

Allegiance: Bastard Child of Royal Despots

Some folks with strong national security concerns have fallen under the persuasive allure of an ancient imperial dogma of deceit, a doctrine of dictators, embracing and espousing the notion by which royal despots persuaded the gullible that they had the right to rule over them as their lord and master, -their absolute sovereign, the one to whom they "owed" allegiance, loyalty and obedience for life due to the happenstance that their mother was within the boundaries of the monarch's land when she delivered them from the womb.

I speak of the Divine Right of Kings, -that pseudo scripture-based doctrine invented by the religious sycophants of the King in order to justify his power and reign by beknighting his sovereignty with the primatur of Divine authority, -which he supposedly was endowed with by He who made him the head of Church & State (King Henry the VIII made *himself* both by severing English ties to the Catholic Church).

How does that impact us today? It does so by confusing the truth about the ineligibility of Barack Obama to be the President of the United States. That confusion springs from an erroneous understanding of the meaning of the words "natural born citizen" which is the type of citizen which the President must be by birth. The Constitution rejects all other types of citizens for that one position alone in order to insure that the Commander-in-Chief has no loyalty to a nation other than the United States.

The confusion springs from an observation made by a Swiss philosopher in his landmark work published in 1857 titled "The Law of Nations; Principles of Natural Law". He, Emmerich de Vattel, observed in that tome that societies / nations are comprised of members born in the country of their parents' nationality. Being born to citizen parents in the land to which they belong made them that country's natives, or naturals (indigenes ou naturels), -as in natural members, natural inhabitants, natural citizens.

No one would disagree with that observation, but some have taken it and falsely characterized it as a stamped-in-stone definition -from which no deviation is possible. What Vattel described did not meet the definition of a definition, and therefore cannot rightfully nor logically be declared to be one since it lacked the definitive qualifiers of "only" and "all".

His description was a general one, not intended to be all-inclusive without exceptions. As such, it didn't focus on any possible exceptions, and thus didn't bother to bring up the nature of the citizenship of children born while their mother was not within her nation's borders. It didn't raise that issue nor declare such children to *not* be a native of the parents' country, -to *not* be a natural citizen of their nation. Yet that is what some have taken upon themselves to declare while basing that authoritative stance on Vattels' limited observation.

In describing his description as an authoritative "definition" (-one which supposedly became part of American common law), leads to the assertion that no one is a natural member of a people, country, or nation unless they are born on its soil to parents who are members, -no exceptions. Therefore all children born over the border, or on top of the border, are not natural Americans like their parents and siblings because they were born with an unshakeable allegiance and loyalty to two countries, -one of which is not the United States. Supposedly they were born with conflicting and dual allegiance and therefore the founding fathers felt that they should not be trusted to not betray their country, -the one where they probably grew up, in favor of the other nation where they entered the world.

It's hard to believe that intellectuals would write the things they've written about babies. So let's be clear; no baby ever born was possessed of an innate sense of allegiance to anything or anyone other than its mother. No toddler that ever walked felt a sense of loyalty to the foreign soil its mother was located on during delivery, yet statements have been made that imply just such a thing. Allegiance has nothing to do with children and everything to do with free adult males; -not babies, not youths, not women.

Question 1: Would or must a seven year-old girl swear or profess allegiance to a sovereign or any other entity?

Question 2: Would or must an eight year-old boy swear or profess allegiance to a sovereign or any other entity?

Question 3: Would or must a 17 year-old young woman swear or profess allegiance to a sovereign or any other entity?

Question 4: Would or must a wife, mother, or single woman swear or profess allegiance to a sovereign or any other entity?

Question 5: Would or must an 18 year-old young man swear allegiance to a sovereign or any other entity?

The answer to all of them is "no" except for the last one, -unless the woman is a foreigner taking the oath of allegiance & fidelity to the United States Constitution while being sworn in as a new American citizen.

But that oath was not written for people like her, meaning people who are not male, because it also involves swearing to bear arms in defense of the United States, which is something that has always and only been required of men since that obligation and responsibility only falls on the shoulders of the younger able-bodied non-felon males of nations.

It has never involved women, so its presence in the oath is evidence that when it was written only men were allowed to become U.S. citizens. [Their wives derived derivative citizenship through their husband's naturalization. They proved their citizenship by showing their marriage certificate and their husband's naturalization certificate.]

So allegiance at birth is a fiction since it only becomes an issue at maturity, -when and if a male is called to military service, or required to register with the government's conscription service to fulfil his obligation to serve in the effort to defend the nation.

Allegiance to a nation is something that can only spring from the socialization of a individual during their up-bringing. It does not spring from the soil nor the borders of a foreign nation. If one feels a longing to be part of and supportive of a foreign nation that they've never known, though born there, then they are either a very sad and lonely outsider, or they have been inculcated with the love and nostalgia of their foreign parents for their homeland.

But when the parents have abandoned their homeland and freely chosen America as their one and only home, then they are highly unlikely to indoctrinate their children into believing that their foreign homeland is so much preferable to America and that America should not be embraced as their true homeland, [-unless they are traditionalists from fundamentalist Islamic countries]. The main priorities of

immigrants were to find a home, a job, friends, a spouse, have children and have them assimilate.

Does the United States government care whether or not young male individuals feel a sense of patriotism and allegiance to America? That's not its concern because it wields the authority to draft them into its military and send them to their death in battle, even against their will. Allegiance is irrelevant but *responsibility* is paramount.

Every free adult male citizen bears the responsibility to defend himself, his sisters, his mother, his little brothers, his grand-parents, his community, and his nation. That responsibility is one with which he is born, and exists as a latent future reality that becomes real and present when he comes of age. A sense of allegiance has no part in that responsibility, but does serve to motivate one to fulfill it.

All talk of allegiance from birth serves only to obscure the truth that it is not something with which one is born. Instead such talk only serves to falsely validate the view that only via birth on the soil of one's own nation (or territory under its jurisdiction) can one be a natural member of that nation and thus eligible to be President. That false and falsely based concept is in violation of the very natural law that it professes to support since the location of a pregnant mother during delivery has no impact on the nature of her off-spring for any species that ever existed, including the human species. In natural law, parentage is everything; location is nothing, -but in U.S. law it's everything when it comes to children born to foreigners. Without it they have no citizenship because they would not be automatically naturalized at birth (by the 14th Amendment).

Suppose that John McCain, who was born in a Panamanian hospital, was the son of 5-Star General & President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Who wants to step up to the plate to argue that he would and should be ineligible to be President because he would be a potential threat to the nation by having been born with dual allegiance and loyalty? Who volunteers to argue that in the minds of our brilliant and insightful founding fathers, he should never be trusted to not be a secret Panamanian patriot who would not have America's best interests at heart and might work to undermine them?

The flip side of the founding fathers having no confidence in, but rather distrust of, the patriotism of American-born sons of loyal British subjects and aristocrats, is their trust in the loyalty of sons of patriotic American fathers, regardless of where their sons were born, -be they born in Boston or Bangkok, -Philadelphia or the Philippines, New Mexico or New Zealand; -be they born to a peasant or a President.

Their confidence in American fathers, -who were raised to believe in freedom, (-the very reason for the existence of the American colonies) led them to author the first naturalization act with the expressed mandate that American children born abroad were to not only be accepted by the U.S. government magistrates and officers as being American citizens, but even “natural born citizens”, -and thus indistinguishable from their domestically born brethren, -with eligibility for the presidency being their natural birthright.

They thought they were making it perfectly clear that sons of American fathers are natural citizens of their father's nation no matter where they are born, but because a later Congress dropped the words "natural born" while retaining only "citizen of the United States" (presidential eligibility not being the focus of a naturalization act) error arose in minds that leapt to the false conclusion that they must therefore not be natural born citizens simply because they were no longer being labeled as such. Worse than that, they presumed that they were viewed by Congress as being aliens in need of naturalization law to make them American citizens!

But not calling a red rose red does not make it not red. Not labeling something with all of the adjectives that describe it does not alter what it is. It is what it is, especially if it is what it is naturally, -without any human interference (or legislation).

John McCain would be a natural American citizen even if born on the moon, just as Barack Obama would *not* be a natural American even if born in the White House, because one's natural citizenship comes by descent, descent from one's father, and, as Obama openly claimed on his 2008 election web-site, his father was a British subject and both he and his children were subject to the British Nationality Act of 1948, by which Obama inherited his father's nationality.

Not being born in America would not make Obama ineligible to be President of the United States. It wouldn't matter since he is ineligible naturally, -by natural law. One cannot possibly be a natural member of two nations, -anymore than one can be a natural

member of two families. Either one *is* a natural member (by birth) or one is a *legal* member (by law), i.e., -a member by adoption.

Obama's paternity made him neither a natural citizen nor a legal citizen because his father was not a member of American society (being as he was a foreign student) and therefore Jr. did not fulfill the requirement of the 14th Amendment that he be born subject to the full jurisdiction of the American government. His father had no “allegiance” or duty to the United States and could not have been drafted and sent to say...Vietnam, so his son, likewise, was not born under a jurisdiction to which his father was not subject since subjection flows through the father, and the father was subject only to the British government.

The bottom line is that only adult male residents of the United States are under its full jurisdiction, including sons of Green Card foreigners who reach their 18th birthday, (-*not* foreign visitors), so Barack Obama is not only *not* a natural American with the Right of Citizenship via *patrilineal* descent, but is also not an American via the naturalization authority of the 14th Amendment either. He is nothing more than a citizen by a State Department policy which was established in 1898 by the Attorney General.

The supposed duality of his “inborn allegiance” is like a red herring because it sows only unnecessary confusion, while presenting the concept as a reasonable philosophical framework in which the truth about citizenship can be explained by relying on the historic dogma of English monarchs, but having no place in Reality, -except the *false* reality fabricated in the doctrine of the **Divine Right of Kings**.

by A.R. Nash April 1013 <http://obama--nation.com>

At the Obama campaign website – Fightthesmears.com – just below the Certification of Live Birth – the following admission was published: When Barack Obama Jr. was born on Aug. 4, 1961, in Honolulu, Kenya was a British colony, still part of the United Kingdom's dwindling empire. As a Kenyan native, Barack Obama Sr. was a British subject whose citizenship status was governed by The British Nationality Act of 1948. That same act governed the status of Obama Sr.'s children.

This was republished from a Factcheck.org, article which further stated: In other words, at the time of his birth, Barack Obama Jr. was both a U.S. citizen (by virtue of being born in Hawaii) and a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies (or the UKC) by virtue of being born to a father who was a citizen of the UKC.