~concerning slavery and citizenship…

Everything You Think You Know Is Wrong

I intend to prove that what everyone believes about U.S. citizenship is wrong. You could ask a thousand lawyers, judges and immigration officials one simple question and they will all give you the same answer; -one that does not reflect reality. That is because they do not understand the fundamental principles of citizenship. Those fundamentals were never taught to them because their teachers didn't know them either, and on back for over a century.

I'll show that native-born children of foreigners are not Americans based solely on where they were born. But first, to soften the skeptics' tightly closed minds, I'll show something else that you have believed all of your life but which is also false. Its falsity is clearly evident in the very words that are twisted to mean what everyone believes, -but which do not say what everyone assumes. I'm referring to slavery and involuntary servitude. Everyone has always assumed that they were banned in the U.S. but in fact they were not.

They are still perfectly legal, under the required condition. But that condition does not apply to the federal government and all of the land it owns (-which is about half of the country). They both are fully legal in Washington D.C. and elsewhere throughout the states (mostly the Western States, -much of which the federal government owns).

Amendment XIII

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, *except* **as punishment for crime** whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

No doubt, you've probably never read the amendment, or if you did, you didn't take note of what it actually said because of the preconception of what it supposedly means. Well, it doesn't mean what everyone assumes that it means, because it says quite plainly that they are only banned for the innocent. Innocent of what? I can only guess that first and foremost was the crime of owing a debt and not paying it back. Under that condition, I could have my own involuntary servant working off his debt to me. It would take him years to do so but not doing so is enormously unfair to me. So the amendment is probably all about innocence & guilt, debt & fairness.

Notice it doesn't refer to the jurisdiction of The United States, i.e., "***its*** jurisdiction", but instead refers to "their jurisdiction", which means it's referring to the jurisdiction of the united STATES, -State jurisdiction, -not federal jurisdiction. By wording it in that manner, it excluded federal jurisdiction by not *in*cluding it. That means that in perhaps half of the territory of the nation, both slavery and involuntary servitude have never been banned even conditionally.

Was Congress aware that it was allowing them to remain legal for Congressmen and all freemen in the District of Columbia and all free inhabitants of federal lands? Could those in Congress who wrote and passed it have been too stupid to understand the meaning of their own words? Would that possibility not be more alarming than the possibility that they did know?

So much for conventional wisdom and common conception about a very universally "known" subject. What everyone assumes is true about slavery and servitude is flat out wrong. And come to think of it, if you drop the word "*involuntary*" from servitude, you get the full legality of selling yourself to another, or selling your service for some period of time. Have you ever heard anyone say that that was perfectly legal in these United States?

These facts are kind of like learning that you were adopted. Belief is not necessarily in harmony with reality. And it is the same regarding the common belief about the origin of citizenship. That belief has been enormously and erroneously influenced by the common misconception springing from a Supreme Court case that ruled on the meaning of the citizenship clause of the 14th Amendment. It falsely conflated the two different meanings of the word: "jurisdiction".

The gist of the 14th Amendment citizenship clause: -three possibilities:

1.) "All persons born within the jurisdiction of the United States are citizens of the United States."

2.) "All persons born *under* the jurisdiction of the United States are citizens of the United States."

3.) "All persons born within *and* under the jurisdiction of the United States are citizens of the United States."

Plus, the imagined implication: "*Only* persons born within & under the jurisdiction of the United States are citizens of the United States."
What the entire legal establishment has been indoctrinated to believe is that there is no gigantic elephant of ambiguity in the room. They believe that the meaning of the amendment is clear and simple, (thanks to that misunderstood Supreme Court ruling in 1898) when that is utterly false. The words are extremely and overly simple but that results not in clarity but in the complete obscurity of its original meaning.

That is because in authoring the clause in constitutionally elegant and simple language, the amendment's authors failed to realize that future generations would live in a world further and further removed from the viewpoint of the founding generation, and would have the ability to think about the meaning of their words in an altogether different fashion than they thought about them, as well as the words of their later 14th Amendment.

Future generations, in pursuit of a biased agenda, could see a possibility of meaning which the authors did not consider nor intend. They could attach a different meaning to the words because the words were inherently ambiguous, -except in the viewpoint of those lacking any awareness of what they meant when written.

The champion of those people, it turned out, was a Justice of the United States Supreme Court who wrote the majority opinion in that 1898 case (U.S. v Wong Kim Ark). He committed a kind of constitutional treason in order to arrive at a conclusion that he had predecided in support of his bias (which was in opposition to the established policy of the United States government.)

That treason began with his blocking of the very thing that is fundamental to deciding constitutional matters, and that is to go back to the origin of an issue's analysis in the congressional debates and the thinking of those who wrote and passed legislation dealing with it.

What did the words they authored mean to them? Whatever it was, -that is the meaning that they still possess today. But that Justice must have known what the words of the 14th Amendment citizenship clause meant when written and didn't like what they meant, and was determined to abuse his power by changing what they meant. And that is what he did, -big-time, beginning with prohibiting any presentation of the facts surrounding the authoring and discussion of the amendment in the Congress that authored it and passed it thirty years earlier.

He knew that one of its authors had explained what their chosen words meant, -namely that they meant the same thing as the words chosen in the authoring of its immediate predecessor, -the Civil Rights Act of 1866. It declared that all persons born in the United States and *not subject to any foreign power* are citizens of the United States.

That co-author answered when ask: "What does 'subject to the jurisdiction' of the United States mean?" (-that being the only change of language from its predecessor) and he replied that: "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States means not being subject to any foreign power;…-that's what it means.

But that judge, in charge of writing the majority opinion in the case regarding the unsettled meaning of the 14th Amendment, (Justice Horace Gray) did not allow that statement, nor others like it, to be considered in the favor of the government's position of opposition to a lower court ruling which it lost when it ruled on the citizenship (or lack thereof) of a young man who the government had blocked from reentering the United States after returning from a visit to China.

His reentry was blocked on the basis that he was not an American citizen regardless of having been

born in the United States (San Francisco) to Chinese nationals who had emigrated to and settled in America.

The perplexity before the court was the question of whether or not the lower court had ruled correctly in overturning the established policy of the executive branch which either was following the actual known and intended meaning of the amendment when authored, or was violating it.

That was not a question that Justice Gray would allow to be considered because the answer would destroy his chosen ruling. Instead, he twisted the meaning of "it" (–the amendment's meaning) to not mean what was meant when it was written, but its actual ambiguous words. Did the government policy violate the literal words of the amendment?

By disallowing what those words meant as authored and passed, he made himself and his companions on the bench the ones to decide what they meant instead of the authors. That was his almost covert way to subvert and overthrow the indisputable and widely known meaning of the amendment's actual language, which is:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, *and subject to the jurisdiction thereof*, are citizens of the United States and the state wherein they reside."

Having avoided the original meaning of those words from being considered in the case, he then proceeded in the written ruling to pervert the meaning of the amendment's language by substituting a different meaning to the otherwise clearly understood and unambiguous phraseology related to "*subjection"* and *"jurisdiction"*. *That* is wherein lies his tactic of assigning a perverted meaning to the ambiguous and multi-use word "jurisdiction".

A vicious dog may be your personal property and therefore housed within the jurisdiction of your home, but that does not make it *subject* to your jurisdiction when it attacks a visitor while you ineffectually order it to stop. Although it is *within* your property boundaries or jurisdiction, it is not *subject* to your jurisdiction, -to your authority, because it is subject instead to it instincts. See the ambiguity? Gray sure did and drove a Mac truck through it.

Rather than contrast, on the one hand, the *territorial* jurisdiction mentioned in the sentence that followed the citizenship clause, -within which each State is bounded by its borders ("any person *within* its jurisdiction") with the sovereign authority of the federal government via its laws, policies, and court rulings on the other hand, he instead deliberately and deceitfully conflated them as if there was no distinction between direct authority and geographical boundaries.

I say "deliberately" because he could not have been so stupid as to have done it ignorantly. After all, he entered Harvard College at age 13.

He purposefully worded it in a very deceitful manner, claiming that clearly the one cannot be more comprehensive than the other, and therefore by a blind leap of anti-logic, they must be equivalent since one is not more important than the other. In other words, territoriality (birth location) provides the fulfillment of whatever "subjection" is (rather than obligation & obedience). Let's see,… your dog is not more important than your cat therefore they are essentially equivalent since they both are four legged carnivores.

His lies did not stop there. He went on to distort and re-write American law history proclaiming in effect the supremacy of British common law over American enacted statutes regarding citizenship as if the United States were still attached by an umbilical cord to British monarchical Church & State jurisprudence. That was a vital element in his perversion because by it he could claim that American citizenship was directly equivalent to the subjectship of British subjects.

That equivalency was the ball bearing on which his entire "final opinion" was perched because under the supreme monarchical authority of the dictator of Britain, almost everyone born to anyone living in Britain or his foreign territories belonged to him for life, whether fathered by an Englishman or an alien. They were all his subjects because their fathers were subject to him and his government.

That autocratic system was rejected by the creators of our nation. They followed instead the law of nations which is based not on royal authority to determine citizenship but on the Natural Rights principles of Natural Law.

By those principles, your child is born possessing, by inheritance, your membership in your nation. Born into it. Government has no authority to change that based on nothing other than the location of your mother when you were delivered. The government is not the owner of the children of its citizens or those of foreigners visiting or residing here. Rather, parents own their own children. That is an unalienable right.

The thing about unalienable natural rights is that they are unconditional. Like unconditional surrender, there are no "ifs, ands, or buts" involved. They involve instead incontestable individual freedoms, -as well as obligations toward others, -how they are and are not to be treated, -which includes how citizens are to be viewed and treated by fellow citizens working for big Government.

Big Government, -forever too big for its britches, viewed itself for nearly a century as having the authority to strip naturalized citizens of their American citizenship if they returned to live in their homeland. Many Congresses wrote statutes to that effect generation after generation, and everyone assumed that it was following its constitutionally ascribed power over naturalization, but in fact, it possessed no such constitutional authority whatsoever.

Finally, after four generations, someone sued the government when their United States citizenship was "canceled" by the most recent version of the statute. What the Supreme Court ruled was noticed by essentially no one outside of the Attorney General's office, but it carried enormous implications as to the nature of citizenship.

What it ruled was that the actions of American citizens cannot be construed by the executive branch as being expatriating (meaning self-canceling of one's own U.S. citizenship) if the actions were not openly demonstrative of such a desire. Previously, various actions were deemed by the State Department and Justice Department as being self-expatriation, including living for two years or longer back in one's foreign homeland, voting in foreign elections, serving in foreign governments or military, obtaining foreign citizenship, and marrying a foreign husband even if one was a natural born American woman.

All of those laws over all of those generations were rendered null and void in effect, -or I should say, unconstitutional, since it was up to the Attorney General to acknowledge the significance of their opinion and its sway over United States Law and policy.

The gist of their holding was that American citizenship is unconditional as long as one does not commit acts that are clear indications of being anti-American. (-such as waging war against the United States, or shooting over a dozen fellow soldiers in a dining hall, -but then that could be viewed as merely being anti-American military policy, which is not the same, hence no move to strip Major Hasan of his U.S. citizenship)

So not only is the nature of natural American citizens beyond government authority, but even the citizenship given to foreigners who are either born on U.S. soil or are naturalized by process. That is because of two fundamental principles of America philosophy. The first is that citizenship, once given, cannot be rescinded by government choice. The second is that all citizenship is natural citizenship no matter how acquired (with the exception of the provisional citizenship of certain foreign-born alien-fathered minors).

Thus all naturalized citizens are viewed as not just being equal to natural citizens but as actually *being* natural citizens. That "doctrine of citizenship equivalency" was inherited from the British which viewed all alien-fathered but British-born children as being "natural born subjects" even though they were in reality alien-born subjects.

The thing about being a natural subject or natural citizen is that your nationality is not something that you possess, but something that you are. Translated, that means you *are* an American, -a United States

citizen, rather than merely the possessor of Americanness and United States citizenship. *Having* and *being* are two very different things.

One cannot take away something that you are. The problem that the ignorant men who populated the Congress for generations suffered from was the un-American view that citizenship is something that one possesses, -like legal adoption.

That was never true of natural citizens but since Congress had authority only over foreigners and their quest for American citizenship, they had no focus on the 97% of the American population who were outside of their naturalization authority because they were citizens by nature, and not by law. Their citizenship was unconditional, beyond the authority of Congress, independent of law and government. Their national membership had no strings attached, -was automatic and irrevocable.

The unconditional natural citizenship of the 97% did not stand in contrast to the citizenship of the naturalized and the U.S.-born of immigrants because by the doctrine of citizenship equivalency, those former foreigners also were natural citizens. So like the 97%, their citizenship could not be rescinded due to congressional conditions being violated. Once given, citizenship was not revocable. The opposite policy could be illustrated by the examples of adoption, and being "an Indian giver".

An adopted child (like a naturalized citizen) is a legal child, -not a natural child. Its family membership is not unconditional from before birth, (unlike the natural children). A government may or may not have a policy that allows parents to rescind the adoption and return the ill-behaved child to the orphanage from whence it came. America, as a nation, has no such policy toward its adopted members. They became via the American doctrine, natural children of the nation and thus are indistinguishable from those born of citizens.

Other nations do not have that doctrine and thus have reserved the authority to rescind the naturalization of foreigners who engage in certain crimes against society or the nation. We Americans can't do that, and never have. We aren't "Indian givers".

The customs of certain American native tribes were quite different from the descendents of European settlers. One must suspect that one of them was the principle of permanent ownership of property. By such a principle, if one is being benevolent toward another, he may present him or her *with what to us would appear like a gift, but to them was merely an indefinite loan.

Think of it as money that one needs, and that need is met by another. Was that money a gift? Or was it a loan? It depends on the customs and culture of the society in which it occurs. To the Indian tribes that had a custom of permanent ownership; it would undoubtedly be a loan which could be revoked in the future.

* The spell-checking Microsoft Word analysis tells me that "him or her" is incorrect and I should change it to "him or she". It recognizes no possibility that it might be wrong, and yet all that I've known about the English language all of my life says that it, the supposed authority, is in fact completely wrong. Which do I go by? The authority of another which makes no sense or by what I've always known to be true? That example shows how authority can get even basic things completely wrong, and cannot be unquestioningly followed.

The Statists in big Government felt for generations that what they gave, they could take back being as it was their gift and they were its permanent owner, -like the Indian-giver custom. The Supreme Court finally set them straight and kicked them out of the driver's seat. They were no longer in charge and no longer owned the gift that they had given away. It thereafter belonged solely to the citizen and not to the government. They could not take it back, nor cancel, revoke, rescind or restrict it. They were out of the picture because American citizenship does not belong to Big Government; it belongs solely to the sovereign American citizens who created and perpetuate their government.

From Permanent Royal Subjects to Independent Sovereign Citizens of a Republic

The sons of immigrants were viewed as being the same as their fathers since that was natural law (all offspring are of the same life-form as their parents and belong to the same group) and it preserved the unity of the family since the wife was also the same nationality as her husband. -One family, one nationality, and one head, (the father). He represented the family in all matters, whether legal, civil, or political (-but not as much with the social, -that was at least equally a woman's role, if not primarily).

Justice Gray, in drawing a very, very tight connection to the rejected British system (under which all souls belonged to the land owner as his property (whether sheep, sow, cow, or slave, -or as an indentured servant or serf if born on his property to an indebted father) had the purpose to determine one's nationality based on the place of one's birth. That was not a bad thing in the United States since we had rejected slavery and servitude in theory so those conditions couldn't be inherited, but it was not an American thing. Rather, it was a relic of colonialism and imperial rule.

In the United States, citizenship was like a prize of freedom when contrasted with being the property of a king for life, so granting it to children of foreigners was not like putting a collar on them but providing a privileged membership in freedom.

But that privilege came with an attachment. That was a responsibility, a duty, an obligation for all able-bodied young men to help defend their nation against conquest, subjugation, slaughter, and enslavement. That obligation, at the primal level, was not one of *self* defense, but rather the defense of the defenseless, -those who the men could not tolerate being abused, gang raped, and enslaved, -they being their wives and daughters, their mothers and sisters.

Since they constituted half of the nation, defending the nation was not an option but a requirement of adult citizenship.

The men of a society, a country, and a nation are subject to their innate obligation to do their duty to defend the defenseless and protect their own group against annihilation or conquest. It is a fundamental element of how humans, and all social creatures, are wired. They defend their own if they can and must.

They are born subject to that responsibility if they are born male. That is the jurisdiction one must be under if their children are to be granted membership in the group, the nation, to which their foreign fathers chose to attach themselves.

Merely being born *within the boundaries* of a nation does not make one automatically subject to the obligation of national military defense unless that's the choice of a nation and it is such based on the reality that the father has made himself and his wife *members* of a society new to them, and are not just transients with no attachments except to their own foreign homeland.

If the government takes the position that if you are one of us, formally or informally, officially or unofficially, then you also bear the responsibility to fight any fires or any armies that threaten to destroy us or the civilization of which we are a part. You, by living in and among us, are one of us and are therefore not a mere guest. You have a duty to protect our home and keep it in good order.

If you live under our roof, and have a child in our home, then it is considered an adopted child who is a member of our family. If you have a child under some other roof, then it is not. If you live in our home, and work within the jurisdiction of our property, then you are under or subject to the jurisdiction of its leadership.

You therefore would be *within* the jurisdiction (territorially) as well as *under* the jurisdiction (the authority). You cannot live *within* our jurisdiction and not be *subject to* our jurisdiction (our authority). Rejection of authority would make one an outlaw, a renegade.

So you can see that the ambiguity of jurisdiction is too easily understood and explainable for Justice Gray to have confused the two. His conflation of

them was purely deliberate. By committing the intellectual crime of declaring there to be no significant difference, he could then declare that anyone born *within* the jurisdiction is a citizen of the United States, while rejecting the requirement that they also be *under* its authority, which foreigners were not, as revealed by the words of the Civil Rights Act ("not subject to any foreign power", meaning owing no foreign king any allegiance, and bearing no responsibility toward any foreign government).

His method of logic is known as Sophistry: unsound, specious or misleading but clever and plausible argument and reasoning.

What the court therefore did in their 6-2 ruling was to overthrow a clearly understood constitutional clause and replace it with an opposite one. They overthrew the constitution in that one regard, and did it deliberately because even though it was constitutionally wrong, it was socially right.

If the court had not done so, then millions of American children might have been viewed as purely foreigners. That would not foster the avoidance of crass discrimination against them. So the court did the *constitutionally wrong* thing but for the *socially right* reason. Rather than doing what was constitutionally right, and sticking to the true meaning of the 14th Amendment (written long before the massive influx of immigration from Europe and elsewhere) the court did what was best.

But its perverted distortion of the jurisdiction ambiguity was perverted even further by the Attorney General in 1898. Under his misinterpretation, the principle of natural law was demolished and *territorial* civil jurisdiction (state and federal) was nationally imposed as the meaning of being *subject to* the *political* jurisdiction of the United States government.

The enormous consequence of that inadvertent or deliberate error was that mere birth within the territorial limits of the United States confers the grant of automatic naturalization for children of virtually *all* foreigners whether legal immigrants, illegal aliens, or transient guests from abroad (who enter via a Visa for a limited period only) except those who are indisputably *not* subject to federal authority, -namely, foreign ambassadors.

Everyone fails to recognize an inherent redundancy within the wording of the 14th Amendment because they do not understand the full meaning of its terms. Everyone focuses on the first requirement of birth within the United States but fails to grasp that it is rendered redundant by the second requirement.

They falsely presume that the opposite is true. They think that by being within the United States, all people (except ambassadors, Indians, and foreign invaders) were like foreigners within the Kings dominion, -namely, fully subject to the authority of the national government.

They believe that, and yet do so without realizing that it is simply not the case without exception, but that error is what is assumed and taught because no one puts the pieces of the puzzle together to create a comprehensive picture, -one that includes national responsibility as one's most fundamental area of subjection to federal authority.

When you take a significant fact into account, the picture significantly changes, -or gets all messed up from the viewpoint that thinks it knows what "jurisdiction" means, (attaching a territorial meaning that excludes only foreign ambassadors).

They think that since essentially all people born in the U.S. are fully subject to national authority (with natural citizens comprising +/- 97% of the population) that it is okay to just assume that virtually 100% are.

That is a fundamental error because it follows no order of principle. It is lazy, thoughtless, unconsidered, uninformed, and inaccurate, -a "good-enough for government work" sort of attitude and approach.

The reality is that a tiny, tiny percentage of births are to mothers who are total strangers to America or were never under any federal authority, as well as similar fathers. They give birth within the U.S. but are not subject to the national authority because they are illegal aliens or foreigners legally present on a strictly limited temporary basis ("non-immigrant

aliens") -or were fathered by such persons, -persons who, while here, married American women.

The tiny number (percentage-wise) of children born of such people results in them being "out-of-sight, out-of-mind" and therefore overlooked and never contemplated (until Ann Dunham's child became the President of the United States).

The redundancy that goes unrecognized by all is the fact that every child born of foreign *immigrants*, (-just as is true of citizens) is deemed to be an American because they are born in subjection to our national authority. Put another way, every citizen is so subject because being subject is a fundamental part of citizenship, therefore every foreign adult male who is subject also, will father children who are also subject, - just like citizens.

Which foreigners are so subject? Only immigrants, permanent residents, the domiciled aliens. Because they share responsibility for national defense, they can be drafted in time of war.

Foreign guests cannot. They (and any children born to them within the United States) do not have the same status as the others; not in regard to their presence here nor in regard to the responsibility of national membership. They are in different categories. All foreigners are not equal. Some are immigrants and some are alien non-immigrants who remain subject to their own government.

If an immigrant's children are born in subjection to the U.S. government by being born within U.S. borders, then they are deemed by the Supreme Court to be U.S. citizens. Thus the actual wording of the 14th Amendment means the same thing as this wording: "All persons born subject to the full authority of the federal government of the United States are citizens of the United States; aka: Americans."

Notice what is missing but not even needed? It is any mention of being born within the United States. Instead of that redundancy, all that's needed is being born in subjection. If you are born of Americans, then it does not matter where your birth takes place because you are automatically an American (and subject eventually to all the requirements of citizenship if you choose to live in your national homeland) [unless your American father has never lived in the United States, -then you are not an American]. But even living abroad does not exempt one from their national responsibility. They must register with the Selective Service at 18 years of age.

Who must register? Only males. That is because from ancient times men have been the defenders of women, along with children and the elderly. That being the universal norm, men were subject to the authority of the national leadership to defend their nation. They owed it a duty to do so, and that duty is what was known as natural allegiance.

Men owed their King a duty to obey his orders to defend the nation when called, being born into a role that at adulthood would evolve into subjection to his authority to require them to fulfill their natural duty.

Females were not born into that role, and as the defended, instead of defender, they were not subject to the King's authority over men. They were not born in subjection to the national authority regarding national defense and therefore the concept of allegiance to that authority had no connection to them, any more than to children and babies.

The Civil Rights Act of 1866 proclaimed United States citizenship for those born in America with no attachment to any foreign power, -those not subject to foreign authority. Well, foreign women were not subject to any foreign government since they were only subject to their father or their husband, so if they gave birth in the United States without a husband or father, then their child would technically be an American citizen, -at least until 1868 when the 14th Amendment superseded the 1866 Act, -requiring that one be not only born within the United States, but also be born subject to it jurisdiction.

A foreign woman was not subject to the authority to which men were born subject and so the nationality of her native-born children was not determined by her nationality but by that of her husband who either was obligated to serve if called, or was not

obligated because he was merely a temporary guest and not a permanent resident immigrant.

So women had no connection to national duty, service, allegiance, obligation, obedience, and subjection to national jurisdiction. Thus nationality flowed from he who was subject, -the father, -the head of the household.

But if he died before his child was born, and he had been a non-subject, -non-immigrant foreigner, then the mother would become the head of the household, and therefore her position would be in place of her husband, and her nationality would be passed to her children instead of his foreign nationality.

If one was born of foreigners then one is not subject to the national authority if born outside of the United States, -so being born subject to the American authority intrinsically implies that one so born was born *in*side the territory of the United States. Otherwise one has no connection to its authority.

Does citizenship result from birth location or from subjection? The Attorney General in 1898 guessed which it is but guessed incorrectly. Or didn't guess and just choose one over the other. Can you have one without the other if fathered by a foreigner? Yes, if a "non-immigrant alien" fathers a child who is delivered from the womb within U.S. borders, -but if he *is* an immigrant, then the answer is "no".

Birth **Location = Citizenship**, -*or*... **Subjection = Citizenship**. Which is it? Subjection comes before birth, since the father must be subject already (as a legal immigrant) in order for his child to be born subject also. Otherwise, they are both subject, literally, and latently, only to the government of his foreign homeland.

The immigrant father's subjection to American authority is akin to a worker who is pushing the hand-truck of native-birth which runs on the wheels of the 14th Amendment's automatic naturalization authority towards the destination of citizenship. Without the worker, nothing happens. So it is without subjection. Native-birth alone, like the hand-truck, goes nowhere, -not arriving at citizenship while lacking the worker and the wheels.

This much is clear: you can have native-birth with foreign parents but without subjection. But...you cannot have subjection without native-birth if born of foreign parents. The native birth makes it possible for one to be born in, under, and fully subject to the national authority of the American government. Without that subjection (which immigrant fathers are under) American citizenship is not conveyed to their children born here.

National boundaries do not make alien-born children into Americans, but without being born within U.S. boundaries, it is impossible to be *under* and *subject to* its jurisdiction. If one is born subject, then that was made possible by being within the expanse of American authority.

Being so born does not in and off itself convey citizenship, as was the case in Puerto Rico, Guam, and other islands that the United States controlled. Vietnam was once almost akin to them since there were half of a million of us there at one time (more than several states' entire population).

American Samoa, Swain's Island, and I assume the American Virgin Islands as well, are all under the sovereignty of the United States, yet their populations are only U.S. Nationals and not U.S. Citizens. So the artifice of birth location is not determinative of the principle by which citizenship is ascribed. It is merely the means by which one comes under American authority.

Those islands are not a part of the United States even though it was and is sovereign over them, so the fact that the people of Puerto Rico and Guam were granted citizenship by the United States Congress does not imply that they had any right to it merely because they were ruled by and born within the authority of the United States.

Before citizenship was granted, they were not responsible to share in the responsibility for national defense. After citizenship they became responsible. They can be drafted, but the men of American

Samoa cannot because without citizenship they are not subject to the full authority of Washington. They are neither fully foreigners nor fully Americans. Just like a child such as Barack Obama, -born of a father who was subject solely to the authority of Britain, even though, like all visitors, he was required to not violate the laws or customs of his host nation. Other than that limitation he was under the umbrella of international law, treaty, and the law of nations while attending college in Hawaii.

Immigrant men are as fully responsible as we are to protect and defend our nation and our future. Their native-born children *should* be citizens. But no one can give a single reason as to why the child of someone who comes here eight and a half months pregnant, has a baby and then leaves back to her homeland, should be viewed as being an American. No one can give a single justification because none exists.

We are living in a brain-dead country that does not even know what it is doing, -but the rest of the world does and realizes just how stupid we are and hopes to take advantage of our stupidity to the benefit of their native-born child, (if they can get here) as well as eventually their entire family when they are all granted admission based on the citizenship of one who is not even truly a citizen except by an asinine error, -or by a deliberate perversion of a Supreme Court opinion, -one that defies all common sense.

So ask yourself, is not everything that you have always believed about the citizenship of children born of foreigners wrong? Well, you are not alone, unfortunately; -unfortunate for our future survival as a nation (-as a nation that we would recognize, -a nation not drowning in an ocean of debt to pay for massive dependency, foreign wars, subsidies to giant businesses, and tax exemptions without any logical basis, -not to forget endemic and widely permitted fraud).

by Adrien Nash Sept. 2013
http://obama–nation.com