

From **Subjects of The King** To **Citizens of The Nation**

The legitimacy of the presidency of Barack Obama is predicated on the assumption that he was Constitutionally eligible for the office. While he fulfilled the 2nd and 3rd requirements for the office, (-the requirements of age and residency), a fallacy has been unquestioningly embraced that he also fulfilled the elements of the first and primary requirement; namely that he be “**a natural born citizen**”.

That fallacy is the result of substituting a related circumstance (location of birth) in place of the oldest tradition of all societies, which is **natural membership** by birth to member parents.

That error is the result of the historical circumstances of the American British colonies, which were not founded as equal members of the King's domain, but rather as separate foreign properties which were outside of the umbrella of legal rights that had been established in England through centuries of "push-back" against royal despotism, beginning with the Magna Carta.

This inequitable relationship with the mother country was not made manifest until England was stuck with the large costs of waging the war against the French & Indians in America. England was loath to bare the costs to defend others so far away while they (the colonists) escaped from paying a sizable share.

So a campaign was begun to squeeze money from the colonies even while they were given no representation in Parliament nor before the King's counselors. The list of the Crown's injustices against the colonies are documented in The Declaration of Independence. Those injustices revealed that the attitude of England was that the colonies were the property of England, along with its subjects who were not co-equals with all the rights of Englishmen.

The view that the colonists were not true members of nation of England, but rather were mere subjects akin to serfs, changed how the inhabitants were connected to the government. As Englishmen, with all

the rights of Englishmen, they would have had to have been treated differently than if they were mere foreign servants of the Crown.

While English society had gained many legal rights over time, they had not escaped from the prevailing political philosophy of "**The Divine Right of Kings**" on which the legitimacy of all the monarchs of the former "Holy Roman Empire" was based. Under that philosophy, the aristocracy of the landed gentry and the nobility viewed all off-spring of the plant domain, animal domain, and human domain (from seed, sheep, sow, or serf) as being the property of the land owner by the fact of coming into existence on his property. That principle was known as "**jus soli**", or "the law of soil".

Children of foreigners who were born within the Kings domain were deemed to be his subjects by his authority, as well as that of his judiciary or Parliament since their parents had abandoned their previous country and resettled in the King's. They were not “natural born subjects” since their parents were not native subjects of the King but were subjects of a foreign monarch. But since their children were born on his land, he had a right to claim them as his subjects.

But a different principle applied for those with wealth, -those with an estate. They were not viewed as the King's property but were considered to be free subjects of the nation via national membership passed down from subject fathers (patrilineal descent). They **inherited** their citizenship, -with its rights & responsibilities and protections from their fathers, and that principle is known as "**jus sanguinis**" or "law of blood".

Since the colonies were the property of the Crown, its inhabitants were viewed as belonging to the mother country by jus soli, not jus sanguinis, because they were born on the land of the loyal owner and were therefore akin to his personal property. That's how the idea of native-birth came to be seen as the principle that bestowed membership in one or more of the American colonies. Its concept was; "We were born on the King's land, -we belong to the land owner" rather than "We are citizens, not subjects,

because we were born *as* citizens by being born *to* citizens, and we are no one's property. We don't belong to the government, the government belongs to us."

The founding fathers realized that the colonial model had to be abandoned and the natural model had to be adopted, but some were not familiar with the natural model because they'd spent their entire lives under the colonial model, in its schools & colleges, and it was the only tradition that they knew. They thought that citizenship was a result of where one is born since that was the tradition of the common law of their native colony.

The phrase "natural born citizen" is composed of three significant words, each of which represents a different historical reality. Before understanding what they mean as a whole, one must first understand what they mean individually.

"Natural" refers to the natural realm. "Citizen" refers to the political realm. "Born" refers to birth, which is related to two separate and distinct legal concepts; a.) human ownership, and b.) birthright inheritance) -as well as the essence of membership. These concepts serve as a bridge to connect the natural realm with the political realm and combine them all into an indivisible unity.

"Natural", it's referenced because it embodies a principle that's directly adaptable to the political realm. That principle has its earliest reference in the book of **Genesis** and the story of the creation of life, about which it was written that each species reproduced after its own kind, -producing offspring just like the parents. Different species do not intermingle and produce offspring that are not like them, instead, they're identical.

That's the natural principle behind the use of the word "natural". A natural born anything is going to be the same as the parents which produced it. The analogy in the political realm is that citizens produce citizens of the same nationality. Any combining of nationalities would not be politically natural.

For example, if a mare (female horse) is mated

with a jackass (male donkey) the off-spring is not a natural born horse, nor a natural born donkey, but instead is a mule, which is not a natural creature since it's sterile. In the human realm, if an Eskimo female becomes pregnant by an African male, their off-spring will not be a natural born Eskimo, nor a natural born African. It won't be a natural born anything other than the greater classification of "Human".

Instead it is born as a racial/ ethnic/ cultural/ and **political hybrid**, -which brings up the related fact that connects to the word "born".

While "born" includes the legal implications of place of birth, it also relates to "natural" in that it's the vehicle that provides one with membership in their natural group. One is a member of a native tribe by birth into the tribe. Without birth to tribal members, one will not be a member of the group. So it is with birth into the political realm, one is a member by birth to members.

Without member parents, one is not a member of the group, i.e., not a natural member or natural citizen. If one's father is not a member of the tribe, then one's acceptance by the tribe is dependent on their adoption rules and how strict they chose to be about maintaining pure-blood membership. In the political realm, one's citizenship is dependent on rules (Naturalization Law) adopted to deal with such hybrid or hyphenated off-spring. Those rules have to be adopted not to define those who are natural members, but to provide membership for those who are *not* natural members.

Such rules of allowance of new members who aren't fully natural results in instances of "Native Americans" being of mixed-blood, -having blue eyes and blond hair, -not as common a thing as having names like McKinsey rather than an ancient tribal name.

The word "born" also relates to an ancient legal tradition that's thousands of years old. It's known as "**Primogeniture**", which is the first born male's right to inherit the estate of the parents (which of

was known as a **birthright**. It's a right that they're born with and is theirs automatically, requiring no law to make it so because the tradition is as old, or older, than any written law.

That's why birthright citizenship is not even included in the Constitution, nor is the right to vote, because they were understood by all to be "a given", -a right so unalienable as to not need to be stated.

Inheriting the throne was the birthright of the prime son. It was his right by birth regardless of who disliked it or him. Any inheritance received by his siblings was based on the parents' feelings towards the other sons, while the daughters were not a part of the inheritance because they became members of the family of their husbands.

By primogeniture, the family name and estate would be secured for centuries, -as long as the wealth was retained and the male heir produced a surviving male off-spring. In England Prince Charles, and his first-born son William were born with the birthright to the throne. Their siblings do not have that right. In the political realm, ones "birthright" is to inherit the citizenship/ membership of the parents.

"Born" also relates to the land or country in which one enters the world, the land where one is raised and comes to be a full-fledged member as an adult. Historically, ones devotion to one's county/ state/ nation sprang from it being one's home, (though that relationship has been greatly altered by urbanization and multiple re-locations). But most peoples have a sense of national identify because of their shared history, language, culture, and perhaps religion. So place of birth, while not instilling a sense of national allegiance and membership, may result in the life experiences that produce those feelings.

Since place of birth (from viewed in a vacuum) seems to be an adequate historical explanation for a sense of national connection, or nationalism, the legal profession has erroneously settled on it as the simple sole criteria for ascribing citizenship (-which would not be a problem if we had a second Canada on our Southern border, with its same wealth, language, educational system and birth rate).

The founding fathers and authors of the Constitution understood the national danger that would threaten the survival of the union of the states of North America if the commander-in-chief of the United States Army, Navy, and Marines felt a greater devotion to the Crown & British Empire, than to the United States. The only way possible to prevent that was to make all dual-citizens and naturalized citizens ineligible for the office of the President, (while allowing them to occupy any other federal office -except the Vice-Presidency.

The way that they imposed that limitation was through adding the requirement that the President be a natural born citizen. Those words come as the sum of all of the above historical references. They combine to mandate the following:

1. The President must be a "natural citizen" by birth to citizens, He must not be a hybrid (or hyphenated) citizen but a natural "full-blood" member of the national group.
2. His citizenship must not be by statute but by birthright, -the unalienable right of citizenship by inheritance from citizen parents.
3. By birth he must have had no taint of being subject to any foreign power through a father-son connection to one who was a member of a foreign society and nation, and subservient to a foreign king.
4. From birth he must have never had any possibility of foreign allegiance through being born to a foreign father, or even worse, being raised by him in a foreign country after being born on U.S. Soil.
5. By birth we must be wholly American and nothing else, with an American father and mother.

United States Constitution; Article II, Section I, paragraph 5: No person -except a natural born Citizen shall be eligible to the Office of the President,..."

Our current President knowingly ran for and was elected to the office for which he is not eligible, and those in positions of authority or public influence don't realize that fact, or they do realize it but are unwilling, or not allowed to discuss it openly. It's seems probable that the owner of Fox News

(owned 7% by a Saudi billionaire who helped Obama gain admittance to Harvard) has muzzled all of his on-air personnel since they will not even broach the subject. They are free to oppose the President for any reason and any policy they find objectionable, but they do not, and presumably cannot, cross the line into the eligibility territory. There must be a reason for that other than sheer ignorance or lack of curiosity.

Hopefully they aren't that ignorant. If they are, then we're in even bigger trouble than if they've been muzzled. The rest of the media won't bring up the subject because they are completely in Obama's corner, so the silence is universal with the lone exception of the internet.

Perhaps the issue might be viewed by neutral parties as a hornets nest (or killer-bee hive) that is best left un-kicked.

The down side of awakening an American awareness of the issue may be that it would be disastrous to any hope of national political civility which is already being sorely tested by the dire circumstances of the national debt and deficit crisis and the magnitude of spending cuts required to right our financial ship of state.

It appears possible that our illegitimate President will not succeed in being re-elected, but it would be far better for the future of our country if enough people realized the truth and moved to defend the Constitution by preventing him from even being accepted as an eligible candidate of the Democratic Party for the 2012 election.

The leaders of his party deliberately avoided declaring Obama as being the constitutionally eligible candidate of their party in 2008 by removing the wording that had historically stated that fact regarding previous candidates. This demonstrates that they know he is not Constitutionally eligible but they care not one bit about fidelity to the document that they have sworn a solemn oath to defend. The oath of office does not require one to preserve, protect and defend the United States, nor its people, nor its legal system, nor its economic system, but to defend

only one thing, and that thing is the Constitution itself.

It appears that the greatest risk to it is no longer foreign, but is domestic. The progressive/ socialist/ humanist/ agenda supersedes fidelity to even the most fundamental law of our nation, and even views it as a dangerous threat to its programs. While pushing compassionate social programs, they also push massive and wasteful spending and social engineering programs which corrupt the political process because that "buys" them loyal voters who will keep them in power.

To defend their ideology and its pervasive presence in modern American life, they will lie and deceive by any means necessary to protect what they have already achieved and to gain even greater power. They will also resort to forging birth documents to deceive those who are contented being deceived.

Only the Tea Party patriots, conservatives, and Libertarians see the damage that has been done and are resisting the ever expanding tentacles of federal power, while most of the country slumbers contentedly, too busy enjoying their sports events, sports bars, gambling get-aways, booze and drugs, video games, HDTV shows, internet entertainment, fabulous vehicles, music collections, and social media interaction. But the days are coming in which everyone will have to choose sides. And it is not very far off.

Which side will you choose? The rule of Law?, -or the rule of men, -men (and women) who subvert and pervert "the Law of the Land" by passing and enforcing unconstitutional travesties against the Constitution of the United States?

If you would stand with nearly half of the country, they you would be in diametric opposition to the principles of our founding fathers, -and would be on the side of constitutional **treason**. That side is for certain the side of the road to ruin.

by A.R. Nash August 2011 /Sept 2012