

Where the Inmates Run the Asylum The Golden Birthright Comparison

Consider this imaginary scenario; A tribal group lives within a territory that has been theirs for eons, and within their territory there is a river that is very special. It contains a vast number of little gold nuggets which resulted from a red hot gold meteor falling into the middle of the river's cold waters and striking an igneous boulder four feet below the surface which caused it to explode into thousands of little gold pieces.

That gold belongs to the group, -to its members who are the owners of the territory where it's located. Nobody who is not a group member is allowed to take or claim it. Only those born into the group get added to the number of souls who have a right to it. If one is not born to parents who are group members then one has no right to it, but those who are born to group members have a right by birth to the gold because they are group members also. It's their birthright.

One day an outside couple sneak into the group's territory and the pregnant woman goes into labor and gives birth among the group members. The group will have one of two possible responses. In a group that is analogous to nations that are original nations and were never colonies of an empire, the members will simply order the outsiders to leave and take their newborn with them because they have no right to be on their land, nor any right to the riches it contains nor any right to membership in the group.

A group that is analogous to nations that were once long-term colonies of an empire, like the United States, will throw up their hands and complain, "Oh great, now we're stuck with an alien new member who was born with the right to our group membership and our gold!" In their warped world, the "birthright" is not a right inherited by birth to member parents, in-

stead it's a right to belong to the land itself and its riches.

That "right" was an ancient legacy of having once been ruled and owned by a more powerful group which considered anything born on the land to belong to them. After the group freed themselves from the tyranny of their oppressors, they became a normal group except with the one exception of failing to realize that membership in the group comes naturally by being born to group members, not by being born on the land that the group owns.

The United States has fallen victim to a grand delusion because of erroneous interpretations of American law that deals with immigrants, interpretations resulting from the delusional thinking that is the legacy of colonial rule, during which the colonies were the personal property of the Crown and all persons born on the King's land belonged to him and had only the rights that he allowed them.

Their rights were never equal to those possessed in their distant English motherland . So their new religious freedom came with an absence of a right of representation and petition before the government in Britain. Colonies never have the rights of the homeland because they are not a part of it. Instead they are merely external properties administered by the lord of the colony, -the governor appointed by the sovereign.

The legacy of a century & a half of colonial rule is that the concept of belonging to the land where one is born is ingrained in the American psyche, while nations that were never colonies hold the natural view of belonging to ones parents and inheriting their membership in society and nation.

The Trailer Park Comparison

The feudal / colonial model of attachment to the soil where one was born is analogous to an imaginary situation of property ownership in which one is born to an indebted purchaser of a

mobile home in a mobile home park. The owner of the park also owns his own home and the land it sits on. He is a free man because he is not tied to that property. He can sell it whenever he wishes because he owns it. The family in the mobile home can't do that because they don't own the land the home sits on, all they can sell is the home itself. But they can't sell it either unless they've fully paid for it.

In the park there are rules, people must obey the rules because the property does not belong to them. If the family buying the mobile home is only able to make their rent payment by renting a room to someone, and then the park owner decides that renting is no longer allowed, they will be in big trouble.

They, (like the colonies) don't own the land and can't tell the park owner to take his rules and shove them because they don't have the same rights as owners of their own property, just as colonists didn't have the same rights as freemen of England.

If the widower father of the family dies, then the family debt falls on the shoulders of the children, in particular the eldest son. He / they are tied to the mobile home by debt, just as the peasants / serfs were once tied to the land of the estate owner by debt handed down from generation to generation. Their children inherited the parents debts and so were essentially "owned" by the estate owner. They were owned by what they owed because they were born into that debt.

The American colonists were in a similar situation. They were "owned" by the Monarch being as the New World territories belonged to him and not the nation of England. When the New World lands were claimed, they were not claimed in the name of the people of England, but in the name of the King of England. Big difference.

The American mind-set still thinks in terms of belonging to the land that they were born on, belonging to the trailer which they inherited, rather than belonging to the parents that gave

them birth, and to the group of which they were members. Other nations are not the victim of this kind of thinking, unless they also were once colonies.

Barack Obama has greatly benefited from this thinking because of the erroneous view that birth on the group's land automatically makes one a natural member, as if that were a law of nature, when instead that violates the law of nature, -the law by which one is a member by being born to parents who are members. That's the natural pattern in the animal world as well as the human world, and is the practice in most nations that were never colonies or vassal states.

On top of the delusion about place of birth and membership, is the delusion that all membership is identical, even though some are members by birth, while others are only members by group rules. Obama is not a natural member but is a member by group rules because he was born to a father that was not a member of the group, nor even lived in the group territory, but was only an outsider visiting it. The rules of the group state that only a full-blooded member is allowed to be the Chief, but the group thinks that any member of any sort who happened to have been born on the group's land must be allowed to be Chief. They don't understand the principles of group membership nor the history of their own group and how that history has warped their view from one that is natural to one that is unnatural.

No animal ever born was a member of its species because it was born on the land inhabited by the species. Species membership is passed from the parents to the off-spring. If, hypothetically, a male of one species mates with a female of another species, their off-spring will not be a natural member of either species, but will be a hybrid. No hybrid is a natural member of any group. That's the law of nature.

That kind of natural law is what is referred to in the Declaration of Independence when it

mentions "the Laws of Nature and Nature's God", as well as in the Constitution when it forbids anyone from being the President unless they are a "natural born citizen". That means that they must be a citizen by natural law, not by "the law of the soil" (jus soli -which is the bastardized principle practiced on feudal estates, in the colonies, and on the slave-owner's plantation).

Once again, after over 100 years of being rid of it, our country returned to it in 1898 -like a dog returns to its vomit, after misunderstanding a Supreme Court ruling.

By the illegitimate misapplication of that ruling, any son of a mass-murdering terrorist, dictator or narco-trafficker can be entrusted with the most powerful office in the history of the world as long as they are born inside the invisible, abstract, man-made boundaries of our nation, while a member of Seal Team 6, who's the son of a Medal of Honor recipient, with American roots going back to before the revolution, could not be allowed to be the President if his mother delivered him just a few feet over the Canadian border. It's safe to say that the inmates are running the asylum, and those inmates are us.

a.r. nash 2011 <http://obama--nation.com>
http://photobucket.com/obama_bc