

The Immutable Nature of Natural Citizenship

Citizenship, like most elements governing the life of a free republic, follows certain laws. In some cases the laws are written, but in others they aren't. In the case of citizenship it's both. There are the written laws which are commonly known by the segment of the population that has had to deal with them, and there are laws that are completely unknown to nearly all citizens since they're administrative laws. In addition there are laws that are unwritten, -laws so fundamental that no one ever thinks about them.

They were never taught about the law that doesn't exist but which undergirds the foundation of our republic. That unwritten law is the law by which they are members of the American nation. They're dependent upon that law even though it's totally unknown to them. The law that they're dependent on is not a written law because it was not in the purview of the Congress nor the authors of the Constitution to write such a law being as it is a right and tradition as old as civilization itself and didn't need to be written, -just as no law was needed to grant Americans the right to marry or have and possess their own children.

The problem has been and remains to this day that there is a competing unwritten law and it also was a tradition for a very long time in many places in colonial America. Its origin was in a distant place that was unique among the nations of the Western World, -that place was the British Isles. They were unique because they had no land borders with Europe. Therefore an idea could develop that was uniquely suited to such a kingdom and that idea was "jus soli" membership (law of the soil).

A philosophy evolved that if the kingdom was the rightful dominion of the king, then those born into his island kingdom were also rightfully his subjects. Over centuries the thinking of the royal class and the sycophants that supported the monarchy became fuzzy and hegemonic and thus the king's "rightful ownership" of those born in his

lands was extended to such a degree that it covered virtually everyone on Earth who happened to be born while their mother was in his domain unless they were of the royal or exempted diplomatic class of other nations.

Thus, the children born to foreigners visiting the isles (along with immigrants) were declared to belong to the king and not the parents and their nation. The royal government decided to make them members of the nation with all the rights and life-long responsibilities of its native natural members even though they were raised by their parents in their own nation and belonged to that other nation via the ancient law of "jus sanguinis" (the law of membership by blood).

Clearly, the result was a conflict of rights; -the right of the king to be lord and master of everyone born in his domain, versus the right of parents to own their own children and pass their natural national membership to them at birth. That is a birthright of all human beings and birthrights are always and only related to blood.

Who is "the Prince Royal", aka the Prince of Wales? He is the firstborn of the monarch and he is born with a birthright that only one person possesses, and that is the right to be king. Look-up the word "primogeniture". It's the birthright of the firstborn to inherit the entire estate of the father.

A birthright is not something that is connected to where one was born, but to whom one was born and in what order. One of the earliest examples is found in the book of Genesis and relates how the elder son of Isaac was tricked out of his birthright by his younger brother Jacob.

There is no such thing as citizenship as a birthright based on borders and one's birth within them. That is just a fantasy based on nothing other than the transplanted idea of jus soli that the monarchy enforced in the colonies just as in Britain. But it is not an American principle even though it was an easily implemented practice in a land that also had no borders with other European nations.

But the founding fathers created a nation built on new principles, -principles in total violation of the foundational traditions that had reigned for a century and a half, -principles based on the Rights of Man, and not the Rights of Kings.

The foremost right of man as a member of a civil society is that of being the rightful owner of his own children rather than the state being their owner. With one's children being members of the father's household their status is inherited from the father automatically. They are what he is, for better or for worse.

The first membership status they acquire is a result of their order of birth and how that results in how they are treated. The second membership status is in relationship to his status in society. The third membership status is in relation to the government of the father. Their membership is derived from his, -it's naturally derivative of his citizenship status whether the status is natural, -or via naturalization, but with one exception created by the 14th Amendment which made the citizenship status of children born in America to foreigners not hostage to the non-citizen status of the father, but upon birth in America to a lawful immigrant. That is American *jus soli*, *not* British *jus soli* which didn't care whether or not the parents were immigrants (or merely transient visitors).

Citizenship via the 14th Amendment affected no one because those who could be affected had already been affected by the Civil Rights Act of 1866 two years earlier. All the 14th Amendment citizenship clause did was to put the naturalization of that law above the ability of Congress to rescind.

But they were not exactly identical because the Civil Rights Act was different in a very subtle way. It required, in order to be deemed a citizen from birth, (with the exception of Native Americans and foreign diplomats) that one not be subject to any foreign authority, while the 14th required that they be subject to American federal authority.

The principle of the 14th Amendment's citizenship clause is that men who aren't subject to a foreign power (natives & immigrants alike) are subject to the full jurisdiction of American federal authority. Every man is subject to some sovereign power so the effect of the 14th Amendment was to tell the U.S. government (in particular the INS and State Department) that native-born children of lawful immigrants are subject to its authority and not that of a foreign nation, even if their parents remain in an unsettled relationship to the authority of their homeland. Therefore they are deemed to be U.S. citizens and not foreigners regardless of being born to foreign citizens.

With American jurisdiction established over such children, American *jus soli* is effected on their behalf, while natural *jus sanguinis* is effected in their relation to the homeland of their parents. Thus if the father is not naturalized then his children are born as dual citizens via two competing principles. But some foreign governments might not even recognize American naturalization, such as was the case with China before a treaty was finally signed. Until then, Chinese that underwent American naturalization were viewed as traitors to the Emperor and would be beheaded if they returned to China.

Before American *jus soli* citizenship was put into writing in the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the 14th Amendment, American citizenship, meaning federal citizenship, was derived from State citizenship because the state laws, courts and magistrates had always been sovereign in the naturalization process. With the passage of those acts it became a federal matter because of the two reasons behind the authority used to pass those acts. The 1866 act was passed by Congress with reliance on the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate naturalization in order to assure uniformity throughout the union.

But the 14th Amendment was above Congress, -its authority derived from the choice of the People as to what the fundamental national laws are.

The People could have passed an amendment that declared that all persons born in America are deemed to be natural citizens, but they passed no such amendment because it didn't exist.

It was not written that way because there was absolutely no reason on earth to interject the issue of presidential eligibility into an amendment that was solely focused on the issue of: "citizen? -or foreigner?" in regard to children of immigrants (not to mention the citizenship of freed slaves for whom it was authored). To have done so would have dragged the other 98% of the American population into the purview of the authority of its statement.

It would have meant that by United States law American *jus soli* would have become the controlling authority over who is an American citizen and who is eligible to be President.

But the necessary word was not added to the amendment and therefore is not a part of its authority. What word? The word "natural". Those made citizens via the 14th Amendment are not described by it as natural born citizens, nor natural citizens, nor natural Americans, but are simply called "citizens" and that was enough and that was all that any foreigner and children born to him could have hoped for. It was what they were praying for and it became law, even if it was ignored by the government for three decades when it came to its universal application (see Wong Kim Ark 1898).

A Supreme Court ruling in 1875 stated: "The fourteenth amendment did not affect the citizenship of women any more than it did of men. In this particular, therefore, the rights of Mrs. Minor do not depend upon the amendment. She has always been a citizen from her birth, and entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizenship. The amendment prohibited the State, of which she is a citizen, from abridging any of her privileges and immunities as a citizen of the United States; but it did not confer citizenship on her. That she had before its adoption."

The citizenship of the other 97% was not affected by either of those acts, nor dependent upon them because its existence was not dependent on law. The law by which they were citizens was never written. One can argue incorrectly that it was the law of *jus soli*, as opposed to *jus sanguinis*, but what one can't argue is that it was written.

It was never written because it was derived from a universal principle that was self-evident; -namely the law of natural membership, -that same law that is seen in the relationships of all natural groups throughout the world, throughout the history of life that has existed in social groups. "As are the parents, -so are the children."

But if one chooses to assert that the unwritten law by which they are a natural American is based on *jus soli*, then that belief does not cancel the fact that any citizenship that *is* based on and derived from U.S. law or court ruling or administrative policy is not natural citizenship but is man-made legal citizenship.

Artificial, conferred, bestowed, ascribed or granted citizenship, (including constitutional citizenship via the 14th Amendment) is not natural citizenship in any sane persons vocabulary. That which is natural is not dependent on the machinations of government to make it so because it is so by nature.

Thus it can be stated that natural citizenship is not legal citizenship because it is not derived from law, even if it were to be *jus soli* natural citizenship (an oxymoron). Therefore, anyone who is merely a legal citizen and not a natural citizen is not eligible to be President because their citizenship is not based on the principle that predates the laws and the charter of government which formed the nation.

Their citizenship is by the beneficence of the American people and government and they have no natural right to it, but obtained it as a gift, -a gift that begins at birth.

But it gets worse for Barack Obama, because not only was his father not subject to the political

jurisdiction of Washington (making the 14th Amendment moot in regard to citizenship through his father who remained under the jurisdiction of Britain) but US citizenship through his mother was purely a thing of US law and not a thing of natural law. So one has to ask; "What is the basis of Barack Obama's citizenship?" Is its nature a natural nature or a man-made nature? Is it by unwritten natural law or written naturalization law?

If he had been born in 1790 to a visiting foreign couple, he would have been deemed to be a member of only their country. So how could a son of a foreign father who was "subject to a foreign power" (as barred by the Civil Rights Act of 1866), possibly be viewed as a natural member of the American family if his parents were only in the U.S. temporarily and never subject to the full jurisdiction of Washington?

What if the 14th Amendment didn't require birth within the U.S.? Then all legal immigrants would automatically possess citizenship via constitutional naturalization. But would such citizenship be natural citizenship like that of the natives of the nation?

These questions can benefit from some further illumination by pointing out the fact that the whole situation of Obama's citizenship would possibly be moot if he had been born to an American man named Stanley Dunham and a Kenyan wife.

That would have changed everything from a historical perspective because throughout much of American history a foreign bride was automatically granted American citizenship as soon as a priest or minister or magistrate signed the marriage certificate. Thus Jr. would have been born to both an American father.

That fact demonstrates is that if the background of one's citizenship is so dependent on transient legal practices then it clearly cannot be proclaimed to be natural since that which is natural does not depend on the caprice of human custom, or laws.

Consequently, Barack Obama is not eligible to be the President of the United States because his citizenship is derived from U.S. law and that makes him a citizen by law, but only native citizens of the United States are eligible to be President because their citizenship is the only citizenship that is natural and not derived from any law other than natural law.

Only natives produce native children. Only citizens produce natural citizens. All other parents (immigrants) produce man-made non-natural legal citizens who have roots in a foreign nation and an unsevered attachment to its government and the obligations that come with it. Only those who are 100% American at birth are eligible to be the President. That's what natural born means regardless of whether it is recognized or not.

Populations can make mistakes (such as Prohibition). Governments can make lots of mistakes, -such as slavery, illegitimate and unnecessary wars, concentration camps for citizens, massive and worthless wasteful spending (32,000 Atomic Bombs! -missions to the moon), and colossal violations of basic civil liberty (Wichard v Filburn 1942 and "Obamacare").

One such colossal mistake was made in 2008 with the presidential election of an ineligible candidate, but that mistake cannot be recognized thanks to the principle of the nail that sticks up from the floorboard; (it gets hammered).

And so the pervasive silence that attended that election continues just as it does when one moves from one level of school in China, or North Korea, or Saudi Arabia to the next level. Dissent and individualism is strongly punished. The more one stands-out from the crowd, the more one is ostracized as a pariah.

The silence and unwillingness to upset the apple cart of Obama's presidency is not a light thing but backed by a very powerful force and that force will not tolerate any challenge to his legitimacy regardless of its basis. Whether or not it is legitimate doesn't matter. It must be squelched.

And so it has been and will continue to be because of a near total lack of courage by those who know the truth but find it as unspeakable as the truth about highly respected priests or coaches who traumatized young boys repeatedly with impunity. It took decades before their victims could find the courage to break the silence because the truth was so unbelievable and unspeakable.

The truth about Barack Obama's citizenship is also unspeakable, and that which is essentially unspeakable and unspoken appears to be unbelievable also, especially when it comes without the imprimatur of the ruling elites and is opposed by the prestige and authority of the righteous, honorable & truthful & officially sanctioned President of the United States.

How dare any 16th / 17th century theologian or astronomer proclaim that the Holy Church is wrong about any matter of science or faith [think Martin Luther, Galileo]?

How dare anyone openly accuse President Nixon, (or Obama) of fraud? Wouldn't they be placing themselves above the authority of the President? Yes they would, and that's where they belong because we are not his servants, -he is ours, (-and an illegitimate one at that).

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