

## Of Children & Families; Citizens & Empires

There are three types of children, and they are directly analogous to the three types of American citizens. The first type is natural children. The second type is adopted children. The third type is foster children.

I've had plenty of experience with all three types, and therefore understand a thing or two about relationships between children and parents, -and understand with some insight the relationship between citizens and nation.

The two relationships are indirectly connected. Families are the basic unit comprising a clan so what applies to families also applies to clans by extension. Clans are the basic unit of the greater entity known as a tribe, and so what applies to clans also applies to tribes.

Except in the New World where new countries were formed due to immigration, tribes are the basic unit comprising the greater entity known as a country so what applies to tribes also applies to countries. Countries that include an educated class organize themselves into NATIONS having written laws and established branches of government. What applies to countries applies also to nations by extension.

Thus the fundamental organizational principles that apply to the primary unit, -the family, has also applied historically to the macro entity of nations through the various larger entities that have families as their basic unit.

Animals do not organize their individual connections into the entity of nations but they may have direct corollaries from families up to countries because, as was seen in the North America bison population, their numbers can run into the millions. And that is also true of certain flocks of birds as well as herds of herbivores in Africa. But the basic unit is always the family.

The natural law regarding families is the self-evident fact that they are comprised of parents and their off-spring. When we focus on human families we have to add a word because some children are separated from their natural mother, so we must be clear by referring to parents and their *natural* children.

Natural children are in contrast to children in a family which are not the natural children of the parents. Natural children are a direct analogue to natural citizens of a nation.

Children in almost all families are natural children, but there is a small number of children (percentage-wise) that are something other than natural. Their connection to their guardian mother & father is, from its inception, a *legal* connection, whereas the connection of natural children to their parents is, from conception, a *natural* connection.

It exists even in the absence of a national or tribal government because it is a primal blood connection. So it also is on the government level because governments recognize and defend that primal connection or bond since it is the foundation of everything.

But because some children are separated from their mother by life or law, they must enter a new home and be part of a new family.

So it is also with nations. Some people are separated from their homeland by war or social upheaval, -including over 100,000 Vietnamese and Cubans who fled oppression at home and were accepted as children of America.

Such escapees and others come to the United States by the hundreds of thousands each year and some of them are allowed to stay and make the United States their new permanent home. Some of them are adopted by their new "parents" via the process of naturalization. By it they become new natural citizens of the United States just like their true "natural citizen" brethren.

## Of Empires & Pax Romana

The rule of all civil and compassionate families that adopt is that the adopted children are not treated as second-class children, like Cinderella, but as full-blood members of the family. That is an attitude and approach toward adoption that goes back very far in the history of Western Civilization, -back to the policy of the government of the People & Senate of Rome, and undoubtedly empires that preceded it.

Nations can be discriminatory if they choose, as is seen through-out the ages as minorities, especially the Jews (-and Native Americans), were horribly discriminated against by bigoted leaders and driven from their homelands (or worse) because a pogrom was

waged against them. But there is one form of government that cannot do that as adopted policy because it would be disastrous.

I speak of the governance of EMPIRES. Empires are composed of an assortment and association of individual nations. Hostility and injustice toward the people of a nation only engenders what arose in the American colonies when their rights were egregiously violated by the dictatorial King and his Parliament. How much more would a people be resistant toward overlords who were not their cultural ancestors but completely alien instead?

Wise leaders avoid such behavior toward their conquered peoples because their chief goal following victory is Peace. Endless war is to be avoided unless it is war against new nations and peoples yet to be conquered and subdued. After conquest and subjugation comes pacification.

### Of Unity & Equality

How do you pacify a conquered and subdued people? There is only one way. You treat them as equals. You adopt them into the family of the empire and grant them the same rights and protections as the natural sons and daughters of the nation that is lord of the Empire. You don't treat them like Cinderella but like your own children. They become first class citizens and so their dignity is not offended, nor is their sense of justice because they have access to the same sort of legal protection as everyone else.

No one is superior and no one is inferior. That is the state of civil life that the Roman Empire evolved to over the decades and centuries and that is how it avoided rebellions arising constantly. Eventually, all the members of the empire were granted Roman citizenship, and so all were viewed as equals to the Italians who themselves were a mish-mash of various ethnicities without any cohesive single-people origin. Everyone was a Roman citizen and their children were natural born Romans. [What united them, like the Constitution unites Americans, was Roman Law, -not Roman blood.]

That's similar to the pattern in the United States where foreigners were added to the national family first as immigrants and eventually as naturalized citi-

zens who completed the naturalization process. Their children were born as natural citizens, -being born of citizen parents.

But what of the children born to them before they were citizens? Their status, at the national level, was similar to foster children. They were not natural children nor adopted children, but they were family members nevertheless, and the "parents" had a legal and cultural responsibility toward them, -as guardians, protectors and referees.

But what were they? Were they foreigners just like their father, -or were they Americans, unlike their father? On what would the answer depend?

Originally, it depended on the naturalization laws of each individual State since just as before the adoption of the Constitution (as well as after it) immigration and naturalization were via State authority. Most states naturalized only the children of naturalized immigrants.

If an immigrant father was indifferent to or reluctant toward becoming an American citizen, then his unchanged, non-Americanized nationality status impacted that of his U.S. born children. Thus their only recognized nationality was that of their foreign father.

But some states did confer their citizenship on the children of their immigrants, but the federal government had neither law nor policy by which it was required to recognize such citizenship. That didn't make much difference in their lives since there were few federal laws and only a very small federal government. Most or all of their life was lived as a citizen of one of the sovereign States.

So the issue went on unaddressed for over a century, but was finally resolved by a Supreme Court ruling in 1898 (U.S. v Wong Kim Ark) and from thereon all children born of immigrant members of the American family were deemed to be citizens of the United States.

At that point they changed from being viewed as the equivalent to foster children of the nation to being adopted children. Legal equal members. Such children would thereafter be born as citizens not just of some States but also citizens of the nation. Thus they advanced from being, for example, merely a "native son of Virginia" to being also a **Citizen of the United States.**

But what was the nature of their citizenship? Was it akin to natural children or to adopted children? That is a question that only one person ever asked because there was no reason to ask it until an alien-fathered candidate ran for the presidency. That was about a century ago. It was never asked again, -at least not until Barack Obama ran for and was elected to the office of President of the United States.

The answer didn't matter in the life experience of any other citizens but it is central to who is constitutionally eligible to serve as President. The Constitution requires that he be no one other than one born as a natural citizen, -which means that he cannot be an adopted citizen.

So.....since they were not born of citizens but of aliens, how could they be considered anything other than adopted? Their parents lived in the American home when they were born but that would not make them natural members of the family of the home owners since their parents were merely tenants and not family members.

But being tenants put certain responsibilities on their parents, and they included, first and foremost, the obligation to help fight fires and attackers. As a member of the nation, that translated as the obligation to defend the nation via military service if needed and called.

Being under that obligation put their parents in a different relationship to the family and the nation than that of over-night guests ("tourists", et al) who were under no obligation. By being members of the household, their children (who were born in it and would grow up in it) would not be like the children born of over-night guests who were under no obligation to fight anything, -and whose child would grow up back in their own home.

Such children would be akin to the child of a slave born prematurely on the plantation of another slave owner that was having a wedding event. Would the child belong to the owner of that plantation simply because it entered the world on his property, or would it belong to the owner of its mother as being the issue of his human property?

The slave mother's owner is akin to the nation of a citizen who gives birth within the borders of another nation. What would give the nation where the child was born the right to claim it as its own? Nothing.

But it has the right to give membership in its national family as a gift to all born on its soil. That form of membership is membership by a gift of law and not membership by a right of blood. It's a *legal* right in contrast to a *natural* right.

During the Civil War, via a law passed by Congress, the U.S. government treated the native-born children of immigrants as aliens who were not subject to conscription, and that was because their father was an alien and subject to a foreign power. Like father, -like son, -so the government had the opposite view of that which resulted from the later Supreme Court ruling concerning the national obligations of foreigners and their sons.

If the family that owned and lived in the home were to announce that the child of the over-night guest was a natural member of the family and the beneficiary of all of its advantages, -as well as being responsible for its protection, that would be considered an absurdity by everyone. Yet as unbelievable as it is, that is precisely the presumption erroneously held by the leadership of our national family.

Why do they assume such a view? Because of ignorance and precedence. That view was adopted by the Attorney General of the United States in 1898 following the Supreme Court ruling mentioned earlier. He distorted the ruling that the court made in regard to the children of immigrants (permanent tenants) and applied it illegitimately to children of guests (tourists, and all types of Visa Card visitors).

No one in government or academia or society has ever challenged that unbelievably stupid policy in court or from within any administration. They have all blindly followed it like sheep, -without a protest regarding its absurdity. How pathetic is that?

Well... -no more pathetic than dozens of other equally absurd national policies resulting from unconstitutional executive and bureaucratic orders, laws, and court rulings.

We are a nation of sleeping ignoramuses, -too stupid to save ourselves from the consequences of our overlords' decisions, laws, court rulings, fiscal and social policies, -not forgetting cultural rot.

It's questionable whether or not there are enough of us to take back our liberty from state and national government entities that have egregiously usurped it.

Living in a nation that has divorced itself from the Constitution and the rule of its law even as it pays weak lip-service to the Bill of Rights, we are adrift on a sea of uncertainty and heading ever farther away from our foundational law and fundamental principles -drifting in the direction of ever-greater tyranny. How can this not end badly, -especially when all fiscal soundness has been abandoned in favor of momentary benefit?

If conservative constitutional principles do not see a revival in America, everything will get worse in every state that continues on the path that we are on, -the path to becoming Detroit.

But I digress.

The reason that the facts herein illuminated are important is because they reveal just how ignorant and asleep-at-the-wheel we've become. Without that fact dawning in the American somnambulant consciousness, there is zero chance of a national recognition that the Presidency of Barack Obama is totally illegitimate and unconstitutional.

The truth about families and citizens shows that he not only is not a *natural* member of the American family since he is the product of foreign blood and not solely American blood, -fathered by a British subject, -a chip off of an alien block, but he was not even a *legal* member either since his father was not a "permanent tenant" here (whose children would be citizen-ized by the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment) but merely "an over-night guest".

Although he is considered to be a U.S. citizen, one has to ask: "by what logic? -and by what law?" The answer is: "by no logic and no law but by ignorance alone."

But that ignorance carries with it a century of weight of policy precedence being as it has never been contested since established as a national institutionalized error in 1898.

Can an error that endemic, -that ingrained, -that established ever be seen for what it is? Of course it can as is clearly understood from the simple facts herein presented, but is there anyone in any position of authority who would dare to recognize openly that

which is so easily understood and explained from a common sense, natural law perspective?

Such a person may not exist. Ted Cruz seems like a very straight straight-shooter, but when it comes to this topic, he'd rather keep his eyes wide shut since his citizenship is no more natural than is that of Barack Obama.

So no matter how clear and loud might be the voice of the knowledgeable, none of them are in positions of power. All of those in the power club, -the ruling party composed of Democrats and Republicrats, (and the liberal media) will remain silent as to the clear and obvious truth lest they jeopardize their membership in the insider's club which will hear no talk about any matter that undermines its infallibility and legitimacy.

No matter how horribly unconstitutional might be the things they do and support, they will never discuss the constitutionality of anything because they left the Constitution in the dust back over a mountain crest or two and operate in uncharted territory, -in post-Constitution land where anything goes, -meaning any and every sort of totalitarian infringement against constitutional liberty by Big Government statist, as well as any and every kind of idealistic quest for collectivist utopia (imposed by authoritarian State power).

by Adrien Nash Sept. 2013 [obama--nation.com](http://obama--nation.com)

Roman citizenship & leadership (from a history blog):

There was little or no concept of being Italian at the time. You either were or were not a Roman citizen - and you could be a citizen **wherever in the Empire you were born**.

Even though Caligula and Claudius were born outside of Rome, their parents were not and they were considered Roman **regardless of where they were born**. Also, they were direct descendents of Augustus so its kinda hard to say they weren't Roman. Trajan yes was not only a Roman citizen, but a senator and a general.

But by Trajan's time **every person living within the empire was a citizen** and therefore entitled to all privileges that came with it. But Trajan was not descendent from any pure Roman blood and rose through the ranks of the Roman army to become the first non-Roman emperor.

CelticBard -Scholar

Not really through the ranks, he didn't start as a trooper or centurion, he did what all young Patricians

and wealthy Plebians were expected to do, follow the Curia Honorum. Started out as a Legionary Legate and advanced as he aged.

Trajan was exceptional in his ability to conquer exotic foreign lands, ripe with gold. His impact on Rome is great. His 100 foot tall column is a testament to his glory, as is his market, and forum, all found in the center of the city.

From its very beginning the Roman state had been an ethnic melting pot; there was never nothing analogous to a "Roman blood"; the mythical founders themselves would have been alien to Italy (purportedly Trojan).

The family of the first emperor himself (C. Octavius Thurinus aka CJ Caesar Jr aka Augustus) came not from Rome proper but from the colony of Velitrae in Latium.

Gaius Iulius Verus Maximinus (aka "Thrax") was described by some hostile sources as of barbarian stock, especially by the notoriously unreliable Scriptor Historiae Augustae (aka "Julius Capitolinus"):

Quote:

Maximinus the elder became famous in the reign of Alexander; but his service in the army began under Severus.

He was born in a village in Thrace bordering on the barbarians, indeed of a barbarian father and mother, the one, men say, being of the Goths, the other of the Alani.

At any rate, they say that his father's name was Micca, his mother's Ababa.

And in his early days Maximinus himself freely disclosed these names; later, however, when he came to the throne, he had them concealed, lest it should seem that the emperor was sprung on both sides from barbarian stock...

Quote Originally Posted by Mosquito:

“And there was no such thing as like ‘Roman blood’”. I think this is the correct starting point. There was no such thing as Roman blood. The Roman Empire (as we are talking about it) lacked the concept of blood origin. One could be a full citizen, an intermediate citizen (such as persons under Latin Law, a provincial and so on there were many intermediate steps) or a foreigner living under the jus peregrini. The slaves, of course were lacking almost all legal protection.

Furthermore, being a Roman citizen was not in any way restricted to color of the skin or birthplace, Rome being remarkably racism free. Once the citizenship was obtained **it was inherited by the heirs of the cit-**

**izen.** The discussion between Paul and the Roman officer in Acts of the Apostles chapter 22 is very relevant to this topic.

By 212 AD Caracalla gave Roman citizenship to all free man and women living in the Empire. It backfired as the provincials did not have an incentive to serve in the army in order to get the full citizenship.

What's the difference between a Roman king and a Roman emperor? The king was not an imperator? A Roman king wore his autocratic powers on his sleeves. He was blatant in his show of power. A Roman emperor was deceitful in his show of power and had to pretend that his subjects lived in a Republic. What would happen to an emperor who acted like a king? See Caligula, Nero, or Commodus.

~In their early history Romans were invading neighbouring cities, destroying them, taking 1/2 or 2/3 of their land and dividing it between its own citizens. But they were also giving the conquered people Roman citizenship, enlarging by it their own numbers. So in the next war those new citizens who were often "sine suffragio" were being rewarded with land of the next conquered people.

Next thing is that when Romans were conquering other city states in their early history and destroying them, they were accepting some of its elites into ranks of their own patricians. So even some of the oldest Roman aristocratic families were not of Roman origin. What's more, after Rome was conquered by Etruscans (and had Etruscan kings) the Romans also mixed to some extent with Etruscans.

Later in the 1st century BC almost all the allies and clients of Rome on the Italian peninsula revolted demanding Roman citizenship. They lost the war but Romans had to give them its citizenship so it was given to the Greeks, Oscians, Etruscans, Gauls and whoever else lived in Italy.

So talking about Roman blood is a complete waste of time, since the beginnings of the Roman state there was never such concept and citizenship had always legal character, not racial or national. Original Romans comes from all the people living in Italy, at least 4 or 5 completely different linguistic and probably racial groups: Etruscans, Oscians, Latins, Greeks, Celts.

~ Maximinus Thrax was the first emperor who didn't come from a nobiliar/senatorial Roman family. Later became a rarity to have an emperor from a former Roman nobiliar family.