The Audacity of Fraud/ -An Unnatural American President

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION: ARTICLE 2, SECTION 1 reads:
"ANY PERSON who is born a citizen of the United States shall be eligible to the Office of the President;..." or it reads:
"***NO person*** ***except*** a natural born Citizen,..shall be eligible to the Office of the President;..." (emphasis added)

The section of the Constitution that delineates who is allowed to be President requires only three simple things. 2). No person is eligible who has not lived for 35 years, 3). and lived in the United States for at least 14 of those years (age 21 to age 35 = 14 years), 1). and last, but actually first in the list, is the requirement of one of the two sentences at the top. Which is it? Conventional wisdom says it's the first one. Liberals/ Progressives/ Socialists choose to believe that it's the first sentence, but the real wording of the Constitution thwarts their desire that the presidency be so inclusive that almost anyone can be President.

Actually, almost anyone ***can*** be President, -but not everyone, because the real wording of Article II, Section I is found in the second sentence, not the first. It is an exclusionary statement, not inclusionary, and it bars a tiny fraction of citizens from being President by requiring that the President be a natural citizen of the United States. The question pertinent to the present is, "Who isn't a natural American citizen and is therefore barred?". To answer that, an explanation must be given as to what a natural American citizen is.

A natural citizen is essentially everyone that you and I know. They (we) are natural citizens because they were born to American parents. They are citizens by birth. Similarly, simians are simians by birth, elephants are elephants by birth, humans are humans by birth, foreigners are foreigners by birth, and Americans are Americans by birth. No simian ever gave birth to an elephant. No elephant ever gave birth to a human. American parents don't produce natural foreign citizens, and foreigners don't produce natural American citizens.

Legal resident aliens can produce children who are automatically granted citizenship upon birth because aliens are immigrants, (and covered by the 14th Amendment) whereas foreigners are not. [Aliens are persons who are not Americans.] The foreigner's residence is in a foreign nation and they are citizens/subjects of that nation and owe it their allegiance, just as that nation owes them its protection.

But not all foreigners deliver their babies in their own country. Some births occur while traveling, visiting, studying, or working temporarily abroad. Those foreigners, along with foreign diplomats, include entertainers, businessmen, professionals, scientists, engineers, scholars and students. They cannot produce a child within U.S. borders with the result that American citizenship is legitimately bestowed upon it (even though the policy of the executive branch is to bestow it anyway) because it inherits its citizenship only from its parents, and thus is a foreigner and a natural citizen of its father's homeland, and will be transported to the land of the parents' nationality where it will be raised as a natural member of its native country (which is the land of the parents to which it was born).

This is all crystal clear. Where it gets less clear is when the child is fathered by a foreigner but has an American mother. Can such a child be considered, constitutionally, to be a natural citizen of the United States ? Can a mule be considered to be a natural horse since it had a horse for a father [and a donkey for a mother]? Can a mule be considered a natural donkey? The answer to both is: "No".

Mules are not natural anything because they are sterile hybrids that have no multi-generational lineage nor identical parental genetic character. Unlike breeds of dogs which are considered pure-breeds, mules do not come from a long line of identical ancestors. They come from a one-time mating of two distinctly different breeds of equines. They, like children born of parents with mixed nationalities, are hybrids. Hybrids are not natural members of any group.

We have elected a President who is also a hybrid. The nationalities of his parents had nothing in common and were distinctly different, thus not producing an off-spring that was a natural member of either nation. Through

his father he was born as a natural subject of the British Empire, while U.S. citizenship could only result from U.S. law that didn't exist when the Constitution was written & ratified. At that time, and long after, one's citizenship was derived from that of one's father or husband, -not one's mother.*

So he would have been solely a British subject at birth and could only become an American via naturalization as an adult in the colony or state in which he lived unless his father became naturalized first. Then any minor children would be naturalized automatically, -obtaining derivative citizenship through him.

Regardless of which era he was born in, having a foreigner for a father instead of an American, would result in a citizenship that's not natural. Only children produced by an American father and mother are natural citizens. All others are naturalized citizens, even if that naturalization begins automatically at birth due to the 14th Amendment

No one is a natural member of a family or a tribe unless they are born into it. All other means of becoming a member, such as adoption or marriage, are not natural. Natural citizens are born into a society/nation by birth to members, whereas outsiders and their children become members by law or permission of leaders. Natural membership is via blood connection to member parents, which accompanies natural inheritance of race, traits, ethnicity, along with the social inheritance of language and family name. As in nature, where one is born has no significance. But to whom one is born is of paramount importance. It determines whether or not one is a natural member of any group.

Many erroneously assume that if Barack was born in Hawaii then he is automatically an American citizen. That assumption is false. If his mother had been the visiting Kenyan wife of Obama Sr. then only fools would claim that he would be an American citizen simply by being born in America. Such children, -who happen to be born in America, are, like their parents, not subject to the jurisdiction of the American government, but to the jurisdiction of their own government, thus they are excluded by the 14th Amendment from being born as citizens of the United States. Barack Obama Jr., fathered by a Visa Card foreign student, was such a child.

Obama Sr. was not an immigrant to the United States and thus was not subject to its jurisdiction. Rather, he was a foreign transient, a temporary foreign student/guest still under the jurisdiction of Britain and international treaties. The United States could not conscript him into the U.S. military nor require him to obey its political commands, such as not visiting Cuba. Hence, no child fathered by him would fall under the umbrella of the 14th Amendment, meaning that it doesn't matter that his son was born inside the United States because his son, through him, would not be subject to the U.S. government. His son was not a true "native-born" American because he was not fathered by a native citizen of the United State nor by a State Department approved legal immigrant. No <u>non-immigrant</u> foreigner can father a native citizen of the United States, and no <u>non-citizen</u> immigrant can father a natural citizen of the United States.

So, the answer to the earlier question: "Who is not a natural American citizen?" is: "anyone who is a citizen of a foreign nation by birth, or has a parent who was born in a foreign nation and owes allegiance to that foreign nation and is not a United States citizen". Such individuals are not natural Americans and our founding fathers, after they decided that the President should have command of the U.S. Army and Navy, wanted no such individuals to be entrusted with the reins of ultimate military power which are held by the Commander-In-Chief.

If all this is true, then how could Barack have been allowed to run for and win election to the highest office in the land? Simple, no one was minding the store. No one was constitutionally required to vet presidential candidates. The heads of the Democrat Party discarded their established protocol to certify that their candidate was constitutionally eligible, and instead simply stated that they certified that he was duly chosen to be their party's candidate. The buck was meant to stop at their desk but when they got it they stuffed it into a drawer and locked it away, -pretending that nothing was out of the ordinary even though they knew long before his victory that he was not constitutionally eligible to be the President.

But they also knew that the American people were completely unaware of the issue and the American media was so liberal that they would never raise the subject. Thus he was swept into the presidency after violating the oath of office simply by taking it and swearing to uphold the same Constitution by which he was manifestly ineligible be the President.

What can be done about it? Perhaps a better question is; "what should be done about it"? If something is to be done, would it not have to include nullifying every law that he's signed, every executive order he's issued, and every appointment that he's made, including those to the federal bench and Supreme Court? Not one person within the Washington establishment can conceive of such a course. It is beyond their capability to think that far outside of the box.

We are no longer a nation that adheres to the limitations of the law or the Constitution. Informing no one, our law enforcement officials send thousands of assault weapons across our southern international border straight into the arms of mass murderers. Our Congress violates the 10th Amendment more often than not as it legislates to empower (-to ever greater degrees), the giant octopus of the federal bureaucracy which extends its tentacles ever deeper into the social and private lives of more and more American citizens. How can such an organization, -one that freely violates our most fundamental law, be expected to handcuff itself and chop off its unconstitutional practices, programs, funding bills, and endless borrowing? It would be the equivalent of a heroin addict voluntarily going cold turkey and handcuffing himself to a bed. It isn't going to happen. The old guard must be replaced with young Turks who are willing to wield an ax, -a chain saw, -call a spade a spade, and hold every branch of government to the limitations of the Constitution and sane budget limits.

Such men and women will have much in common with our founding fathers who were revolutionaries, but have almost nothing in common with the "politics as usual" socialistic good-ol'-boys who have gone along to get along and have spent our nation into a mountain of debt so high that is can never be reduced, much less paid off and eliminated.

The election of 2012 is truly the most pivotal cross-roads that our nation has seen in decades because we are at a tipping point. We will either begin to move away from the cliff that liberalism is driving us full-speed toward, or we will become Greece and Italy but with no one to bail us out. Like the two groups of survivors in the movie Poseidon (Adventure) in which a giant luxury ocean-liner capsized, one group believes that survival means heading upward, -the other believes that safety comes from going downward. Only one is correct. Which direction will we go? Toward escape or toward inevitable doom? The wise money is betting on inevitable doom because the entire establishment of the country is protective of the status quo through its ignorance, its silence, and its collusion in keeping illegitimately wasteful, excessive, and unconstitutional government spending and regulation in place, along with an unconstitutional President.

by A. R. Nash Jan 2012 http://obama--nation.com

* The connection between an immigrant woman's nationality and that of her husband convinced many judges that unless the husband of an alien couple became naturalized, the wife could not become a citizen. While one will find some courts that naturalized the wives of aliens, until 1922 the courts generally held that the alien wife of an alien husband could not herself be naturalized.(3)

In innumerable cases under the 1855 law, an immigrant woman instantly became a U.S. citizen at the moment a judge's order naturalized her immigrant husband. If her husband naturalized prior to September 27, 1906, the woman may or may not be mentioned in the record which actually granted her citizenship. Her only proof of U.S. citizenship would be a combination of the marriage certificate and her husband's naturalization record. Prior to 1922, this provision applied to women regardless of their place of residence. Thus if a woman's husband left their home abroad to seek work in America, became a naturalized citizen, then sent for her to join him, that woman might enter the United States for the first time listed as a U.S. citizen.(4)

In other cases, the immigrant woman suddenly became a citizen when she and her U.S. citizen fiance were declared "man and wife." In this case her proof of citizenship was a combination of two documents: the marriage certificate and her husband's birth record or naturalization certificate. If such an alien woman also had minor alien children, they too derived U.S. citizenship from the marriage. As minors, they instantly derived citizenship from the "naturalization-by-marriage" of their mother. If the marriage took place abroad, the new wife and her children could enter the United States for the first time as citizens. Again, if these events occurred prior to September 27, 1906, it is doubtful any of the children actually appear in what is, technically, their naturalization record. The lack of any record for those children's naturalization might cause some of them, after reaching the age of majority, to go to naturalization court and become citizens again.

Just as alien women gained U.S. citizenship by marriage, U.S.-born women often gained foreign nationality (and thereby lost their U.S. citizenship) by marriage to a foreigner. As the law increasingly linked women's citizenship to that of their husbands, the courts frequently found that U.S. citizen women expatriated themselves by marriage to an alien. For many years there was disagreement over whether a woman lost her U.S. citizenship simply by virtue of the marriage, or whether she had to actually leave the United States and take up residence with her husband abroad. Eventually it was decided that between 1866 and 1907 no woman lost her U.S. citizenship by marriage to an alien unless she left the United States. Yet this decision was probably of little comfort to some women who, resident in the United States since birth, had been unfairly treated as aliens since their marriages to non-citizens.(5)

After 1907, marriage determined a woman's nationality status completely. Under the act of March 2, 1907, all women acquired their husband's nationality upon any marriage occurring after that date. This changed nothing for immigrant women, but U.S.-born citizen women could now lose their citizenship by any marriage to any alien. Most of these women subsequently regained their U.S. citizenship when their husbands naturalized. However, those who married Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, or other men racially ineligible to naturalize forfeited their U.S. citizenship. Similarly, many former U.S. citizen women found themselves married to men who were ineligible to citizenship for some other reason or who simply refused to naturalize. Because the courts held that a husband's nationality would always determine that of the wife, a married woman could not legally file for naturalization.(6)

Congress was at work and on September 22, 1922, passed the Married Women's Act, also known as the Cable Act. This 1922 law finally gave each woman a nationality of her own. No marriage since that date has granted U.S. citizenship to any alien woman nor taken it from any U.S.-born women who married an alien eligible to naturalization.(11) Under the new law women became eligible to naturalize on (almost) the same terms as men. The only difference concerned those women whose husbands had already naturalized. If her husband was a citizen, the wife did not need to file a declaration of intention. She could initiate naturalization proceedings with a petition alone (one-paper naturalization). A woman whose husband remained an alien had to start at the beginning, with a declaration of intention.

In 1940 Congress allowed all women who lost citizenship by marriage between 1907 and 1922 to repatriate, or resume their citizenship, regardless of their marital status. Since then, any woman who lost U.S. citizenship in those years by marriage to any alien, even if they remained happily married, could resume her citizenship by applying and taking the oath of allegiance.

http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/1998/summer/women-and-naturalization-1.html