

## Fundamental Responsibility & Primal Law

cooked version: Natural Instinct, Natural Bond  
Natural Duty & Natural Rights

raw version: Primal Instinct, Primal Bond,  
Primal Duty, & Primal Rights

Primal instincts determine fundamental things in life. The most primal instinct of all is a craving for oxygen. The experience of water-boarding is so distressing not because it inflicts pain or injury but because it induces panic by interfering with the freedom to satisfy a primal urge, the urge to breath.

Perhaps second is the primal reaction to being burned by fire or high heat, followed by aversion to the pain of stepping on piercing objects like thorns, nails, and needles while barefoot. Avoiding pain, cold, thirst and hunger are primal responses.

But another primal instinct comes into existence after a mother has a baby. The development of a primal maternal bond to her baby results in a new instinct, one felt by every sentient being that feels that bond, -the most primal bond of all. It's the instinct to protect, provide for, and possess one's own young. A world without that bond and the instincts connected to it would be quite different;

~on the personal level;

Stranger: "I want your baby and I'm gonna take her."

Mother: "Ok,..I don't have a feeling either way."

~ on the national level;

Potentate: "I want your country and I'm gonna take it."

Passive citizen: "Ok, I don't have any feelings about that either way."

~on the international level;

Alien: We want your planet and we're gonna take it."

Earthling: "Ok, we don't have any feelings about that either way."

Primal bonds are very real even though they exist on a level that rarely reaches our conscious mind. We aren't conscious of how strong they are until they are violated by those who would sever them in the physical world. Then we awaken, like Lambert, the Sheepish Lion, as his adoptive mother, a sheep, is carried off by a ravenous wolf. Then the bond's full primal power comes to the surface.

Nascent Dictator: "I want your freedom and I'm gonna take it."

Passive male citizens: "Ok, we don't really have any feeling about that either way."

We, like free stallions, have a primal instinct against being enslaved and chained; -against our liberty being robbed from us. That's obvious, but there's another less obvious primal instinct.

Primal bonds are a form of primal instinct, -an instinct that rebels strongly at separation from that to which one is bonded. That instinct is the source of a primal right, -a right to own that which one's own body has produced, -one's own young. From another angle, it is a primal property right, -the right to own not just one's self, but what one makes, or fairly and legitimately acquires.

Primal rights start on a primal level, with the right to live, to breath, to walk, to speak, to think, and to feel, and they are always accompanied by primal instincts, beginning with the instinct to defend one's self from harm. Followed by, or preceded by the instinct to defend those to whom one is bonded.

A mother is bonded to her children, and ideally to her husband. A father is bonded to his wife & children, and it is his primal instinct to defend them against attack, -be it by an animal or a person or a mob or an army. His right of self-defense extends to them as well since they are his and are of him.

They, being dependent on his primal instinct to defend them, have a right to count on him to defend them because they cannot defend themselves to the degree that he can. He bears an obligation to be their defender. It is his primal responsibility.

But if he is a freeman, then his responsibility does not end there. He also bears a responsibility to participate in the defense of the community to which he belongs, including his clan, his tribe and his country.

If such a responsibility were not real and not felt, there never would have been such a thing as the Confederate Army, which was populated by common men who were not slave owners. They either felt the responsibility to defend their own and volunteered, or they were conscripted by their government to perform the duty that issues from their primal obligation to defend those to whom they are bonded, along with

those to whom they are connected in the struggle to remain alive and free.

Just as the individual has the right to defend his own, so also the tribe leader has a right to defend his tribe even if mounting that defense requires ordering his men-folk to perform their duty of defending their greater family, -their own people.

It is not fair to those who shoulder their responsibility voluntarily when some are unwilling to do so and thus place a greater share of sacrifice on those who *are* willing, and so it is the right of the leader, in doing his duty to defend his people, to order the recalcitrant and reluctant to perform their duty whether or not they feel the primal instinct, and embrace their primal duty.

His primary means of enforcing his fair orders is the use of force and punishment, both of which can be considerable. The individual, who's a member of a community, is not an island with no connection to others. He is part of a matrix of similarity and common dependency when it comes to avoiding being annihilated or enslaved. He bears a responsibility to man the position that is assigned to him in the circle of common defense.

In nations that do not practice ostracizing, the only penalty for disobedience is the use of force and /or incarceration. Discipline must be maintained or troop-cohesion will evaporate. That is essentially what happened in South Vietnam, but not in North Vietnam. The south was not gripped by the primal instinct of self-defense and resistance to enslavement, nor community duty, and so they were over-run by those in the grip of the ideology of totalitarian Marxist "liberation" in the form of Statist nationalistic dictatorship.

A big brother (the United States) cannot fight all of your battles for you. At some point, you have to grow up and fight your own battles, but the South was far too immature, and so was not prepared for the invasion to come.

Mature nations know that vigilance is the price of freedom, and vigilance requires the participation of the able-bodied men of the nation. In time of peace, that participation may be voluntary, but in a time of war, it may not be. It was not voluntary during World War I & II because the man-power raised voluntarily to fight and win the wars in Europe, -threats to the free world, was insufficient, and so a draft was instituted. And men

were conscripted to fight for their country -whether it was their native country or their adopted country. They were fulfilling their primal duty to fight for those who could not fight, -for the defenseless, the exempt and incapable or less capable.

Whether defense is on the personal level or on the national level, the principle is the same; -the primal duty to defend those who depend on you and to whom you are bonded.

Back when the 14th Amendment was being written, -with its added citizenship clause, Native Americans and Gypsies were deemed by many to be outside of its citizenship provision because they had no bond to American society and were not viewed as being under the jurisdiction of the local or county or state governments because they were a people unto themselves.

Gypsies were transients everywhere they went, -with no attachments to other Americans, having their own law and leadership. Therefore they were not included in the meaning of the jurisdiction under which citizens lived because they did not live under it, and therefore citizenship was not intended to be imputed to them since they were completely outsiders.

They had no primal bond to other Americans, and therefore they were not under any duty to defend a people that they were not a part of. As such, they were not under an obligation of obedience to the authority of the government of the American people since they were separate and apart from them. They had a right to not be subjugated by a power that was not a part of their structure and identity. That's especially true of Native Americans.

Immigrants come from a place and life where the same circumstance is true, but after adopting America as their new home and nation, their former bond and duty is overlaid by their new obligation to their new society and country. They therefore become subject to the authority of their new nation's government.

That is a truth that was not acknowledged by the United States government from its establishment until the Supreme Court in 1898 declared that the native-born children of immigrants are born subject to the authority of Washington and therefore are American citizens by the authority of the 14th Amendment. That opinion was diametrically opposed to the position of the United States government until it was tried before

a federal court, followed by the Supreme Court and upheld by the majority in the suit of the U.S. vs Wong Kim Ark.

What primal principle was the government following for over a century instead of the one the high court mandated be followed? It was the principle of duty being tied to identity. If your identity was not American, then you were not under the jurisdiction of the American government because you were under no obligation to fulfill a duty to a people and nation that are not your own.

To be a part of the American people and nation you had to be American-ized by rejecting your former nationality, your former sovereign, monarch, or potentate, and his government. If you were not willing to do so, then you were not to be considered to be an American, and only American parents were capable of producing American children.

Every family had only one nationality, one loyalty, and one government. Dual citizenship was not possible because nationality was not inherited from one's mother unless the father had died before her child was born. Also, from the founding of the nation, a foreign woman who married an American man became a derivative citizen of the United States through her husband. And from 1907 until 1922 an American woman who married a foreign man lost her American citizenship outright (Nationality Act of 1907). If Obama had been born in the year in which his grandfather was born, he wouldn't even be an American citizen.

Clearly the citizenship of American women was viewed as being less than that of American men. Why was that the case? Because they were not under the primal duty to defend the nation. American women, like immigrant men, could not be ordered to serve the nation in time of war nor forced to undergo combat training, much less actual combat. But American men could, including American blacks, and because of that obligation blacks were in the strange and awkward situation of being second-class citizens and yet they could vote and serve on juries (and be elected or appointed to public office) regardless of being dirt poor, while American women could not, regardless of how wealthy or educated or intelligent or powerful they were. Discrimination was the American way in actual practice though not in philosophy.

The implication of these facts is that when the Supreme Court ruled that domestically born children of immigrants *were* subject to federal authority (even though it was only latent subjection until they reached adulthood) it did *not* simultaneously rule that domestically born children of *non*-immigrants were also born under that subjection.

It could not rule that they were because that would be a violation of the 14th Amendment citizenship clause since non-immigrant fathers bear *no* responsibility to defend a nation that is not theirs.

Their visit to America, along with their pregnant wife, did not obligate them to defend America because they would not have a primal bond to America, nor a primal duty to serve in its defense.

Being merely guests, America would have no right to force them to. They remained subject to their duty to their own nation and people, and their son born in America would inherit that same duty as a latent obligation to one day defend that foreign homeland if needed, -the homeland where they would grow up, -unless their mother was not foreign but American. Then, if the marriage was a fraud, they might grow up in America, but their nationality would have been inherited only from their father.

The result of these facts is that the 14th Amendment did not grant citizenship to children of non-immigrants because they, like their fathers, were exempt by primal law, and international law, (as were U.S.-born children of immigrants by the previous national policy and tradition). But the Supreme Court imposed the principle of primal duty on native-born children of immigrants, while *not* imposing it on native-born children of *non*-immigrants. That is the clear limit of their opinion, the boundary that it did not cross, but unfortunately for our nation during its last several decades, that was a boundary that the Attorney General in 1898 (John Griggs) *did* cross in interpreting their opinion.

And now the belief that *any* child born in America (except to foreign diplomats) is a citizen via the authority of the 14th Amendment is an institutionalized error that is assumed by all to be a fundamental element of American law when in fact it has no basis whatsoever in actual law.

He made that erroneous conclusion because he had no clue about what the subjection requirement of the amendment meant, and so he ignored it, and it's been

ignored ever since. But without meeting its requirement, no child is born a citizen of the United States, even if the incorrect and ignorant policy of the government since then has assumed that the opinion and resulting **policy** of Attorney General Griggs *is* the law of the land.

But in actual truth, it is *not* “the Law of the land”, it is merely the policy of the land. It was not a position passed by nor endorsed by any Congress other than by passive acquiescence, nor did it comport to the limited ruling of the Supreme Court. By that policy Barack Obama is a citizen of the United States, but not by any law or court opinion ever issued.

Barack Obama, being a national policy citizen, and not a naturalized citizen, nor a statutory citizen, nor a derivative citizen, nor a constitutional citizen (via the 14th Amendment), is least of all a natural born citizen as the Constitution requires all Presidents and Vice-Presidents to be since the only political nature he inherited was through his father, and his father was an alien visitor, and not an immigrant. Hence his presidency is unconstitutional.

By Primal Law, he had no duty to the United States since his latent primal duty was to Kenya, -the home land of his father. So the United States had no obligation to embrace him as one of its children, and he in turn had no right to expect that it did. He only had the right to expect that his paternal ancestors' homeland owed him the right to be a member of its society and nation since he was one of its descendants.

And its laws, and those of Britain, acknowledged such a right, and he had two years after reaching adulthood at age 21 during which to embrace that right and to shun the non-primal right of American-policy citizenship, and become a fully subject and singularly loyal Kenyan citizen by taking the Kenyan oath of Allegiance and Renunciation.

Presumably he didn't do that since American citizenship was of far greater value even as he was probably maintaining the story that he was Kenyan born in order to receive financial assistance as a foreign student. That can't be proven because he has kept all of his records secret. One can't assume that he is doing that for no good reason. Secrets are kept for a reason, and that reason usually begins with embarrassment or evidence of lying, and fraud.

But the American citizenship that he presumably possessed was a form that allowed him to become not just a state representative, and state Senator, but even President of the Senate, -but...*not* President of the United States.

It was a citizenship which allowed him to not only become a United States federal judge, but even the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, but...*not* the Commander-in-Chief of the United States military.

Article II, Section I U.S. Constitution: "No person except a *natural born citizen*,...shall be eligible to the office of the President,". As such, his reign as POTUS is an ongoing crime against the Constitution since he is an illegitimate President of the United States.

ps:

Nationality and citizenship are two separate concepts. One is a National of his country, and a citizen of his nation. No one is a citizen of a country because a country is not a political-legal entity but is instead a large natural association of people within a contiguous land area. Indonesia is not a natural country because it is comprised of 18,000 island, with 6,000 of them inhabited. The people are citizens of a nation but not nationals of a country except in regard to the main island and those close near.

Originally India was not a natural nation because of the Hindu-Muslim divide, so it split off the nation of Pakistan. It also was an unnatural nation because it was comprised of two separate countries, one on each side of India, so it split-off the nation of Bangladesh. Just as one can be a U.S. Citizen but not be a real American (Boston bomber) so one can also be an American but not be a citizen (as was the case with Native Americans and children of illegal immigrants who were raised in the United States. They have no other identify or country, but aren't true citizens.

Obama isn't a “true American” due to his upbringing immersed in Islamic culture & schooling and Islamic religion, -along with his mentoring in Hawaii as a teenager by the Communist Frank Marshall Davis. Proof of just how un-American he is is seen in a video in which former governor Richardson and Sec. Of State Clinton and others are on a stage with their hands on their hearts while Obamas' remained at his side all through the singing of the Star Spangled Banner. His heart belongs to Allah and Alinsky,-not America.