civic matters that anything can be put past them. And it was.