

The End of Eden & The Rise of Obama

In today's world, four decades after the women's liberation revolution, it seems very odd to think that women, wives, and daughters throughout American history were treated as inferior to fathers, -to husbands, -to sons, and that that treatment was not only a feature of American and worldwide society but also of American law.

There was a patriarchal tradition based on the subjugation of wives to their husbands, -as was called for by the Holy Bible when God, or the author, says that it shall be so because Eve tempted Adam with the fruit of the tree of the Knowledge of Good & Evil and therefore subjection to her husband was her punishment for that offense which led to "the Fall of Man" and their banishment from the Garden of Eden.

In the male dominated traditions of the world, women are not endowed with the many rights that are reserved only for the "adults", meaning the men, -the heads of their household, -the ones responsible for the sustenance and survival of the family and the nation. Those rights include such things as the right of inheritance, the right to own property, the right to vote, etc.

But the tradition that is most curious from today's perspective is that American women lost their citizenship when/if they married outside of their national family. Their citizenship was then converted from American, or British, to that of the husband. It's known as "expatriation by marriage". Whatever the husband was, so was the wife and their children. One uniform citizenship. She pledged her obedience, she took his name in place of her own, and she took his citizenship in place of her own. She became his and they became one. No such submissive wife would say; "I'm an American but my husband is British". All she would/could say of her family was; "We're British", or "We're American". That uniform citizenship avoided the problems inherent in dual-citizenship in marriages and in children being born in subjection to two different nations.

What does this have to do with anything relevant? Only this; if Barack Obama's mother, Stanley Ann Dunham, had become pregnant by a foreign student and then became married to him between 1907 and 1922, by the legal tradition described above, which became official law through the Nationality Act of 1907, she would have become a subject of the British Empire at that time and the only citizenship that would have passed to her son (Obama Jr.) from his parents was that of the husband and father. So at birth, by the British Nationality Act of 1948, Barack Obama Jr. would have been a British subject, -as his own website has acknowledged that he was, and not an American.

[Library of Congress on Immigration & Naturalization](#)(1840-1950)

Married women and children under the age of twenty-one derived citizenship from their husband or father respectively. Children of unsuccessful applicants could apply for citizenship in their own right, at the age of twenty-one.

"Yes, this is the reason Harvard was still citing the 1859 Buchanan OP when Barack Hussein Obama-Soetoro-Soebarkah was born. Obama was first & foremost a British subject at birth, just as his father was. This was the law recognized by all nations, that a child born in wedlock follows the nationality of the father, not the mother until such time as a divorce or an adoption may take place or upon the child reaching the age of 21. The only change in the 1950's pertained to children born to single mothers abroad, ***NOT children born in wedlock.***"

Following the passage of the 19th Amendment which gave American women the right to vote, the Cable Act of 1922 was passed. It provided American women who married foreign men with their own citizenship independent of his. But the citizenship of the children was passed only from the father to the children, unless they divorced (or the father died) and the mother retained custody. Then her native U.S. citizenship could be restored and imparted to her children.

But eventually the law changed and they came to have the same rights as American men, so by derivative citizenship, their minor children, though possessing the citizenship of their foreign father, would also possess

the citizenship of the American mother and therefore, though they would not be natural born citizens, they would be native-born 14th Amendment dual citizens automatically naturalized-at-birth.

Although they would inherit their mother's citizenship as a birthright, her citizenship alone is not sufficient to place them in the category of natural citizens because without an American father they were the hybrid fruit of a branch grafted onto a foreign tree, -attached to a father who was not of the same nature/nationality as their mother and therefore their nature could not be describable as purely & naturally American.

Understand this, any citizen whose citizenship is ascribed to them by human law is not a natural citizen but a man-made, half-blood, statutory, naturalized citizen. But that citizenship is identical to natural citizenship in almost every way with the lone exception of eligibility to the office of the President. All American citizens are equal, except some of them are more equal than others when it comes to being the Commander In Chief.

Many will erroneously assume that by being born in the United States, (a "fact" not yet proven by any certified and authenticated hard-copy evidence) Obama obtained American citizenship automatically, but that is not backed by actual U.S. law. The 14th Amendment only declares those born in the U.S. and subject to its jurisdiction to be U.S. citizens. Although a widespread false assumption exists that a native-birth magically imparts a birthright to claim American citizenship, that's simply not legally true. Birth within the U.S. is not attended by any birthright since that right is one that is inherited, -passed from the father, or parents, to their off-spring, or granted as a form of naturalization to children of legal U.S. immigrants by an 1898 Supreme Court ruling on the 14th Amendment.

But since Obama Sr. was merely a visiting student from Kenya and not an immigrant with permanent resident status granted by the State Department, he therefore was subject only to British jurisdiction and International Treaty. He was free from U.S. political jurisdiction and could not be required to register for the draft nor could he be conscripted into the U.S. military because he was only a temporary guest of the government, and not a permanent member of American society.

As such, any child that he fathered in the United States, being under his jurisdiction and therefore, (-by proxy through him), under British jurisdiction, was excluded by the 14th Amendment language from U.S. citizenship through him since he was a non-immigrant alien.

But since his mother was subject to U.S. jurisdiction, he was subject through her and thus, a birth in the U.S. would fulfil the requirements of the 14th Amendment for native-born citizenship if he had been born in the United States.

But even if born after in the U.S. he would not possess natural born citizenship because his citizenship would have not been the result of being born a citizen with only American parents, allegiance, and nationality. No one with dual parentage, dual allegiance, and dual nationality constitutes a natural citizen since natural citizens are saddled with no duality, -no foreignness, -no alienage. Instead they're the product of only one uniform nationality.

So since he was not an American through his father nor an American through a "native birth", he therefore was not an American native by birth, even if he was "native-born", since he lacked having a native of the United States for a father. Only native fathers can father natives. Only citizen fathers can father natural citizens. Foreigners can not. Consequently, he was not born as a true native of any nation nor as a natural citizen of either the United States or Great Britain.

Obama's citizenship is a form of naturalization because it's something mandated by human law, not something that children such as himself are endowed with by natural unalienable right. So just as a Nazi "Aryan" father and a Jewish mother would not produce a natural red-blooded "Aryan" Nazi nor a full-blooded Jew, so a foreign father (like a North Korean, -or Kenyan) and an American mother aren't capable of producing a natural American.

But what about the American dream? -The dream that every American child is entitled to aspire to be President one day? Well that is still true for perhaps 98% of us. Must it be true for 100% of us?

The founders of our nation, who experienced the dangers, trials and tribulations of war, -who endured the treachery of General Benedict Arnold and determined that such treason must never be possible by an American President, were determined that

no citizen that was born with a direct inherited connection to any other nation should ever occupy the Presidency and they wrote that in stone into the Constitution.

On July 25, 1787, John Jay, the 1st Chief Justice of the Supreme Court under the new Republic and also the President of the Continental Congress, wrote to George Washington the following:

*“Permit me to hint, whether it would be wise and seasonable to **provide a strong check to the admission of Foreigners into the administration of our National Government; and to declare expressly that the Commander in Chief of the American Army shall not be given to nor devolve on, any but a natural born citizen.**”*

It's a rule and requirement that cannot be changed except by a constitutional amendment. But it can be ignored, -and it was ignored by essentially the entire nation. No officer of the government, whether elected or appointed, no reporter or TV news operation, no talk-radio pundit, no syndicated columnist, no celebrity, no Judge or Justice of the Supreme Court ever raised an objection to the attempted usurpation of the presidency by an ineligible candidate. Then after he was found to have won the election, it was too late. The damage was done because the people had been allowed to pick an ineligible man for President.

The Constitution was nationally violated and no one who knew it said a word. That is a great enough travesty, but it may be allowed to be repeated even after these truths are now known. Will ignorance, indifference, and cowardice allow the conspiracy against the Constitution to be rewarded a second time? If they do then we may find ourselves irrevocably on the path to mandatory socialism. Socialistic aims and sentiments have dominated American politics and law-making for 100 years and their tentacles are deeply entrenched in nearly every major aspect of American life, so it's very possible for such a powerful influence to win the day next November and thereby slowly strangle the future.

by A.R. Nash Jan 2012 republishing rights granted to all.
<http://obama--nation.com> http://photobucket.com/obama_bc