

Principle vs Policy; Obligation vs Obedience

The problem that all Obama-defending students of legal history suffer from is that they are ignorant about four vitally important things. They are the meaning of natural citizen, jurisdiction, resident, and principle. Without understanding all four, they live in a zeitgeist in which tradition and royal fiat reign supreme, and natural principles and natural law in effect do not even exist.

In such a world, unalienable natural rights also do not exist and government is supreme. Government is the all-powerful dictator of all things -beginning with who you belong to. It dictates that you do not belong to your parents, -to your own your family, you belong to it first and foremost. Your parents were merely your custodians.

This is true because the government wills it to be so and your place and membership in its organization are of its creation and by its authority alone. And that is all the result of the POWER and domination of the SOVEREIGN STATE over everyone who enters life within its territory.

It is all based on borders. Without borders you have no Kingdom, but more notably, without a Kingdom, there are no borders (with exceptions such as islands). Instead there's only life. And life goes on and children belong to those who produced them.

Where there are no man-made borders, where is the principle that borders determine everything, citizenship in particular? For borders to exist, property ownership must first exist, and land must be categorized as property. Then a dictator can claim authority over all the lands of the subjugated people that he has conquered or inherited, and all children born to them within the borders of his land.

But what happens when there is no dictator? -no concept of land being property nor of children belonging to anyone other than their parents? Was that not the situation all across most of the continent

of North America where native empires never reigned?

No one belonged to their tribe because of where they were born. They belonged to their parents by natural right, and were natural members of the tribe of which their parents were members.

Where were the borders for migratory and nomadic tribes? They had no concept of land ownership nor settled existence, yet they had a concept of group membership, as do all natural groups.

What was it based on? A principle. The principle of natural belonging. You belong to your family. Your family belongs to its clan. Your clan belongs to its tribe. That is the principle of natural law.

Ownership and belonging based on borders does not follow any principle at all. It follows the dictate of dictators who own all born on their subjugated land. It follows the practice of conquest and the practice of slavery where all born on the slave plantation belong to the plantation owner. That's not a principle. That's authoritarianism.

Would it be "a principle" if a policy existed on the plantation that a slave child who was white enough would be a free person? That would be nothing other than a policy of the slave owner. Just because policies have rules does not mean they are principles because principles are not the products of human choice and dictate. Nor human power and authority.

If an authority does not follow principles then it is a dictatorship and not a model for the United States of America.

England, through the centuries, devolved into a realm that forgot its fundamental principles because of the interfering greed of its dictators. After many centuries had past, the policy of the crown supplanted the principle that had once been clear and fundamental, and that was possible because of ambiguity of language and the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings.

When words lose precision of meaning, then dramatic changes can result due to very slight adjustments of definition. Like the steering gear for

a rudder of a great ship. One little piece determines the direction in which the great ship will move.

When the crown forgot or abandoned the primal principle of natural membership, it changed the rules for who would be considered to be a member. And even worse it changed the meaning of the words that describe members.

Natural rule #1. "All children of subjects are subjects also. If born abroad, they still are subject born and are natural members of the nation.

Natural rule #2. All children of aliens are aliens. [-unless their fathers become naturalized subjects]

No wait, let's change that to all children of aliens are subjects. Okay, there's no down side to that, and a positive upside. From henceforth that is the policy of the land, and the old principle is ignored and abandoned.

But let's go one bastardized step further. Let's call the children of aliens by the label for children of subjects and label everybody as a natural born subject. Okay! No down side to that. It reaps more power to the king because all natural born subjects belong to him for life and have no right to reject subjection to him and become a citizen of another nation. And that policy of membership now applies world-wide. On every continent and island on earth. It's all very convenient... for the dictator.

By bastardizing the principle of natural membership, the crown also bastardized the truth about the principle of natural responsibility. In place of the natural obligation of the strong to protect the weak, the adult to protect the child, the male to protect the female, the Kings of England invented a philosophy that justified their dictatorship under the guise of obedience to the crown being the just response toward the king as compensation for his protection.

Instead of the responsibility of Freemen to shoulder the burden of defense of their communities and nation, the authority devolved to the royal dictator because he was the "rightful" leader of the nation, and therefore its military forces also, even

though mostly comprised originally of volunteers banding together in a mutual pact of defense and survival during times of great national threat.

It was a very morally seductive philosophy that infected the minds of even the most moral-minded of men, such as Vattel and Blackstone, not to mention all of the church hierarchy, the nobility, and the judiciary.

They could not think outside of the zeitgeist of monarchy and the rule of Heaven through divinely anointed Lords of men. They were great supporters of royal power to force men to be obedient to the dictates of God and Kings.

But something diametrically opposite to that developed in America because it was founded by people that were sick to death of being dictated to and oppressed for not adhering to the doctrine of the dictators that ruled the lands where they were born and raised.

They, as a rule, were also religiously intolerant toward others who disagreed with their theology, and wanted nothing to do with them, heretics! But they wanted to live life free from oppression and belief control.

Some of them formed colonies that followed both the *principle* of natural membership and the practice of membership by *policy*, and allowed colonial membership for children of outsiders. But when the colonies declared their independence and union, that union contained no membership policy because that was the business of each sovereign state government.

After the states formed a new nation and formal central government, there still existed no national policy toward membership, but Congress used its authority to write a uniform rule of naturalization for foreigners who wished to become Americans.

But the administration of the rules remained under the purview of the individual states and they all followed the natural principle of natural membership, although at least one (Virginia) allowed citi-

zenship for children of its immigrants (“sons of the soil”). But the central government never followed the policy of dictators.

If you were born of an alien, then you were an alien also just like he who produced you. The natural principle was not accompanied by the royal policy which mandated the supremacy of national borders over the principle of natural membership.

(In time the policy was defeated and all children of Englishmen were recognized as members of the empire by birth to British parents (or commonwealth subjects) regardless of birth location. The king's bastardized policy was thus repudiated by Parliament, and rightfully so. They finally re-recognized the supremacy of natural law.

Just as subjects of the crown were required to be obedient to the monarch & government, so citizens of America are required to be subject to the authority of our central government, but for a very different reason.

We don't owe our government a debt of obedience as pay-back for its protection since we protect ourselves, -as individuals and as volunteers in our military forces. The People are supreme and the government is meant to be the guardian of that supremacy, -not the other way around.

But we, being the associates of our pact of civilization and governance, are responsible to protect the nation from invasion, insurrection, and anarchy just as we are we are responsible to protect those dependent on us, our families and the defenseless who are not designed for war, or are no longer capable.

It is our duty to obey the necessary orders of those who are entrusted with authority over us by those whom we have elected to govern us. Not for *their* good, but for ours. Not to maintain *their* power, nor enrich them, but to maintain *our* freedom and to benefit *us*.

A problem exists when *their* power is the greatest threat of all to our freedom. That is where we find ourselves today. Back under the yoke of dictatorial fiat which relies on corrupt means to further corrupt motives which sponsor and enforce unconstitutional mandates that plunder freedom and independence from the American people.

We are devolving from the Land of the Free into the land of the hobbled, the bridled, and the saddled. And the elite overlords are happily working toward the day when they can ride us after they've destroyed our innate desire to be free rather than broken and dependent.

They have already accomplished most of the task of doing that but we shall soon see just how much residual natural independence we as individuals, and as a people, still retain. The roll-out of the vast ocean of Health Care mandates and taxes and penalties will reveal just how compromised and conquered our moral character has become.

Hopefully it will result in a whole lot of polarization, with states taking diametrically opposite sides. If such a situation and war does not result, then we will have clearly been conquered from within, just as the communists had once predicted.

A new nanny totalitarianism will reign and be justified as simply being what's best for the General Welfare. That justification entitles the elite overlords to wield nearly unlimited power. The result will be an unrecognizable nation within just one generation.

When a line in the sand is never drawn by the American people, then the government can never be guilty of crossing it. The question is whether or not there are enough patriots to draw the lines that our founders would have drawn long before now.

By A.R. Nash April 2013 obama--nation.com

Principle vs Policy; Obligation vs Obedience