Sitting Bull & Barack Obama; a Tale of Two Chiefs
(one legitimate and one not)

When someone assumes the role of the leader of a people, it is presumed that before that ascension to the top position that certain conditions must first be fulfilled, and generally they are very simple to state. To be the Chief one must be a mature and experienced person, experienced in leadership, judgement, and administration. One must also have lived among one's people for a considerable number of years (as opposed to living with another tribe). Lastly, but foremost, one must be a full-blooded member, -a natural native member of the group by birth, as opposed to being a member by permission.

In a hypothetical scenario, if George Armstrong Custer had a wife who gave birth on the land of the Sioux nation (which he was out to destroy) would that child be a natural native member of the Sioux nation? Would that child be viewed as equal to the sons of Sioux fathers and eligible one day to be the Chief? "Of course not!" you respond; "that would be insane!". Which is true, and yet "insane" is where we find our nation living. The difference is that the nation is America, not the Sioux, and the father is Barack Obama Sr, not Custer.

If makes no difference that he fathered a child with an American woman because it's untrue that the right to be the Chief is based solely on the ownership of the land where the mother delivered the child. "Sitting Bull, -born on Sioux land, therefore eligible to be the Chief; George Armstrong Custer Jr., -born on Sioux land and therefore eligible to be the Chief; Barack Obama Jr.; born on American land, therefore eligible to be the Commander in Chief" (even though he is not a natural native member of the American tribe since he was fathered by a "non-immigrant alien" (official INS designation) temporarily on U.S. soil as a foreign student).

The authors of the Constitution wrote a prohibition in Article II, Section 1, in which they ordered the rejection of any citizen from being eligible to the office of the President if that citizen was not a natural native member of the American nation. Their worse-case-scenario would have been an American-born son of King George, growing up under his wicked father's tutelage, returning to the United States at age 21, and 14 years later running for and winning the office of President. To prevent that, or any lesser version (son of Benedict Arnold for example), from being a candidate for the presidency they required that only those born as natural citizens, -natives of the American nation, be acceptable. That required having American parentage, proscribing having foreign parentage, i.e.; an alien father. Only natural American citizens, born of citizens, or children of natural-ized American citizens could be the President.

The Law That Was Never Written

Sitting Bull, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Joe Biden, -fill-in just about any name you can think of, -except Barack Obama, and one thing will be true of all of them. That thing is that they were/are members of their group by an unwritten rule. That rule is so obvious and fundamental that there was never a need to commit it to writing. It's the rule of natural membership. It's the same rule that's seen in nature. Off-spring of any and all species are of the same species. Off-spring of group members are members also because membership is passed from parents to children via their blood connection. Whatever the parents are, -so also are the children.

So it is among nations also. One's political nature, i.e. citizenship, is passed from parents to children. That is the law that was never written because it was universally accepted as self-evident.

But life in an evolving nation is not as simple as life in a tribe, and eventually unusual situations arise which only the highest judges can decide with finality. Such a case arose in 1875 (Minor v Happersett). The Supreme Court was asked to rule that an American woman had the Constitutional right to vote since she was an American citizen, and all citizens are equal. The court was put in the awkward situation of having to first make a determination as to whether or not she, as an American female, was a citizen. Only after determining the answer was "yes", could they proceed to determine if she therefore had a right to vote.

The first thing they had to examine was the United States law regarding the citizenship of its native members (naturalization law covered only immigrants and their children). They went to the proverbial legal cupboard for a recipe for natural citizenship and found the cupboard was bare. There was no law. Nothing had ever been written, -except one little mention in the Constitution using just two words -but only in regard to the office of the President. "No person, except a *natural born* citizen...shall be eligible to the Office of the President,...". That was the only thing ever written in law in all of American history that dealt with the subject of the citizenship of 99% of the native members of the American nation.

Out of necessity, and having no alternate choice, they had to resort to ascertaining what that three-word phrase meant, and extrapolate whether or not Mrs. Minor was a citizen or not. Attorney Leo Donofrio described what they ascertained thusly: "the Supreme Court held that persons born in the US to parents who are citizens are 'natives or natural-born citizens.' These are referred to as a "class" of persons separate from the class of persons born to alien parents."

The court decided that while Mrs. Minor was clearly a citizen of the United States, she was not entitled to vote because the federal Constitution did not delineate any right to vote since it was a State matter. So the court found that although American women were citizens of the United States, voting was not a right of citizenship. Even though unfair, it was up to state legislatures or a Constitutional amendment (the 19th) to change things.

Thus, without any written law to follow, the Supreme Court deftly defined the principle beneath the citizenship of all citizens who are not naturalized nor born of immigrants. They described citizens by applying common sense to the universal principle of membership as seen in natural law. Citizens were not defined as all those who are born in America, but are those who are born to American parents. All those who are not born to American parents can only become Americans by the application of laws written for that purpose. Those laws include immigration & naturalization laws, as well as the application of the 14th Amendment for their children. Under it they are naturalized at birth if the parents are un-naturalized, but if the parents had completed naturalization before their birth, then they are born as natural American citizens.

No citizen who is a citizen by law is a natural native citizen of the American nation because no law was ever written to define them. All the laws ever written have been for those who are NOT native citizens because they were citizens of another nation (immigrants), or children of such transplanted persons [as well as Native Americans and former slaves].

The meaning of the words used to describe those citizens who alone are eligible to be the President were written with the fathers of presidential candidates in mind. No son of a foreign father was to ever be entrusted with the reins of power of the Commander-in-Chief, just as no son of Custer, even if born on Sioux land, would ever be entrusted with the position of Chief of the Sioux nation.

Only an American father is capable of producing a son who is a natural member of the nation, i.e.-a native or indigenous citizen, aka "le naturel" or "the natural citizen". The current President was never such a son since he was fathered by an foreign outsider who was no more capable of fathering a natural American son than Obama's maternal grandfather, if visiting Kenya, would be capable of fathering a natural Kenyan son.

By a.r. nash oct 2011 http://obama--nation.com http://photobucket.com/obama_bc