

How the Thief-in-Chief Stole the Presidency

"There are two sources of citizenship: birth or naturalization" That conclusion reveals Justice Waite's cluelessness about the nature and origin of citizenship. In 1875 he was the Chief Justice who issued the court's opinion in one of the few cases that touched on U.S. citizenship. [Minor v Happersett] But he was ignorant of the truth because the truth was something so overlooked and obscure that it was never taught nor learned in the legal profession.

The roots of citizenship went so far back that they were forgotten, and all that existed were foggy concepts, impressions, and recorded opinions of earlier "authorities" who were educated in a similar environment in an earlier time.

But the truth of the matter is that there are five types of citizenship, -not just two, -four of which existed when he wrote his opinion, The five types of citizenship are: 1. natural, 2. "native-born", 3. naturalized, 4. derivative, and 5. provisional.

- 1. Natural citizens are born being citizens via natural inheritance of the political status of parents with same nationality. They are Americans organically, -not merely legally.
-
- 2. "Native-born" citizens are not born being citizens by *nature*, but are born *with* citizenship (beginning at birth) thanks to the permission of the American people. It was granted via their ratification of the 14th Amendment, -and its erroneous but practical & ethically justified reinterpretation by the Supreme Court three decades later.
- Those that the government has labeled "native-born" are not natural citizens but are instead legal (or constitutional) citizens only. Their citizenship is due to birth within the United States to legal immigrants.
-
- 3. Naturalized citizens are those foreigners who have chosen the United States as their permanent new homeland and have completed the process meant to strip them

of their former allegiance and obedience to their abandoned homeland, and to baptize them into a new life as new natural(-ized) Americans.

-
- Derivative citizens are those who derive(d) their citizenship from a naturalized father or an American husband [marriage no longer confers U.S. citizenship on foreign brides]. It's also the type of citizenship ascribed to the children of American women who marry foreign men. In one epoch they had to first divorce him before their children could derive U.S. citizenship from their mother.
-
- Provisional citizens are children born abroad with one parent being a foreigner. Their citizenship is provided permanently only if they live in the United States fulfilling the prescribed conditions of the law.

There may have been a cases in lower courts that have touched on the issue of natural citizenship and presidential eligibility, and a few supreme court cases that have included and discussed descriptions of the parameters of citizenship - e.g., Minor v. Happersett and Wong Kim Ark - but the supreme court has never directly addressed the specific question of a presidential or vice-presidential candidate's eligibility based on one being, -or not being, a natural-born citizen.

[That is a fact, and Obama's eligibility is the perfect case for finally recognizing in law what natural citizenship really means. But it won't happen since they can't accept such a challenge to Obama because they would be seen as complicit in the conspiracy of silence that worked to allow the first person of color to be President, which was made finally possible when the Chief Judas failed to refuse to swear him into office.

Instead, Judas Roberts traded the Constitution for stability, he took the low road instead of the high road. He took the easy way instead of the hard way. He took the coward's way out in place of being true to his oath of office by which he swore to defend the Constitution against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, which is every

patriot's duty. He took a Billy-club to the Constitution and smashed one of its knee-caps. He became via his authority the validator & enabler to the Thief-in-Chief.

He, in effect, performed plastic surgery on the Constitution, altering its natural form by the tip of his hat, the up-turned thumb of the caesarian overlord of the ultimate court. He gave his Barackness the big OK sign for all the world to see. And then flubbed the wording of the presidential oath just to add to the ineptitude and illegitimacy of the moment.

He in effect, placed the breast implants of natural citizenship into Barack's flat, half-foreign chest, making him appear, via the supreme authority's imprimatur, as if he was perfectly natural in every way and therefore eligible to enter and win the role of Miss President of the United States. He made a silk purse out of a sow's ear.

It is as if the founding father's had placed into the Constitution a requirement that the President have two legs. The right leg representing an American **father**, and the left an American mother, and here on inauguration day stands one with only one leg, and it's a left leg. Everyone is fooled by the artificial leg that he wears, the one built out of the false impression that birth within the United States qualifies one to be the supreme leader of the nation, and commander of all of its thousands of nuclear bombs and millions of military and federal personnel.

But the innocent patriotic children of the nation point to the peg-leg tip protruding from the end of his right trouser leg and declare, like the child that observed that the Emperor had no cloths, that the man doesn't have a right leg.

What is the crowds response? To tell the child to shut the heck up. Their glorious new champion must not suffer his reputation and honor being bismirched by such an accusation. And so no one's eyes shifted their focus to a point that is not in accordance with their desires, politics, and philosophy.

They, Congress and those they benefit, absolutely do not support fidelity to the Constitution because it's whole focus is not on legitimizing and

expanding their authority but on greatly restricting it via the plainest language possible. And the supreme political court is populated by "progressives" that hold that treasonous attitude also. Its most recent expression was in the 5-4 support for the manifoldly unconstitutional "Affordable" Health Care Act.

How could he then turn around and adjudicate honestly a suit brought against the one on whom he had placed the crown of supreme authority? No human being in history has ever faced such a conundrum, much less dealt with it properly. He would view the medicine as worse than the disease. And since the Court has no obligation to even state a reason for not accepting a case submitted to it, it certainly would give none. The Travesty would and will continue uncorrected and unaddressed. But I digress.]

No one other than those born to citizens are "natural" citizens. Only American parents produce natural American children, just as only Indian parents produce natural Indian children. Obama absolutely required naturalization because his father was a non-immigrant foreigner.

No non-immigrant foreigner can beget an American citizen, and the 14th Amendment is inapplicable because such a father is not subject to the full federal jurisdiction which citizens and legal immigrants fall under (military conscription, military training, military assignment, military deployment, military combat, and death in military battle).

They are exempt due to not being a member of American society, and to remaining subject to U.S.-recognized foreign jurisdiction in accordance with the Law of Nations, -as well as the laws of their foreign homeland.

Without the automatic at-birth naturalization of the 14th Amendment, children of immigrants would not be granted U.S. citizenship since they are born to foreigners and have no natural right to American citizenship.

A natural right is not the same as a traditional right. One state or colony might have had the tradition of bestowing its citizenship on the children of their immigrants if those children happened to be born within their territory ("sons of the soil"),

while other states and colonies had the legal tradition of requiring that the father first become a citizen of the state or colony before recognizing his U.S.-born alien children as state citizens..

But natural citizenship requires no legal recognition, and is the result of no law whatsoever. There is no provision in the United States Constitution wherein the nature of natural citizenship is even mentioned, much less made subject to Congressional authority. It's an unalienable right of natural inheritance because citizens give birth to citizen children by the natural transmission of not just the parents' biological nature, but also their political nature as well. They were born as state members via "the law of blood".

The first hint of the nature of citizenship is found in the first naturalization act of the first Congress in 1790. After addressing the uniform minimal requirements that all the new states must adhere to, it next addressed the tangential subject of American children born abroad. It declared that they were to "be considered as natural born citizens" (protecting them not just from pencil-pushing bureaucrats controlling immigration and naturalization (who might stupidly treat them as foreigners), thereby also making it clear that it would be the policy of the United States government that they were just as eligible to be the President as their domestically born brethren).

No doubt strong protest from one Thomas Jefferson, -living abroad as the United States Ambassador to France, along with one John Adams, -living abroad as the United States Ambassador to England, made the Congress aware of the short-coming of the Constitution due to over-looking the matter of children born to Americans on foreign soil.

But the hint of which I speak is found in the clause that dealt with children born abroad to American parents who were also born abroad. It declared that "the right of citizenship shall not pass" to children of an American father who has never lived in the United States.

What is remarkable about that statement is something so mundane and unremarkable that it doesn't even register in the conscious mind. In our

ignorant age we have lost sight of the meaning of what that statement states when it used the phrase "the right of citizenship".

Our modern ignorant minds think that it is referring to a right granted by the government to members of American society, a right guaranteed by some law, when in fact it is just the opposite.

Our nation is founded on the concept that certain rights are unalienable, and among them is the natural right of membership in the society and nation to which one's parents belong. That is not a privilege granted by the permission of the government. It is nothing less than an absolute natural right of every natural member of the nation.

Only those who do not possess that natural right need the government to grant them permission to be members of the nation. They need laws to be written which bestow membership upon them if they fulfill its requirements. The 14th Amendment is the greatest of those laws. But understand that no citizenship that is obtained by any law is *natural* citizenship. It is *legal* citizenship instead, and no legal citizen is eligible to be the President.

Natural born citizens are not "legal citizens" because their citizenship is not derived from, obtained by, resultant of, convey through, nor dependent on any American law. It is outside of the realm of American law. That's because Congress has no constitutional authority to legislate regarding natural citizenship, and has never done so.

The 14th Amendment, written four generations after the Constitution, while being part of the constitution of our government, does not state anything new regarding natural citizens. It merely affirmed the facts that already existed regarding domestically born Americans, for the purpose of applying them to those who had been denied their place in American society, namely the former American slaves.

Any form of citizenship that is dependent on any law is a form of naturalization. That makes Barack Obama a naturalized citizen. I believe that the facts of his citizenship are as follows:

- Obama was naturalized by a statute of naturalization law that granted citizenship to children of American women after they divorced their foreign husband who was the father of their child, and whose citizenship was their primary citizenship.
- But the U.S. citizenship granted at that point was provisional, -dependent on the child living a minimum number of years in the United States. Obama completed that number of years thanks to being returned to Hawaii at age ten and not going back to Indonesia. If he had returned to Indonesia with his mother, he would not have retained his U.S. citizenship.
- The U.S. naturalization law that grants U.S. citizenship to children of American women at birth only covers births outside of the United States, but if Obama was born outside of the United States he would not have been covered by that statute because by one of its provisions his mother was too young by several months for it to apply to her offspring. She had not lived in the United States for the required five years beyond the age of 14 since she was only 18 when he was born.
- Obama was born a provisional British subject, and naturalized by his mother as Indonesian. Obama was returned to Hawaii at age ten to live with his grandparents. At age 14, Obama began fulfilling the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act's (INA) 301(a)(7) and 301(b)'s five-year continuous residency requirement to become a U.S. citizen, See 8 U.S.C. 1409(c) and http://www.theodora.com/ina_96_title_3.html
- Consequently, the conclusion is inescapable that Barack Jr. was born without American citizenship no matter where he was born. But with, or without U.S. citizenship, what he is lacking is natural citizenship. The difference is that he is constitutionally eligible to serve as President of the Senate, but not as President of the United States. He is constitutionally eligible to serve as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, but not eligible

to serve as Chief Commander of the United States Military.

He is occupying the one office which he is constitutionally barred from occupying. He is therefore an unconstitutional President and a usurper of the power center of the nation. He is the Thief-in-Chief who stole the role of President firstly from Hillary Clinton, and secondly from John McCain.

Unlike President Richard Nixon who rightfully asserted "I am not a crook!" (his criminality wasn't described by that term) Barack Hussein Obama Jr. actually *is* a crook who lied and misrepresented his way into the White House, -in effect stealing the election under false pretenses. Everything he has done since has been under false color of authority.

If you believe your own lyin' eyes, point-out the nakedness of the Emperor and question the veracity of his clothing but don't think for a minute that it will do any good. He is still the Emperor, naked or not, and has all the power of that office. Truth can't unseat him. Congress can't unseat him. Judges will not even try. Only a legitimate election can do that. But if it is as close as it appears it will be, who can be assured that it will truly be a legitimate election?

by a.r. nash july 2012

Sunshine49 wrote:

In the debates in Congress over the 14th Amendment and the Civil Rights Act of 1866, it was stated that these laws would have the effect of "naturalizing" children at birth that were born on US soil from PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS with NO ALLEGIANCE to a foreign country. These children would be known as "native born" citizens -- NOT "natural-born" citizens.

Through the years these terms became intermingled until people just ASSUMED that children born on US soil from foreign parents with ALLEGIANCE to foreign countries were still natural-born US citizens. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

When these laws were written, if the FATHER had ALLEGIANCE to a foreign country, the child did NOT receive citizenship AT ALL because the child was BORN with the same citizenship as the FATHER even IF the child was born on US soil. If the FATHER became naturalized before the child came

of age, the child was automatically naturalized also.

The US felt it did NOT have the RIGHT to make citizens of children who were under the JURISDICTION of and ALLEGIANCE to a foreign country through the father. The child still had the right to be naturalized on their own once they came of age BECAUSE they had been born on US soil. To do so they had to swear TOTAL ALLEGIANCE to the US ONLY and give up ANY ALLEGIANCE to a foreign country they acquired through the FATHER. Today it's still the same. The Constitution requires that a candidate for President of the United States be a "natural-born citizen". According to the US Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual : "the fact that someone is a natural born citizen (citizen at birth) pursuant to a statute does not necessarily imply that he or she is such a citizen for Constitutional purposes."

Blacks Law Dictionary (9th Edition) erroneously defines 'Natural Born Citizen' as "A person born within the jurisdiction of a national government."

1st Session, 39th Congress, pt. 4, p. 2893. Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Lyman Trumbull, participating in the debate, stated the following: "What do we [the committee reporting the clause] mean by 'subject to the jurisdiction of the United States'? Not owing allegiance to anybody else. That is what it means." He then proceeded to expound upon what he meant by "complete jurisdiction": "Can you sue a Navajo Indian in court?... We make treaties with them, and therefore they are not subject to our jurisdiction....If we want to control the Navajos, or any other Indians of which the Senator from Wisconsin has spoken, how do we do it? Do we pass a law to control them? Are they subject to our jurisdiction in that sense?....Would he [Sen. Doolittle] think of punishing them for instituting among themselves their own tribal regulations? Does the Government of the United States pretend to take jurisdiction of murders and robberies and other crimes committed by one Indian upon another?...It is only those persons who come completely within our jurisdiction, who are subject to our laws, that we think of making citizens."

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

That's what I call a post. Enlightening and informative. Too bad Black got the NBC definition wrong. Like most, he was unaware of the primal principle underlying natural citizenship, -citizenship beyond all laws, citizenship pre-dating all laws, unalienable citizenship that is as much a part of a person as their familial ties, -citizenship by the principle of natural membership.

The whole discussion involving foreign allegiance and alienage is a discussion about children of foreigners, NOT children of Americans because they have no such issue.

"...who are subject to our laws, that we think of making citizens."

Government does not make natural citizens, -it only makes citizens of those who have no natural right to it, including their children. That's why citizenship laws exist. But no one who is a citizen by law is eligible to be the President because such citizens are not natural citizens.

[Understand this, there's a gigantic difference between being a citizen "by" birth, and a citizen "at" birth. "By" refers to birth itself, via the process of being conceived, gestated, and born. What's part and parcel of being natural born? Being born to a mother and a father who are Americans and not foreigners, -who are citizens and not immigrants.

"At" birth refers to Time, the time at which one is viewed as becoming a citizen. Those who are granted citizenship by government and laws are not natural citizens even if it begins from the date of their birth. It doesn't matter when it begins, - what matters is how and why it begins. If it is not natural citizenship, (which requires no law whatsoever, -and none exists, nor *can* exist because it is an unalienable right) then even citizenship "at" birth is not a qualification to be President.

In a paper in November 2011 aimed at clarifying presidential eligibility, the Congressional Research Service declared that the practical, legal meaning of "natural born citizen" would "most likely include" not only anyone born on U.S. soil but anyone born overseas of at least one parent who was a U.S. citizen. That lame conclusion is based on no identifiable principle whatsoever. It's based 100% on the extrapolation of impressions of opinions of long dead men who based their opinions on the

same. None of them ever dug deep into the issue of the principle upon which natural citizenship is founded.

A natural member of any group is one born to a native of the group.
One is not a native unless fathered by a native and born of a native mother.
Outsiders cannot produce insiders.
Foreigners cannot produce natives.
Alien parents cannot produce natural domestic members of any group, including nations.
Only citizens can produce children who are natural citizens.

Immigrant parents can only produce citizens via the naturalizing power of the 14th Amendment. It produces constitutional citizens, not natural citizens. Any citizen whose citizenship is derived from any law is ineligible to be President because natural born citizens do not derive their citizenship from any law. It's a result of natural law, -by which all off-spring are the same as their parents, biologically and politically.

A.R. Nash

Spaulding wrote:

Obama, on his "Fightthesmears (dot) com" website, told us "I am a native-born citizen of the US." While the term "native-born" is confusingly close to "natural-born", native-born citizens are similar to the slaves whose status as non-citizens the 14th Amendment was intended to correct.

[The terms native born, and natural born, are like the words "pipe" and "pole". Most pipes can be poles and most poles are pipes, but not all because some are solid. Most native-born citizens are natural born because they had American parents (but some were born to foreigners) while most natural born citizens are also native-born (but not all because some are born beyond U.S. borders.)

A native-born citizen is a 14th Amendment Citizen, which is, by definition, a naturalized citizen. The 14th Amendment was an exercise of Article 1 Section 8, creating "an Uniform Rule for Naturalization". The author of the 14th Amendment, congressman John Bingham of Ohio, an ardent

abolitionist and judge, carefully repeated the Marshall definition, albeit using terms to emphasize the intent: "I find no fault with the introductory clause [S 61 Bill], which is simply declaratory of what is written in the Constitution, that every human being born within the jurisdiction of the United States of parents not owing allegiance to any foreign sovereignty is, in the language of your Constitution itself, a natural born citizen...." [there is no such declaration anywhere in the Constitution! Consider the degree of erroneous presumption by which such a false claim was made and believed to be true.] Those words are in the Congressional record for 1866.

The Justice who wrote the Wong Kim Ark decision, making the native-born Wong, a citizen, and not a natural born citizen, though he was born and raised in San Francisco, cited the precedent, confirming the Marshall citation of common law, in *Minor v. Happersett*. The facts are clear but inconvenient to too many whose behavior, including Roberts, demonstrate complicity with the cover-up. There is no document in which Obama has claimed to be a natural born citizen. He knows better. He does not accept the validity of Article II Section 1. He was elected and sworn in by Roberts. Only one Congressman contested his eligibility, Nathan Deal of Georgia. Deal was immediately faced with ethics violations from income tax records of a decade earlier, and his published letter to the White House ignored. Deal resigned and is now Governor of Georgia.

The facts are incontestable. The ruling class has overruled the Constitution. Four years ago they cited *Minor v. Happersett*, which confirmed the definition, mentioned as dictum in dozens of Supreme Court cases. The Marshall, John Jay, G. Washington, J. Madison, Ben Franklin definition was not unique to the Swiss legal philosopher Vattel, but Vattel's was our first law book, at our first Law School created by Thomas Jefferson at William and Mary in 1779, and Jefferson specified Washington and Hamilton's most trusted source of natural law, the foundation for the authority of our Constitution, Vattel's Law of Nations. Marshall and Monroe were students at that law school. There is no doubt.