

~Unlimited & Untouchable Citizenship for Life~

What is citizenship and what is the source from which it springs? It springs from the principle of inheritance of natural membership in a natural group. By birth, children of members are members also. For better or for worse, (-for worse has historically been very common) one might be born into a privileged or advantaged group, or might be born into an enslaved or disadvantaged group. One has no choice regarding to whom they are born. Their membership in their parents' group is automatic.

If you were born into the untouchable caste in India, then that was where you were stuck for life. Similarly, if you were born to slaves....likewise. Nothing could magically transform you into another group. Your fate was sealed by your parentage.

If you were born to royalty then you would be a royal for life because you were royal by birth and nothing could change that. You were a natural born royal and it didn't matter where you were born. It's the same with nations. What you are by birth is what you are for life regardless of where your mother gave birth to you, unless you yourself freely choose to abandon your roots, your homeland and people, your loyalty to them, and seek membership in another national group.

You have the natural right to do that, but that right has historically not been recognized by dictatorships of any kind. They shun belief in individual worth and the natural rights with which man was created. Instead, they view their national members as their own property and possessing only limited human rights, -like the limited rights of children. But that right to choose where one will live and to which people one will belong is one of the foundational principles upon which The United States was founded.

But even more fundamental is the right to be what you are by birth. If you are an American by birth, then your right to be what you are is inviolable, sacrosanct, untouchable, and limitless. No human has a right to limit nor regulate your citizenship. No department nor agency of government has such a right. No court nor congressmen nor administrator has such a right. Your citizenship is untouchable and immutable because, as the founding fathers recognized, it's an unalienable right and therefore need not and shall not be legislated nor regulated. It's yours by an invisible, unwritten, undergirding principle of Natural Law, -which is the foundation upon which all law is built.

Just as no one is authorized to grant you the right to life or liberty or property, or justice, so no one is authorized to grant you that with which you were born, -namely membership in the American family, -which springs from your birth to members. Your membership is not ascribed to you because your mother happened to be, or not be, within a certain artificial, man-made political boundary. Boundaries, borders, geography, and abstracts of the human mind do not constitute anything that is natural, and if ever a thing in this world is natural, it's birth. One's political nature, just like their physical nature, is something that they are born with by the principles derived from the Laws of Nature and Natural Rights.

If these laws are not recognized, then the Natural Rights that spring from them and from the rights granted by "Nature's God", including free-will, and autonomy, cannot be recognized either. Without these Natural Rights, natural rights do not exist, and man can do to his fellow man whatsoever he chooses since there is no principle nor natural right that prevents one from claiming to possess greater and superior rights than all the rest.

Instead human society would have no foundation but would instead function by the law of Darwinian survival. In such a world, your citizenship can be revoked. But that can't happen if no one has the authority to revoke it. In our life times, I cannot recall any attempt at revoking the citizenship of even one person born as an American, regardless of how vile, evil, and sociopathic one might be. Otherwise one such as Charles Manson would not still have American citizenship. Why wasn't his citizenship revoked? Because no one has the authority to revoke it. But they once did, and not very long ago.

American women once lost their citizenship by marrying a foreign man, which was the flip-side of foreign women being automatically naturalized via marriage to an American man. It served the national good for wives to have the same citizenship as their husband. But the policy wasn't written in stone until it was formally included in the Nationality Act of 1907, (repealed in 1922 with the Cable Act) but still questions remained in regard to an American women moving, or not moving, to her foreign husband's homeland, among others.

So that which was fundamental law for all men was not fundamental for all women because they were paternalistically viewed as belonging to the husband

-who was lord and master of the household. For constitutional purposes, women were not viewed as "persons" since "persons" had rights and responsibilities which women did not. They were in a protected-class similar to children.

So, while there was lots of gray in regard to the universal application of universal rights, there was never any gray in regard to the rights of men. Their citizenship was unlimitable and untouchable because Congress was excluded from possessing any authority regarding the citizenship of American men. Their only authority was to legislate and regulate the naturalization of foreigners. As a result, there is no law by which you are an American unless your father or mother was an immigrant or a foreigner.

Therefore natural American citizenship cannot be revoked because it is not something that is granted. But it can be abandoned or rejected by certain actions which are considered citizenship nullifiers. But *naturalized* citizenship can be revoked -maybe. No one is sure since it's supposed to be equal in all respects except the presidency. There are no natural principles governing naturalized citizenship because it's not a natural thing.

So,...what's the deal with Anwar al Awlaki and his 16 year old son who was a U.S. citizen who was born in Denver? Awlaki was a U.S.-Yemeni citizen turn-coat who sold America out and worked to help kill Americans. Why wasn't their U.S. citizenship revoked before they was killed by Predator missiles? Because there exists no authority to revoke it. But he could be killed legitimately because of the principle of Natural Law which gives one the right of self-defense. That right is also an unalienable right, and it supersedes that of a fellow American's right to live if he has committed acts leading to the deliberate killings of members of the American family. His killing not only prevents further deadly acts but also obtains another Natural Right of American citizens, and that is the right of Justice. As long as there is no divine justice being meted out in this world, government rightfully fills that role to obtain justice for its citizens.

These fundamental rights supersede the constitutional right to a trial which was an impossibility anyway since he was uncapturable. But by what natural right did the U.S. Government ignore the pleas of the grandfather of Anwar's son and murder his grandson? Such a right cannot be found in civilian criminal law, so if it exists, it has to be based on principles of na-

tional self-defense which includes defending against, via lethal force, the intent and inevitable action of an enemy combatant to take as many lives of your fellow citizens as he is able. No one who occupies the camp of would-be mass-murderers is guiltless and innocent of murderous intent. So in such a situation it becomes covered by the right of self-defense, -either kill or be killed.

But upon hearing the news of his death, or that of Osama Bin Laden, did it occur to you that those Natural Rights were involved? It sure didn't occur to me because we are not normally conscious of those rights. We never think about them, and yet they are part of the very foundation of the law that governs our nation.

So also is the natural right of membership in the American family into which we were born. No foreigner possess that right, neither do children born to him because they inherit the right to membership in the father's national family. Any child born without the natural right to membership in the American family is not a natural American citizen because such children are not born to American parents but to one or two foreigners.

In 2008, the American people voted by a majority to elect to the presidency someone who possesses no natural right to be an American because he was fathered by a visiting foreigner who was not subject to the jurisdiction of the American government. He is not a natural member of the American group. His membership is the result of the goodness of the American people who've granted, via law, policy, and the 14th Amendment, permission for the children of foreigners to be included in the American family. But that permission is permission, -it's not a right that they were born with. They weren't born as natural members of American society and are therefore not "natural born citizens" of the United States.

No person who is not a natural born American is eligible to be the President. And so we have a sitting President who is in violation of the United States Constitution, and has breached the wall of separation between American and foreigner that the founding fathers inscribed as a fundamental requirement for one single office or position in all of American government, and that is the one that holds the power of being the Commander-in-Chief of the United States Armed Forces.

The founding fathers rejected discrimination against those born in foreign nations, or born to foreign immigrants or naturalized foreigners, but with that one exception. It was an issue of trust. It was accompanied by the limitation based on age discrimination, which was a matter of maturity. Also it was accompanied by the discrimination based on residency, (14 years) which was a matter of assimilation, knowledge of American principles, traditions, laws, and history, -as well as development of loyalty to one's new homeland. So the qualifications for the presidency are all about discrimination.

Vermont Constitution 1786 Section XXXVI; "Every person, of good character, who comes to settle in this State, having first taken an oath or affirmation of allegiance to the same, may purchase, or by other just means acquire, hold and transfer land, or other real estate; and after one year's residence, shall be deemed a free denizen thereof, and entitled to all the rights of a natural born subject of this State; except that he shall not be capable of being elected governor, lieutenant-governor, treasurer, councillor, or representative in assembly, until after two years residence."

The history of American state and federal citizenship contains countless examples of discrimination and selection between natural citizens and foreign immigrants. Such clauses delineate how naturalized citizens are the same as natural born citizens in every way, ---except..... -and then there's the exception. It's made clear that in certain situations they are not equal without limitation. But natural citizens have no limitations (except in regard to maturity and perhaps character).

Foreigners who are naturalized citizens are required, before filling a public position, to have been citizens for X number of years because they were not born being citizens nor members of the American family where they reside. They must be assimilated first. Those who do not assimilate are never trusted to assume public office even though they are legal permanent U.S./State residents. If they are unwilling to become naturalized citizens then that is evidence that their loyalty remains with their own homeland, -which loyalty they are unwilling to renounce. If for some reason they are "unable" to naturalize, then they have a problem that renders them incompetent to serve, such as the inability to learn English.

The most stringent restriction of all is that which limits who can be the President. It's so strict that maybe as much as 50% of the population are barred from being President because they are too young, but that was not the case when the Constitution was written. Rather, it was much worse. Half the population was barred alright, but for a different reason, which was that they were female.

Of the male population perhaps half were barred due to immaturity (under 35 years of age). Then of those old enough, all those who were too old, or of African or Asian or Latin or Jewish or Catholic or southern or eastern European descent were barred, -not by law but by strong public opinion.

With those groups excluded, there remained perhaps only 10% of the U.S. population who could run for the office of President. The third generation of some groups might have been able to assimilate enough to be viewed as "normal Americans", but not most.

These real-world limitations were not realities that the framers of the Constitution were unaware of. But it didn't matter to them because eligibility to be the President wasn't a subject that was framed in terms of inclusion of all, but exclusion of all, with only two exceptions.

The limitations on the eligibility of those who would be President were so central in the minds of the framers of the Constitution that they began their list of qualifications by barring everybody from being the President. And then they made two exceptions, and the first exception was "natural born citizens". The second exception was for their own generation, of which none were born as natural citizens of the United States since it didn't exist yet.

Fortunately, the class of natural born citizens would constitute in time the largest class of all because most Americans were born to Americans and thus were Americans by birth. Those who are Americans by birth to Americans are the nation's natives, -also known as "les naturels" (the naturals) which were labeled in English as the "natural born citizens". They can be the American President, but those with foreign parentage cannot be President without being in clear violation of the Constitution of the United States.

By A. R. Nash Mar. 2012 <http://obama-nation.com>