The American national history and policy regarding citizenship for foreigners is spread across three distinct periods. The second began when the new nation was formed in 1789, and the third began in 1898 with the Wong opinion of the Supreme Court.

Before that, national citizenship was based on State citizenship with the individual States that formed the union retaining their sovereignty over who they regarded as their citizens and Congress only tasked by the Constitution with making a uniform rule to make their naturalization qualifications uniform across all of the States.

For nearly a century, foreign women could not become Americans except by marrying an American. Why not? Because they were under the headship of their father well into adulthood and carried his foreign nationality as their own. They remained as a member of their own family and that family was foreign. Only sons could step outside of the family and attach themselves to another nation and seek to become a member of it.

Why were they allowed to naturalize but not their sisters? Because they could and would become full citizens while women could not become full citizens since they were viewed in the patriarchal world as akin to chattel. They did not possess the rights of CITIZENS because they were not subject to duties of citizens, -the first and foremost of which was the obligation to contribute directly in national defense.

That obligation was enshrined in the oath of naturalization that men-folk took in order to sever their remaining connection to the sovereign government of their homeland and pledge their allegiance to their new country and its Constitution. They swore on the Bible that they would bear arms in the defense of the nation (if required) and that was an oath not written to be taken by any woman. Women were not under any obligation to bear arms since they and children were the ones for whom defense was purposed. Being in the protected group that men were responsible to defend, they were not subject to the federal jurisdiction that extended to all able-bodied American men within military age.

That meant that foreign women could not be required to serve in the American military, so since women had no civilian citizenship privileges and duties anyway, there would be no purpose for them to obtain American citizenship. They could not defend the nation and its people. They could not vote, serve on juries, serve as government officials nor as elected officials. And they could certainly never be President. Thus no naturalization rule was ever written for them. [Their rights in foreign nations were no better, but were probably worse.]

Naturalization in America involved a serious severing of a man's old loyalties and obedience to his own nation and government. The severing via the taking of the sacred Oath of Allegiance & Renunciation was akin to cutting an umbilical cord that attached him to his homeland and its society, and rejecting the umbrella of protection of its government, -which was accompanied by an obligation of obedience.

To understand that second period of American history, one needs to think of the immigrant foreign family (such as my mother's immigrant great-grandparents and their four daughters) as a single unit, -headed by the husband & father, encapsulated within a political placenta attached to an umbilical cord rooted in their foreign homeland, -to which they could return and continue their lives there as natural members and natives of their country.

The attitude of our national government was to view them as a single foreign unit separated from all Americans by being surrounded by the barrier of foreign membership. If a birth occurred within that foreign sphere, -within the placenta with a foreign attachment, it was as if it did not occur on American soil but on foreign soil because the foreign subjectship of the father surround him and his, the whole family unit.

That was exactly the same as the attitude of the national government toward a foreign minister or ambassador if his wife gave birth within one of
the several States. He was alien as well as all within his family regardless of their birth location.

The sphere that surrounded the immigrant family can be thought of as comprised of two hemispheres. -One is the natural connection to his own kinsmen or countrymen, while the other is his location within the sovereign borders of his own nation. He and his own were "within and under the jurisdiction" of his own nation while living within it.

But while living within the American States, half of that sphere was no longer surrounding them. Only the natural ties to his homeland remained, -also known as his alienage.

Within some States, that openness and closeness to American soil fostered the attitude, policy and law (inherited from colonial law) that any children that might be born to him in America would be considered as a citizen of the State into which he had emigrated.

But that was not consistent with the view adopted by the national government which was ultimately responsible for dealing with international relationships, including those regarding foreign subjects.

As a result of the two different approaches to citizenship, for a century there were unresolved doubts that such domestically born children were really American citizens.

Those questions were resolved by the Supreme Court case of Wong Kim Ark when the court opined that U.S. born children of Chinese immigrants are American citizens, and thus by extrapolation, so also were the U.S. born children of all other immigrants.

The issue as to citizenship hadn't been in regard to alien-born females (because all females were in effect merely American subjects) but rather their brothers. If they were viewed as State citizens due to native birth, and were elected to office as adults, then were they also eligible for national office when the national government did not recognize their national citizenship? So, under the rule of two separate governments, State citizenship was not the same as national citizenship, in particular regarding the right to serve in Congress and as President.

They were foreigners by birth to foreign parents who might have always remained foreigners, and the U.S. government rejected the notion of embraced dual-citizenship, just as bigamy was rejected by American society.

What happened in 1898 was the Supreme Court deciding that the original and intended meaning of the words of the 14th Amendment's nationality clause; "All person born in the United States, or naturalized, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are a citizen of the United States" would mean something else, something much less than what they meant as written and ratified.

That something that they dropped out of sight was one's natural obligation to defend one's own nation. That obligation was invested in the men of the family, starting with the father, and inherited by his sons upon maturity.

Foreign men, by American law and policy, were not subject to that obligation as American men were because they were not citizens, remaining still within the remaining hemisphere of their foreign attachment and jurisdiction.

When the high court ruled that the native-born children of immigrants were Americans regardless of the families intact foreign attachment, then that opened the door to the view that if the child had American roots via its birth within American jurisdiction, then the father and sons also had connections to their new nation and thus shared the responsibility for national defense.

From then on, they were subject to military conscription, even though they were viewed as foreign nationals. And that remains the policy still. They must register with Selective Service.

In response to the court's opinion, the Attorney General adopted the policy that subjection to American sovereign authority was not a consideration and in effect had no meaning as concerns the male responsibility in national membership.
He thus eviscerated the intent of the 14th Amendment, the concept of family unity under the father, and natural foreign attachments as a factor in determining American citizenship for any and every baby born within U.S. jurisdiction, -even if not subject to it as required.

Ever since his total bastardization of the very clear and simple Supreme Court opinion covering children of only immigrants, any baby born in U.S. territory is erroneously assumed to be a U.S. citizen as long as his father isn’t an ambassador. ~

When you were born, by what right did you belong to your mother (and she to you)? I know what you’re thinking; by every right, -both natural and legal. But you are mistaken. Your right was 100% a natural right and 0% a legal right if one is referring to an actual law.

All that the authority of government does is to recognized and validate your natural right. Your natural right is an issue of blood, -and whose blood you were born with by natural inheritance.

By your blood relationship to your mother, and your father, you are a natural member of their family, -and government is not needed to validate that right but is obligated to support and defend it. That right never needed to be written because it is fundamental to the very nature of all living sentient creatures who have a higher nature that includes natural bonds. That natural right exists side-by-side with the right to live, and it can be called “the right to belong”.

No one gives it to you, and no government grants it. No matter how authoritarian a government might be, that right is sacrosanct. It cannot be violated without very good reason springing only from protecting a child from harm, which is an obligation of government towards all of the members of the nation.

That natural right of belonging is not bounded by one’s immediate family only. It extends to the greater family of which they are a part as members, from clans and tribes, to countries and nations.

Every child is born with the natural right to belong to whatever societal group the parents belong to. That is not a right that our founding fathers would have ever ceded to government caprice, policy, sentiment, or legislation. It was their inviolable right and would never be surrendered for any reason. And it was not surrendered, -even though many who fail to understand fundamental American principles might think otherwise, presuming that the old way of the English Kings is still controlling the lives of Americans today.

We fought a war of independence to overthrow the old royal dictatorship, including ownership based on a native-birth paradigm. The Americans switched from having to acknowledge before the revolution that “I am a subject of the King because I was born within his territory.” to “I am no one’s subject and I belong to my country and nation because I was born of countrymen and citizens of the nation. I inherited my membership naturally through my blood connection to members.”

That declaration could and would be accompanied by its sister declaration: “And it does not matter where my mother delivered me from the womb, because I naturally belong to her and my father, and as part of them I am also a member of the people and society and nation of which they are a part.”

Bottom line? Native-birth is absolutely an irrelevant factor in determining who is a natural born citizen of the American nation and eligible to be President, because the issue of birth location is wholly an arbitrary human-invented factor that has no relationship to natural membership and natural citizenship. A “natural born citizen” is everyone born of citizens.

By a Supreme Court opinion, a child can be born as an American citizen, but being a citizen is not the same as being born as a natural citizen, which must be the true natural status of all Presidents. They constitutionally cannot be alien-immigrant-foreigner-born. They must be born of only an American mother and father.
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