Nations, Citizens, Responsibility, & Natural Law

Mario Apuzzo wrote: "So if it was not the English common law which controlled the definition of national citizenship, which law was it? The historical record shows that the law of nations became American national law which the U.S. Supreme Court considered as "common law."

The Supreme Court, being the final arbiter of legal matters, should and does (usually) consult prior authority in forming its opinion. To do that there must first be some prior authority, and there almost always is. But sometimes there isn't, and so what they must consult is merely opinion, and some issues are strictly philosophical so all that legal determination can do is consult opinions by lawyers regarding philosophical issues that are outside the legal realm.

The legal mind sees everything connected to the law through legal eyes. It is incapable of seeing things as they really are, -they can't see the forest for the trees because they are completely surrounded by trees. To see the forest they must move far away, -to a vantage point outside of the legal realm. But they are not wired to do that because their minds are filled with legal trees.

The very question itself, quoted above, reveals a lack of natural perspective into the reality of the issue. Understand this: the words "controlled" and "definition" and "which law" should be thrown out completely unless arguing before a judge because they come from a realm that is outside of the real world, the natural world, the world from which the word "natural" is derived. "Natural" does not come from the Legal realm nor is it defined in that realm. It comes only from the natural realm.

In the natural realm there is no such thing as control of definitions because definitions do not exist, nor do human laws. There is only natural relationships and natural laws & principles. The term CITIZENSHIP is a concept from the Legal realm. *Membership* is a reality in the natural realm, describing the connection of families, herds, prides, tribes, and clans, which on a larger scale includes countries and nations. To be a Citizen is to be something that the legal realm can define, but to be natural is not something that the legal realm defines, -natural things are only described by natural law principles. So to describe a type of national member which is a native, indigenous member requires spanning the gulf between the legal realm and the natural realm by creating a hybrid concept involving both.

The natural realm is not a part of the legal realm and the legal realm is not a part of the natural realm, but a hybrid combination of the two is needed to describe native members of nations, and that combination involves the use of the term *~natural* CITIZEN, or natural born citizen, implying that such a person was born being a citizen via natural inheritance of their parents' political nature.

There is no controlling authority to define that which requires no defining. Does anyone need a legal definition of what a child is? (meaning a natural child) Everyone knows what a child is because a child is a natural thing. A definition is only needed when the law becomes involved, as in "an adopted child". So it is with natural national membership.

If one is a member by birth then that is self-explanatory. What needs explaining is how non-natural members are made members *at* birth (via automatic naturalization by law). Natural membership needs no explanation, nor any law, nor any constitutional clause, nor any SCOTUS opinion, nor any Attorney General Interpretation. It exists apart and beneath all legal acts & definitions because it exists even in the absence of their existence.

Anyone born as a member of a group is born with a responsibility to help defend it when its survival is threatened. That responsibility exists apart and beneath all legalisms, such as Allegiance, Obedience, Protection, Subjection, Jurisdiction, none of which speak to the primacy of natural obligation, -the same kind of obligation that a father has in

regard to protecting his family. All of those concepts can be tossed out because they obfuscate the otherwise obvious. Their origin is not found in natural relationships because the relationship they spring from is not a natural one but one conceived with the sole intent of legitimizing the autocratic rule of Kings.

The Divine Right of Kings makes all subservient to his Royal Highness, his Imperial Majesty and justifies his absolute authority by asserting that total obedience is the just compensation for his protection. But in a democratic republic, that relationship is turned completely upside down.

It is not the People who owe the rulers obedience, its the rulers that own the people obedience, as in obedience to their foundational charter and the laws based on it, and the rights that they secure. The government does not bear the responsibility of protection of its "subjects", instead, “The People” bear the responsibility of protecting the nation and its government via their obligation to serve in its defense, -an obligation with which they are born -if....they are male.

Females are not under that obligation because the males of a society will not require it, nor tolerate it being required.
Hence the true and full meaning of being "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States is revealed.
Subjection involves four areas; 1. Civil Law, 2. Criminal Law, 3. Political Law, & 4. Military Law.

Subjection to Military Law is the foundation of nations, -without it they would cease to exist because they would be conquered and destroyed. While females are under the authority of the other three areas of law, those alone do not make them a part of the primary foundation of nations because they are exempt from military obligation.

They are like a three legged table. It can stand on its own, but you cannot stand on top of it. But nations cannot stand without all four legs because without the fourth leg they will topple when push comes to shove. No nation in history that was populated solely by children, women, and civilians would have survived for very long because without a military sector it would lack the shield and sword vital for national defense.

So it should be understood that the subjection required in the 14th Amendment cannot be imparted by one's mother, but only by one's father because one’s mother is not subject. If one has a foreign mother and an American father then the obligation of national defense is passed to his children and they are born subject (latently) to federal authority. Their subjection to the authority of the federal government and the military obligation it enforces on behalf of the defense of the nation becomes active at the age of 18.

But if one is born in the U.S. to a *non*-immigrant alien father (like a tourist or student) then there’s not inheritance of an obligation to defend a nation that is not one's own. But if one is an immigrant, then one bears a responsibility to defend and protect the society that is his home, and that responsibility extends to the real-world obligation to serve in the nation's military service. That's why even immigrants must register with the Selective Service if between the ages of 18 and 25.

The 14th Amendment opinion in Wong Kim Ark imposed a new definition of who is subject to the federal authority. By declaring the children of immigrants to be subject, they were also issuing a de facto ruling that their fathers were also subject because subjection only flows from father to son, -not from mother to son, nor from father to daughter, nor from nothing to something.
That declaration of the subjection of the children of immigrants altered the executive branches policy of not viewing immigrants as responsible for national defense by reason of them being foreigners. It made them, in effect, co-equal to citizens in respect to the responsibility to protect the nation, all while not possessing citizenship rights.

Women were the exact opposite. They, after passage of the women's voting rights amendment, then enjoyed the privilege of voting but not the responsibility of national defense. But immigrant

males were, by the 14th Amendment, subject to the full jurisdiction of the federal government (civil, criminal, political, *and* military) while not possessing the full civil rights of citizens.

This truth is critical to understanding the actual meaning of jurisdiction and how it applies to Barack Obama. Since his father was not an immigrant, he was not subject to federal jurisdiction, and therefore had no obligation toward American national "defense", including service in the Army in Vietnam. So subjection to American authority could not possibly be passed on to his son.

Additionally, full subjection could not be passed from his mother since she was married to a non-immigrant alien and she was not subject either, although that could be viewed differently if they had not been married. Then the obligation of national defense would fall on his shoulders at age 18 as it does to all permanent residents but not as a 14th Amendment citizen under its original meaning.

Throughout the half of American history preceding the 14th Amendment, her bastard child would have been viewed as either a foreigner or as a stateless person, -*never* a natural citizen. He would have needed to be naturalized as an adult in order to become an American because he would have been viewed as the hybrid bastard son of an alien, born outside of Holy Matrimony, legitimized by nothing.

As an “illegitimate” person, he would have been viewed as a less than acceptable member of the nation, having an odious and unnatural status in the environs in which he lived. No doubt, no such case ever came before a court to determine such a citizenship status because such persons would have sought naturalization as an adult or legitimation via a step-father as a minor. Or, he may have not cared about his citizenship status if he was illiterate or semi-literate and not politically inclined nor active. Voting was an irrelevant right to the disinterested, and travel abroad only a pipe dream.

Note: The executive branch enforces an extra-legal policy of ascribing subjection to its jurisdiction based on its arbitrary authority alone, and not on any law or natural principle or natural responsibility. It does so in regard to children of parents who are not subject to federal authority, including babies born to foreign visitors, and even consulate officers. By that bastardized policy it is free to ascribe U.S. citizenship even to children of foreign terrorists and illegals if they happened to be born within U.S. borders. Any Attorney General or President could end that policy overnight with a mere signature. It’s not based on law.

Similarly, citizenship acquired at birth by the 14th Amendment could be completely eliminated by simply repealing it. That fact demonstrates the tenuous nature of such citizenship. Though it is above the authority of Congress, it is not above the authority of the people. But what is above all authority is that for which no authority is needed, and that is natural citizenship. It is not dependent on any law or constitutional clause. It exists as a primary principle of nature and an intrinsic element of the foundation of all nations. All fundamental national laws are based on fundamental moral laws and natural or philosophical principles, and by those principles, Barry Obama is not a natural citizen of the United States and is therefore an unconstitutional President.

Visit Mario Apuzzo’s latest treatise on the history of British & American citizenship at:
http://puzo1.blogspot.com/2012/10/barack-obama-is-ineligible-to-be.html

It’s enormously informative, historically thorough, and entirely convincing. It’s a college course on one page. It’s only drawback is the conviction that natural law must be combined with human law and royal policy, -requiring that birth location be viewed as a major factor in natural citizenship. But Natural Law and reason dictate that it is totally irrelevant, as I’ve explained exhaustively in numerous expositions.

by a.r. nash nov. 2012 obama--nation.com