The Citizenship Conundrum

How Forgotten Principles, Mindless Policy, and Common Misconceptions Elected a President

Nations must be governed by laws and the application of those laws. Laws must be based on principles otherwise they lack moral legitimacy. While laws are written down and can be pointed to in courts and administrative offices, principles are different since they aren't written down. Their employment in the creation of law and its administration is possible because of a universal understanding of their existence and importance. But if one's perspective is solely from within the realm of law, then the principles on which it's based may be completely unknown to one's conscious mind.

When that's the situation which the legal community has devolved into, then in the minds of its members, law is everything and principles are non-existent. Such is the case in America today when it comes to fidelity to the principles of the United States Constitution, as well as the concepts employed in the legal realm of citizenship.

The problem is manifested in two pronounced ways and they're closely connected. One is the nature of citizenship and the other is the proof of citizenship. The thinking in the American legal community in relationship to those two important areas of national membership has come to be an example of the tail wagging the dog.

The dog is citizenship itself and the tail is proof of citizenship. Does one exist without the other? It depends on whether one is asking about legal existence or "philosophical" existence. Things can exist without any legal recognition of their existence, -beginning with parenthood. Being the parent of a child is not dependent on the recognition of any law in any society, whether human or animal. It is a fact of reality in the natural realm, -not the legal realm. All the legal realm can do is acknowledge the fact, -not make it so or not so. Citizenship is very similar and is based on the same sort of principle.

Those whose perspective is the product of a devolution of understanding of natural principles suffer from a form of law blindness because they assume that citizenship is the product of the legal realm, -the choices of government, but they fail to recognize that that is only half true. That means that it's also half false. Some citizenship is the result of the necessary choices of government, but other citizenship, like parenthood, is not dependent on government. All government can do, from a principled standpoint, is to acknowledge that that principle is controlling, not men and their laws, since men are not gods.

Government has a rightful role in certain aspects of citizenship because principle is not the controlling factor in some aspects of the nature of citizenship. Those cases are the abnormal, atypical cases where natural law has no corollary. The most pronounced example in American history was the relationship of the United States with those who were the indigenous peoples, -the sovereign native tribes. There is no corollary in American nor British common law.

But most situations involve foreign parentage, (-not birth location), because only parentage is connected to the natural realm from which natural law springs. Birth location is irrelevant to the natural citizenship required of a President.

The problem is that location of birth is accompanied by something of immense importance to government, and that something is proof that is visible and tangible, -whereas principles are neither. But what exactly is it proof of that is of importance? That question is at the heart of one of the biggest problems facing America today, and that is "who is an American and what makes them an American?"

A similar problem is that of the nature of the citizenship of the man elected President, and whether or not it's the type of citizenship required in order to be constitutionally qualified to be the President.

To clear away the confusion we must begin by recognizing that there is a form of citizenship which is natural, -it's something with which one is born; and

its counterpart is citizenship that is not natural, -it's man-made via law.

Man-made citizenship is always the result of atypical, non-normal complexities. It deals with situations that do not follow the natural pattern, and therefore do not produce natural citizenship. Natural citizenship is the result of natural inheritance, just as in the natural pattern by which one is a member of the same species, race, family, tribe, and nation as those who produced them. By that principle we are able to answer fundamental questions such as:

"Can a huge Clydesdale work horse father a natural pure-bred race horse by impregnating a thoroughbred mare?"

"If a Neanderthal and a Homo Sapien engaged in a cross-species mating, would the child be a natural Homo Sapien or a natural Neanderthal?" Answer: Neither, it would be a hybrid.

"If a Negro African Muslim impregnates a Caucasian American Catholic, will the child be a natural Negro Muslim of African descent, or a natural Caucasian Catholic of American descent? Is a hybrid off-spring a natural member of both parents' groups, or a natural member of neither?" Answer: Neither.

"Can foreigners, aliens, outsiders -whether immigrants or non-immigrants, father natural members of a group to which they do not belong?"

"During birth, can merely being present on the territory of a group to which the parents do not belong, result in producing a natural member of that group?"

"What does the irrelevant location of one's exit from the womb have to do with the group with which one has natural membership?" "Can parents give birth to children who do not belong to the group to which they belong?"

"Can a man father off-spring who are natural members of a nation with which he has no connection, and against which his own nation may be at war?"

Such questions have very clear answers but the answers aren't widely known because the questions are never asked, never considered, never contemplated. But they need to be asked and answered, along with these questions; "When in human history has the foreign bride of a group member not been recognized as a new member of her husband's group?"

"When in history has a man's children not been natural members of the group into which he was born?"

"When in human history has a man's children been born as natural members of a group to which he does not belong, (-as in the group to which his foreign wife belonged)?"

"When in human history has the birth location of a man's children been of any significance in determining whether or not they are natural members of his group?"

If you remove the word "natural" from that question, then you come to the source of the problem we face today regarding U.S. born children of illegal aliens, and the presidency of Barack Obama. The answer is that birth location only became of any significance when civilization reached the point of keeping permanent records. Before then no one had anything to go by in ascertaining what group one belonged to other than his word or that of those who knew him for a considerable length of time, such as during the years of his birth and childhood. [Although accents were a dead give-away.]

Permanent birth records changed everything when it came to ascribing citizenship, -or we should say "subjectship" since only members of free democratic nations are truly citizens of their nation and not its subjects. Permanent birth records, along with census taking, provided royal dictators with a data base of who was born within the dictator's realm and therefore who belonged to him for life as his "natural subject" (since he was their "natural master" via the doctrine of The Divine Right of Kings).

There are no subjects in a free democratic republic since there are no masters other than The People, but as government grows larger and more powerful, it becomes more of a master and the people become more like its subjects, -which turns the foundation principles of the United States on their head. But I digress.

Having the irresistible and irreplaceable utility of birth records, government reasonably turns to them as prima fascia evidence of what nation one belongs to, -just as the despotic monarchs of the mother country did to ascertain who belonged to the King, via the reasoning: "born within my realm? Bingo, -you belong to me!" The convenience of such irrefutable proof was relied upon to determine subjectship and citizenship even though it did not rely on the principle by which citizenship is derived.

That natural principle is invisible, intangible and generally unprovable without a blood test. So something tangible had to be relied upon in its place, and that something was a certified copy of a birth record.

That official certificate shows that one was born in such-and-such State, to named parents, as well as the status of their nationality. Although the parents and their nationality were what truly determines the citizenship of their off-spring, the birth location was fixated on following the passage of the 14th Amendment which over-road the centuries-long tradition that citizenship was a State matter, and each of the sovereign nations that made up the union known in 1789 as "these united States of America" were the determiners of immigration and naturalization.

Following the end of the Civil War and the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, Washington exerted its authority over the States, the southern states in particular, as it had never been allowed to do before then. The difference is seen in the wording of the 1st Amendment, which begins; "Congress shall make no law…" It didn't mean that the States couldn't make a law respecting an establishment of religion because they retained that right.

Many civil rights, such as voting, serving on juries, entering into contracts, and owning property had nothing to do with the federal government, but with the passage of federal civil rights legislation and amendments, certain rights were made to be federal rights which no state could violate as they had had the right to before then.

With the passage of the 14th Amendment which reads: "Any person born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, is a citizen of the United States and the State wherein they reside.", attention focused on the easily provable location of one's birth, -to the neglect of one's parentage (which related to both American and foreign parents) and jurisdiction (which related mostly to foreign parents and the issue of whether or not they were subject to U.S. federal jurisdiction or to the foreign jurisdiction of their homeland.

The State Department, Immigration Service, and Justice Departments ignored the 14th Amendment for three decades until the Supreme Court forced them to accept it when it ruled that an American born son of Chinese immigrants was not an alien but an American.

Ever since it's been a down-hill road as the government moved from acknowledging that immigrant parents are subject to Washington in the same way that citizens are subject, (and therefore their children are granted citizenship from birth) to the government saying "the hell with it, -we'll just take the easy way, the brain-dead way, the mindless way and ascribe U.S. citizenship to every living thing born on American soil as long as its recognizable as human. We'll just make the birth certificate and its proof of a US birth location as everything, and the natural principle of natural membership can be simply ignored. The very foundation of natural citizenship is unneeded in ascertaining and deciding matters of citizenship."

And you know what? They were right from a practical stand-point, -until, that is, the presidential election of 2008 and the candidacy of one unnatural citizen who called himself Barack Obama.

Thanks to him, we have not only the continuing problem of the bastardization of the jurisdiction requirement of the 14th Amendment as it relates to illegal immigrants, but we also have the bastardization of the presidential eligibility clause of the Constitution itself.

Stupidity and treason to the Constitution are the Twiddle Dee and Twiddle Dumb of the attack on the foundations of our governing law and principles, both of which have been perverted by illegitimate concepts that are diametrically opposed to the original meaning and intent of citizenship requirements that are neither ambiguous nor optional.

The result of the conflation of the 14th Amendment native-birth citizenship concept with that of citizenship being government defined and bestowed has led to the wide-spread assumption that presidential eligibility is based solely on being native-born and not natural born.

The erroneous thinking is as follows: "Since citizenship is bestowed by government, and the Constitution, (14th Amendment), and native-birth is all that's needed to obtain that citizenship, therefore that constitutional citizenship is all that's required to be President."

That's three gigantic errors chain-linked together, and oblivious to the truth that natural citizenship is not bestowed by the government, -place of birth does not have any bearing on natural citizenship, and presidential eligibility is wholly dependent upon natural citizenship and no other type, including constitutional citizenship.

The inconvenient truth is that no one with constitutional citizenship is eligible to be the Commander-in-Chief of the American military and nuclear forces. No one dependent on government, law, or native-birth is eligible to be President. No one born to a father who wasn't an American is a natural member of that nation to which his father does not belong. He is instead a hybrid.

The die-hard supporters of Obama's presidency cling to the argument that native-born and natural born have been conflated [erroneously] throughout U.S. history and that that is somehow proof that they are one and the same, while they choose to willfully ignore the fact that the INS has always distinguished between the native-born (constitutional) citizen and the natural born citizen who is not dependent on the 14th Amendment nor native-birth.

I've share that fact, and the quoted proof from the Immigration Service's own website on my home page, and in many other commentaries, and won't repeat it here. Wishful thinking won't make it go away, (-although the Obama-protecting conspirators in the U.S. government *did* make it go away by deliberately changing its web address, but I was able to locate its new address).

Natural citizenship is based on the Law of Natural Membership, -a principle of natural law. I would say that the principle is not based on the written law, but that the written law is based on the principle, only the problem is that there is no such written law. It was never written and never needed.

The only law ever written is that which covers those who were not born with natural citizenship. Everyone whose citizenship is dependent on that man-made law is ineligible to be the President because they are not natural born citizens. The law by which an American is a natural United States citizen was not written in 1787 when the Constitution was authored and has never been written since, but by that unwritten law Barack Obama is a usurper unconstitutionally occupying the White House.

by a.r. nash april 2012 http://obama--nation.com