

# BEARING ARMS, True Faith & ALLEGIANCE

~the forgotten full meaning of citizenship

Nations are populated by two distinct classes of citizens; adults, and minors. Adult citizens are members of two distinct classes; male and female. The male citizens are separate and apart from the female and minor citizens because the male, and only the male, is responsible and accountable for paying, if need be, the ultimate cost of freedom.

Recently liberated nations know this fact all too well being as the men of those nations have died by the thousands to free themselves and their fellow countrymen from tyranny. But nations that have enjoyed long extended periods of freedom from direct national danger forget that fact as it slowly slips from the national consciousness. America is one of those countries.

The men and women of our armed forces constitute a rounding error compared to our population numbers. They are as few as the grains that stick to the measuring cup when preparing a pot of rice. An insignificant number, and yet they, and American veterans, are the only ones who understand the reality of what it means to be a citizen. They understand because they've lived it, and all the rest have not. The rest remain in a secure cocoon that's free from the dangers of enemy fire.

The peoples and nations that suffered the most from tyranny, from Poland, Hungary and Russia, to Iraq and Libya know the meaning of citizenship, the meaning of oppression, and the cost of freedom. But the un-oppressed nations do not. They lack the personal knowledge of what is required of a nation's people in order to become free, and they lack the personal experience of the degree of authority that they are required to submit to in order to fulfill the mission of national defense. That authority is only learned one way, -the hard way.

When Hezbollah detonated a massive truck bomb in front of the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut and destroyed the building, killings hundreds of Ma-

rines in the blast and collapse, our leader, Ronald Reagan, decided on a course of action which had implications that didn't occur to him. He decided to withdraw our intended "peace-keeping" force and hand the belligerents the very victory that they were seeking.

I felt, upon hearing that news, a distinct sense that he had done the very opposite of what was needed, -the opposite of our American military tradition, -the opposite of what was befitting the memory of the men who died, and who had died in all the military confrontations of the United States before them.

I knew that we were leaving behind the dignity, honor, prestige, and credibility that had been slowly rebuilt following the revelation of the Mai Lai massacre, the end of military conscription, and the downfall of South Vietnam. I knew something that Ronald Reagan didn't.

I learned the shocking truth about the primacy of absolute national power while being spindled, folded & mutilated, -regimented, de-humanized, traumatized, slapped, punched, choked, stepped on and exercised to the point of torture in Marine Corps boot camp. I also learned about the experiences of those who served generations earlier, -those who didn't know the meaning of surrender or retreat, and how their sacrifice shaped the world's view of the seriousness of the United States as a foe.

I, and millions like me, knew that that view needed to be restored in order to counter the "paper tiger" view that had neutralized it following our withdrawal from Vietnam. Even as a former Private, I knew something learned from first hand life exposure, which the man in the nation's highest position did not know because of his lack of exposure to torturous combat training, and that was that our subsequent withdrawal from Lebanon would strongly reinforce that impression of the lack of resolve of the United States when it comes to military commitment. It would make it appear for certain that the United States was a paper tiger.

Unfortunately, that impression of the signal we were sending turned out to be exactly the signal picked up by Usama bin Laden. The consequence of his drawing the conclusion that we had become a paper tiger was that he had no fear of attacking us. The result of his feeling emboldened by our "weakness" was his executing massive attacks against us. My apprehension proved in time to be prescient since the withdrawal led to the consequence that was the eventual result. That result has cost our side nearly 10,000 dead, 10's of thousands of injuries, and a trillion dollars.

The civilian that led the nation didn't know something about war and consequences that any thoughtful private would have learned from history and his own real-world experience of the application of absolute power.

Civilians think that the military is merely a tool to use in certain contingencies, -that it's an instrument of international political policy, but what they don't recognize is that the history of humanity is mostly a history of war, attack, invasion, defense, death & injury, surrender & subjugation. And the only thing that makes a difference between life and death, freedom and slavery is the one thing that is far more than just "a tool".

It is the very spine of the nation, -the bone, -the core. Those who comprise the spine know all too well that truth because they are 100% subject to whatever orders that they might be given. They can't disagree and just go about their business. They are no longer freemen but are bond servants of the nation's military. They are not among the lazy, spoiled, self-serving, self-directed civilian class. They are in a very different class, -a class that must abide by far stricter rules, with far fewer liberties, and far greater penalties for ignoring "the rules".

They are not citizens first and foremost, instead they are subjects first, and citizens second. They are both citizens and subjects because they have signed their life away to the federal government for X number of years and they possess no right to rescind the surrender of their rights. They are a needed

piece of the spine and are under the obligation of fulfilling their solemn duty to perform their part in the war machine that defends the nation.

They are a part of a tradition and history that dates back to 1775, -to the time when men who valued their freedom began to take up arms to defend it. Those who've never done so have never been a part of the spine of the nation. Being a part of the spine is the ultimate obligation of men who would be free, men who would remain free, men who would defend their women and children, men who would defend the liberties secured by a written Constitution, men who would be true Citizens of the Republic.

Being a citizen comes with the responsibility to be a part of the national and local life of a nation and to follow and support the rule of its laws, the maintenance of order and tranquility, and the moral upbringing and education of its young. It also comes with the duty to be a bulwark against attacks that could endanger the mothers, sisters, wives, and children of the nation.

That responsibility does not fall on them, -it falls on their sons, brothers, husbands and fathers. They are the ones held responsible to defend the defenseless, and their life is not too high a price to pay in furtherance of that duty. The mothers and daughters of a nation are not called upon to defend the sons and fathers, nor to fight for the nation's defense and freedom. They are the defended, -not the defenders, and as such are exempt from the full responsibility of citizenship that falls on the males.

The males of the nation are subject to the fullest authority of the government to regulate their lives right out of the free, independent civilian realm and into the realm of total discipline, responsibility, obedience, pain and discomfort, danger, injury and death.

The federal government reserves that ultimate authority over every able-bodied male of acceptable age. They are the ones who are "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States whether they like it or not.

The women of a nation have never been similarly subject, and never will be even though it may be considered only fair, but men and women are built and wired differently. That difference is to a degree sufficient to make an everlasting differentiation in the roles of the two in the group to which they belong. Because of that difference, a male's relationship to his government is also different.

Every citizen of a nation has a relationship to his country. The people of America's ancestral homeland had three principle relationships; to the nation, to the government, and to the Crown. In the United States we have three similar relationships, only our third one is to the Constitution.

In the view of the citizens, their primary relationship and obligation is to the nation. In the view of those in power our primary obligation is to obey the laws of the government. But in the view of our founding fathers, our primary obligation is not to the nation, nor the government, but to the Constitution -without which the other two would not exist, -at least not in the form in which they gave them to us.

When a citizen is elected or appoint to public office, that person must take the oath of office, with 50 states and 50 state constitutions, it's safe to say that there are probably differences in the oath that officials take. But for the federal government (and probably the states as well) there is no such thing as a straight "oath of office" because it includes an Oath of Allegiance, -and the allegiance to which one swears before man and the Almighty, with their hand placed on his sacred holy word, is a solemn vow to defend the Constitution against all enemies, both foreign and *domestic*.

Domestic enemies are not foreign enemies on U.S. soil, but are fellow Americans who are traitors to the Constitution.

But even those traitors are generally patriotic and protective of their fellow citizens, and protective of the nation as a whole. But are they protective of the government in which they serve? What is their

relationship to it? Citizens and officials alike have a relationship based on their positional status, age and gender. A male member of Congress can be, and has been, inducted into active military duty as a part of his National Guard unit.

Females members can also be required to serve in wartime, but such citizens are signed-up volunteers who are already members of the military. They would otherwise be exempt from conscription as are public servants.

To the civilian males of the nation, their relationship to the government is akin to one with a strict father who can order you to do anything he expects of you, but for female citizens the relationship is more life that with a mother who may be firm but protective.

The male citizen's relationship to the country is different. It was, from the beginning, similar to one's relationship with one's bride, -fidelity and singleness were paramount. But in the inexperienced, clueless modern civilian world it is instead more like one's relationship to one's sister or brother, and not one's bride or groom for whom one is fully ready and willing to kill and die to defend.

For the first century of our nation's existence one's relationship to their country was viewed by the government as a marriage. One would be a disdained political bigamist if one held loyalty to more than one country. You had better go back to where you came from if you are not willing to divorce your old country and marry your new one. America would welcome everyone who wanted to be an American, and welcome no one who wanted to not be an American.

Dual allegiance was akin to political apostasy. Be this or be that, be one or be the other, don't be a political hermaphrodite. Choose! If you want to become an American then you are welcome to do so, but you must first swear before God that:

"I hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen; that I will support and *defend the Constitution* and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and *domestic*;

-that I will bear *true faith and allegiance* to the same; that I will ***bear arms*** on behalf of the United States when required by the law; that I will perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States when required by the law;...so help me God."

Clearly that is based on an ancient oath taken only by men-folk and was inconceivable as an oath that women would ever take.

Historically, before huge waves of immigration washed over our shores, that oath was taken as a single, individual foreign man standing before a state magistrate. It was personal, looking the official in the eyes just like taking one's wedding vows (not an impersonal mass ceremony event).

The seriousness of the oath was learned one day by an officer of the Citizenship & Immigration Service (formerly INS) She wrote:

#### My Journey to Afghanistan to Naturalize Members of the U.S. Armed Forces

By Leah Van Wilgen, US Citizenship & Immigration Service Bangkok Field Office Director.

I may never be able to truly depict what I felt during this temporary duty assignment to naturalize members of the U.S. armed forces serving in a hostile war zone in Afghanistan, but I know it was a gift to participate and I remain in awe and inspired by the experience.

As a civilian I was *never exposed to military life* and did not know what to expect. As our plane entered the air space over Afghanistan, I looked out the window and saw the beige landscape of the desert, and the forward operating bases of the coalition forces. Once we landed, I faced a new reality – the

walls and ceiling of the first building we entered were riddled with bullet holes.

#### Welcome to Kandahar Airfield, Afghanistan

The next day, as I interviewed the soldiers, sailors and Marines, who applied to become U.S. citizens, I found myself mesmerized by their life stories. Many had overcome troubles I would never experience, so much so that I found myself suppressing tears that often welled in my eyes. Among them was the soldier who escaped his home country in Somalia due to violence. Another soldier shared that while he migrated to the United States from Kazakhstan, he was of German ethnicity. During World War II his parents and family were shipped to Siberia, and later migrated to Kazakhstan. Others simply had desires far greater than any I'd ever experienced; including the sailor from the Philippines who stood barely 5 feet tall – she was living her dream of serving in the U.S. Navy and becoming a citizen of the United States.

Occasionally, as the sirens would go off and the loudspeakers would announce a rocket attack, we would immediately dive for cover and head to the nearest shelter until the "ALL CLEAR" was announced. During these actions, when I might have felt afraid or worried, I was bolstered by the steadfast leadership of those around me.

#### More Determined to Continue My Mission

As the week progressed and I met more soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, I could not help but notice that these men and women *sacrificed more* in both their personal and professional life than the average civilian ever will, including, of course, myself.

In the culmination of our work, we naturalized 98 service members from 48 different countries on a rainy Saturday morning in a large reinforced building. An overwhelming feeling of pride and a sense of a job well done came over me as the new citizens walked on stage to receive their naturalization certificates.

After the ceremony, I lingered with the new citizens and their commanders - wanting to soak it all in. While the service members thanked me for traveling to Afghanistan to complete their naturalization, I am the one who continues to feel enormously grateful and owe thanks to each of them for their military service.

Count me among the first to volunteer to return to Kandahar - or any military installation – to help naturalize the men and women of our nation’s armed forces.

(Since October 2004, when the law changed to allow USCIS to conduct naturalizations overseas, USCIS immigration officers have traveled to 23 countries and naturalized more than 9,000 service members, some in combat zones.)

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Her experience demonstrates that ideas of citizenship held by inexperienced civilians are merely ethereal legal concepts and not in touch with real world realities. With citizenship comes obligations; first to the Constitution, second to the national defense, third to the nation and its laws.

What it boils down to is dedication first & foremost to the faithful defense of the Constitution, and acceptance of one's obligation to defend and support the nation if called to serve. Allegiance to the Constitution and one's obligation to serve in war is what citizenship is all about. If one is unwilling (or not allowed) to shoulder the same responsibility as the natural male members of the nation then one is not fully subject to the authority of the federal government.

To what does this relate in today's world? It relates to the nature of citizenship, -what it takes to be a citizen and what is involved. In particular, what is involved in obtaining citizenship by law. Those who do not obtain their citizenship but are instead born with it as natural members of their tribe/city-state or nation bear the responsibility not by choice but by the nature of who they are. But those who join themselves to a nation other than their own, must assume the same responsibilities.

They must be willing to fight, bleed, and die for their new country, its people, its government, and most importantly, -its Constitution. They must swear the oath to do so of their own free will. Those who were not allowed nor required to take that oath were foreign immigrant women. They could not become a United States citizen except by marrying an American [or suffering the death of her American husband, thereby becoming a widowed head of an American household].

They, and their female American counterparts, were not included in the language by which children of foreigners could become U.S. citizens at birth. It was not allowed that children of single foreign women would be accepted as American citizens because their mother was not subject to the full jurisdiction of the federal government, -a jurisdiction which, in 1866, -when the 14th Amendment was written, was just a year beyond the end of the war that Washington waged against the South and which sent hundreds of thousands of American men to an early grave by the exercise of that jurisdiction.

Women did not possess equal rights as men because they were not subject to equal responsibilities since they were not equally subject to the full obligation of citizenship, -including being fully subject to the jurisdiction of the national authority and its military requirements. Their obligation was to support their husband and children.

The father's obligation extended beyond his own family because there exists a greater family which also has a natural right to survive, and to resort to self-defense to ensure that survival. That family is the nation, the larger group, the society of which he is a part. That right of nations is as fundamental as the rights of individuals because it's based on the same immutable principle of the right to live and survive. When a nation is threatened, it has the right and duty to defend itself.

South Vietnam was not up to that duty because compared to their northern brethren their leaders were as soft as marshmallows. The South was not

mature enough to make the sacrifices needed to survive, and so it did not survive. But the North was highly disciplined and hard as nails in comparison, and so they prevailed in what they viewed as their right and duty to reunite the nation and once again become a natural country without an unnatural division.

They were principled, while the South was not. Principles mattered to them more than comfort, or life itself. They were willing to die in a ratio of 9-10 to every one of the U.S. fatalities. That is an example of national discipline, devotion, commitment, and unwavering allegiance that the sons of freedom in the South knew nothing about because they had been shielded by the sons of America standing in their place. Their soldiers fought and died bravely but the nation was unwilling to send enough of them into the fight to preserve their security because such a state of preparedness was a sacrifice they were unwilling to make.

The laws of a nation are important, but the principles upon which those laws are based are not just important but are fundamental and central to the continued survival of a people and its form of government.

Congressional law and constitutional law are like a vast arctic ice sheet that's dozens of miles square. You can't even see the edge of it it's so huge, and yet it's not permanent. It's meltable, driftable, crackable, and changeable, as it floats on something permanent, immutable, unchanging, and that is its mother ocean, -the source of its existence.

Laws made by men either float on something, -on principles, or else they float on nothing, and have no tether or connection to anything permanent, -floating in the ether with no up or down, no East or West, North or South -nothing but the capacious wishes of those who passed them. But the only type of government so constituted is a dictatorship without mercy, reason, fairness, or justice. Such governments, but for short periods, have never existed except as savage gangs because they would crumble under the rebellion of those they oppress.

Governments must be grounded on everlasting principles in order to be all the things that gangs are not. Those principles begin with nature and are joined by spiritual law, religious law, and practical law. In some cases, that which is natural is also that which is practical, and therefore doubly strong as a fundamental principle on which the law and government can be founded.

The law of natural membership is such a principle. It binds people together in a natural, and even national way. Being a member of the group results in one's children being members also. Being a natural member of the group, -one born to members and not outsiders, comes with privileges that outsiders and their children have no right to. One of those is the right to be the Chief.

He's the one to lead the tribe in battle, and so he must be one who is a member in his bones. It must be what he is, not what he's become by permission, even if permission was obtained from birth. He must be a member organically, naturally. He must be a member by his nature, -his identity must be in his blood. He can lead the tribe in war without any distraction such as having a mother or father or brother who's a member of the opposing side.

War is the greatest challenge to any nation and its members, and the seriousness of war must be taught to every generation or else they will lose touch with the most fundamental reality of human existence and human history. The women of the group are exempted and protected from that reality but the men are not. The reality that faces them on the most primal level is that of the possible requirement to sacrifice their life to defend the group. That fact is a consequence of a responsibility with which they are born and cannot escape without abandoning their membership in the nation or being unfit for service.

In American history that fact was evident by the commands that military officers could rightfully give to their men. They could order them to march into a wall of bullets that would surely kill them.

The reality of war was the reason that historically the name of our department of the military was not called the Department of Defense but the Department of War. There's no defense nor offense without engaging in the realities of War, and those realities are the reason that American women will never be required to face cannon and machine gun fire.

They, and foreigners, especially foreign women, are not subject to the jurisdiction of the federal government when it comes to the most fundamental responsibility of citizenship, and that's why citizenship was not passed to children from them. That's why citizenship is not rightfully passed to the children of foreign women, especially if they are in the country illegally.

The naturalization power of the 14th Amendment does not apply to their children because they are foreigners who are subject to their own government and not to the responsibility of national defense as are American and immigrant fathers.

The executive branch has been off the tracks for a long time in regard to the legitimate application of the meaning of the 14th Amendment. But it has the right to be wrong. It has the right and the responsibility to honestly and impartially interpret the Constitution, just as do the elected representatives of the Congress. But they do not have "the right" to ignore it completely as they do. The Supreme Court is the final arbiter but not the only one. All federal officers and elected officials are charged with protecting the Constitution and that means obeying what they believe it says.

But what they believe can be flat out wrong. Or they can choose to deliberately ignore its clear and plain words. Any history of Supreme Court rulings makes that evident, as well as Congressional history and Justice Department history.

But they can't change fundamental facts, nor the history behind those facts, -nor the principles that those facts were based on. Time has made everyone forget where we came from, -to forget the facts that made us who we were. Facts about the full respon-

sibilities of citizenship and who was charged with those responsibilities and who was not.

Due to our national amnesia we have altered fundamental things in an ignorant manner and the result is "common knowledge" assumptions that have led to the election of an unconstitutional President and the rewarding of foreign law-breakers with our greatest gift, -our American citizenship.

It would take more political courage than our national representatives possess to change the political landscape regarding citizenship being ascribed to foreigners who are born within our borders. The national government lacks the will to do anything about it, but the States could change things overnight. Here's how one blogger envisions a solution; Russ wrote:

"I think there is a very simple remedy to the abuse of the Fourteenth Amendment by illegal immigrants and the left. Each state currently registers live births. At the hospital, the mother is asked to fill out an application which is forwarded by the hospital to the appropriate agency.

States can require that the applicant mothers provide proof of legal residence in their state [or an official State identification photo-ID].

No proof -- no birth certificate. The consequence is no passport and no proof of citizenship.

I would be willing to bet that any state implementing this policy would see a notable reduction in immigrant births immediately."

Problem solved. But that is too sane and reasonable for most politicians to grab onto.

<http://www.vdare.com/articles/plyler-vs-doe-the-solution>

A Principle-of-Citizenship Hypothetical:

If the President of the Soviet Union impregnated the female head of the Peoples Republic of China, and they visited the United Nations in New York while she was 8 & 1/2 months pregnant, and she prematurely gave birth there, what would be the

nationality of the child? If the answer is "not American because they are representatives of foreign governments" then the question is: "why does that make a difference?" The answer is: "they are not subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S.

Then the question is: "why are they not subject to that jurisdiction?" The answer is "because they are merely guests and not resident members of American society.

If a man from Mars, along with his pregnant wife from Venus, had their child born within the borders of the U.S., would it be a natural born American? Or a natural born Martian?, or natural born Venusian? Or would its birth location be totally irrelevant? Under the 14th Amendment its birth location would be irrelevant because it would not be subject, through its father, to the jurisdiction of Washington. Therefore, being a hybrid, it would not be a natural member of any group nor a citizen of the United States.

The bigamy of dual-citizenship. The dual dater has a girlfriend in hotel room A and another in room B. Where does his loyalty, his devotion, his commitment lie? With one, or the other? Or both?, or neither?

Or in the case of the married man who has a wife in home "A" and another in home "B". Where does his loyalty, his devotion, his commitment lie? With one, or the other? Or both?, or neither? Who knows? Governments are not mind-readers, and so he is suspectable of not being loyal solely to one.

Such a suspicion is the reason that Americans who have foreign parentage cannot be trusted with the most highly dangerous and powerful secrets and devices held by the United States government unless they are personally appointed by the President.

They can't be trusted with the three government-related areas most critical to the present and future security of the nation, and they are: the protection of the President, access to the highest national security secrets, and access to and control of nuclear weapons.

These tasks are only allowed to be handled by people who have passed a thorough background

screening which rules out anyone with a direct foreign connection, such as a father or mother or wife from Iran, China, North Korea, Russia, or any other nation for that matter. Instead, they must have only American roots, even though the President that they take orders from or guard, is constitutionally unqualified to give those orders because he came with a foreign background that the founding fathers forbid.

by a.r. nash may 2012  
<http://obama--nation.com>

~~~~~

Oath of Allegiance (United States)  
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

The United States Oath of Allegiance is an oath that must be taken by all immigrants who wish to become United States citizens. The first officially recorded Oaths of Allegiance were made on May 30, 1778 at Valley Forge, during the Revolutionary War.

The current oath is as follows:

- I hereby declare, on oath, that:
- (1) I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen; that
  - (2) I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that
  - (3) I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that
  - (4) I will bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by the law; that (5) I will perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States when required by the law; that
  - (6) I will perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law; and that
  - (7) I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God.

[The inclusion of the pledge to bear arms is clear evidence that the pledge was not written to be taken by women, but by men only. Does anyone in the government in modern history recognize that fact? Good luck trying to find one.]

The current exact text of the Oath of Citizenship is established only in the form of an administrative regulation promulgated by the executive branch. [its federal policy, not congressional law] However, under the Administrative Procedure Act, CIS could theoretically change the text of the oath at any time, so long as the new text reasonably meets the "five principles" mandated by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1953. These principles are:

1. Allegiance to the United States Constitution,
2. Renunciation of allegiance to any foreign country to which the immigrant has had previous allegiances
3. Defense of the Constitution against enemies "foreign and domestic"
4. Promise to serve in the United States Armed Forces when required by law (either combat or non-combat)
5. Promise to perform civilian duties of "national importance" when required by law

There has been some controversy about the wording of the oath, parts of which are based on the British Oath of Supremacy which was written in the 16th Century. As a result, some have suggested much of the language is antiquated and confusing. In the fall of 2003, CIS (Citizenship & Immigration Service) planned to change the oath of citizenship in time for Citizenship Day (September 17). The proposed oath was as followed:

- (1) Solemnly, freely, and without mental reservation, I hereby renounce under oath all allegiance to any foreign state.
- (2) My fidelity and allegiance from this day forward is to the United States of America.
- (3) I pledge to support, honor, and be loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and its laws.

(4) Where and if lawfully required, I further commit myself to defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, either by military, noncombatant, or civilian service.

(5) This I do solemnly swear, so help me God. The introduction of the new oath was scrapped by the U.S. House of Representatives Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims on April 1, 2004.

~~~~~

So why scrap such a clear and modern version of the Oath of Allegiance? Because it seriously deviates from the original. How so? Look at the 5 Principles mandated by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1953. The order, priorities, and circumstances have been altered in noticeable ways. The foremost allegiance that's required is not to the United States but to the Constitution. Big difference.

Everything that is "good for the country" can be weighed against the limitations imposed by the Constitution. If what's "good for the country" is inhibited or barred by the Constitution, then to which of the two do you devote your allegiance, and obedience?

By the new and perverted oath one's allegiance is first to the United States and secondarily to the Constitution. So the determinant of one's actions is not the rule of law but the rule of "whatever's best" in one's own opinion.

Note also that the third pledge is again firstly to "the United States" and secondarily to the Constitution, and that pledge uses words not found in the original, namely "honor and be loyal to" which are totally indefinable in a practical sense. But the original oath instead requires that one again pledges to "bear true faith and allegiance to" the Constitution, NOT to the United States.

What this reveals is the fact that one can actually "honor and be loyal to the United States" while being a traitor to the Constitution because they are two separate and distinctly different entities.

The worst distortion of the words of the original pledge comes in the 4th pledge. Instead of requiring one to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. -without caveat or condition, it makes it entirely conditional upon it being "lawfully required", and then it makes it doubly distorted by attaching that defense to submitting to physically service in some role.

That bastardization means that one has no obligation to defend the Constitution in civilian life, in civic settings, in state or federal jurisprudence and legislative battles. One can ignore it and just accept whatever unconstitutional decisions or laws are promulgated by county boards, agencies, state and federal legislatures, and courts.

The revised oath's 3rd pledge of support and loyalty to the (1) United States, (2) its Constitution, (3) and its laws makes the unbelievably juvenile implication that the three are all of one, all on one side, all in agreement, all universally unanimous in intent and effect. When, as often as not, just the opposite is true. Congress can make laws that are ruled to be in violation of the Constitution, and if they truly and clearly are so from day one then it is the obligation of all citizens and officials to defend the Constitution and oppose the implementation of those laws.

The Supreme Court can hand down rulings that become de facto law but which are in clear violation of the Constitution and its limitations on the power of Washington. And the executive branch can ignore both the laws of the Congress and the rulings of the Supreme Court if it believes they violate the Constitution. They take the oath to do exactly that. They do not swear to support, and defend the rulings of the Supreme Court.

So the question is; "To what is a citizen sworn to support and defend as being first and foremost? Is it the United States? Is it the federal government? Is it the rulings of the Supreme Court? Is it the policies of the bureaucracies of the executive branch? Is it the legislation passed by Congress? Or is it the United States Constitution?

Fidelity to the Constitution will never be restored as long as it's to the benefit of politicians (and the agendas of activist judges) to violate it as they see fit, -as if it no longer exists or matters.

They all are currently allowing a clear and egregious violation which is the continued presidency of an unconstitutional President, but that is a problem that is too sensitive to touch. That's a powder-keg too dangerous to move, -a boat too unstable to rock, and so they won't. And no one can blame them personally because that's also a buck that stops at no one's desk.

It's a hot potato that even the Supreme Court is afraid of handling because the implications of following and enforcing the Constitution would be astronomical, especially if the President decided to not accept their interpretation of the meaning of "natural born citizen", and instead remain in power anyway.

Does anyone reasonably think that that is not a real possibility? What would the country do then? No one knows, and that's part of the conundrum of an illegitimate Presidency.

Adrien R. Nash 2011 [obama--nation.com](http://obama--nation.com)

~~~~~

the dilemma of an unwed American mother:

A single American woman, who is expecting a child, faces a difficult choice. She could marry the father and legitimize the child's birth, or she could remain unmarried and ensure that the child acquired American citizenship at birth. She had to choose one or the other. She has grown up overseas, and has not lived enough years in the United States to qualify to transmit citizenship to a child born abroad. Both her mother and her father are U.S. citizens and her father had been performing useful services to the private sector of the United States.

Had her father been working for the U.S. Government, she would not have had any problem. She's lucky she has even this choice. The law makes it five times easier for an unmarried mother to trans-

mit citizenship to a child born abroad than a mother married to an alien.

the son of a World War II veteran has a stateless child:

A young man living in Holland was recently informed by the U.S. Consulate that his child does not qualify for U.S. citizenship. Since the father had grown up abroad, studied abroad, and married abroad he had not accumulated the required number of years of prior residence in the United States to qualify to transmit U.S. citizenship to his child.

He went overseas in the first place as a military dependent because his father, a World War II veteran, was then serving in the U.S. Army.

When his father retired, he chose to live in Germany, where he then began working for an American insurance company. The young man's alien wife did not transmit her citizenship to the child either. This grandson of a World War II veteran is deemed stateless.

~~~~~

Barack Obama is not a United States constitutional citizen via the 14th Amendment, nor a natural born citizen via American parents. He is instead a naturalized citizen via a Nationality Act which ascribed to him provisional derivative citizenship through his divorced American mother. By that naturalized provisional citizenship he's therefore ineligible to be America's President and his entire Presidency is illegitimate and unconstitutional.

**Bearing Arms, True Faith, and Allegiance**

~the forgotten true meaning of citizenship