

## The Eligibility Credibility of one Barry Obama (~US Kings, Spartans, & A Stranger in the White House)

There's a problem in the White House. There's a stranger in the Oval Office and the Secret Service doesn't know exactly who he is. They haven't done any background check to determine whether or not he might pose a threat, but they are restrained from ordering him to leave because he happens to be the President. They view him through suspicious eyes even though he was elected to office, because they know that any and every U.S. citizen is not eligible to hold the office of the Commander-in-Chief, and it would appear that he is one of those who isn't.

They know also that any and every citizen is not acceptable to guard the President because they themselves had to pass a deep and thorough Yankee White Single Scope Background investigation to vet all would-be protectors of the President. They know that they would not have passed that vetting process if they had been born to a non-immigrant alien father. They had to have an American father. And yet they are required to sacrifice their lives to protect a man who is not qualified to guard himself.

The stranger in the White House is an anomaly, not because he is half Negro, but because he is half African, half alien, -and spent most of his first two decades of life as an Indonesian citizen via adoption. Never before in US history have the American people knowingly voted for a man who was half European, or half Russian or half Chinese, or half anything that wasn't American, and yet his charm and corrupt electioneering tactics allowed him to bulldoze his competition out of the way even though the odds against him were great.

But how was the American electorate bamboozled into thinking that a half-something candidate could be eligible to the highest office in the land? The answer is that due to wide-spread ignorance, a wide-spread "urban myth" was swallowed as gospel. That myth is multi-fold and the first part is that mere birth on U.S. soil automatically imparts U.S. citizenship. The second is that such a birth fulfills the constitutional requirement to be President. In other words, anyone born in the U.S. can be President with only one kind of exception; children born to foreign representatives, -children of mass-murdering foreign dictators are ok.

Those myths are founded on a perverted distortion of the meaning of the words of the 14th Amendment's citizenship clause. Barack Obama and his minions used and relied upon that perversion to assert that he was eligible to be President because of his supposed constitutional citizenship which is courtesy of the 14th Amendment. He even claimed as much on his campaign website "FightTheSmears.com" -now off-line.

The false supposition is that he was covered by the 14th Amendment, but the truth is that he wasn't. The meaning of the 14th Amendment and the citizenship that it bestowed did not pertain to rights possessed by women (mothers), but strictly to men (fathers). It granted citizenship to children of those men who were subject to the jurisdiction of the United States government. In that era, wives were subject to their husbands, children were subject to their parents, and fathers were subject to the government. Women could not be called upon to defend the nation, and possibly die doing so, but men could, and that's one reason why they were the head of each household. The wives were not viewed as co-heads and equally subject to Washington's jurisdiction.

The 14th Amendment of 1868 reads: "All persons born in the United States, or naturalized, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside.". Everyone understands the meaning of "born in the United States" but everyone does *not* understand the meaning of being subject to US jurisdiction.

It means two things. The first, according to the authors of the clause, is that it means the same thing as its predecessor, -the Civil Rights Act of 1866 which requires that those born in the U.S. (covering freed slaves and children of immigrants [two birds with one stone]) not be under the jurisdiction of any foreign power. Some shallow thinkers leap to the conclusion that babies are directly under the jurisdiction of Washington and therefore all of them born on U.S. soil must be citizens. But a baby, and all minors, are not subject to the government, -their father and mother are, but historically we would say that only the father was of significance. In other words, only adult husbands were viewed as being subject to the jurisdiction of Washington.

Then the question is; "what does jurisdiction mean?" To answer that we have to first answer the reverse question; "what does jurisdiction in the 14th Amendment *not* mean?" The answer is of immense importance in combating the urban myth about the nature of the citizenship of Barack Obama and whether it is included or not by the language of the 14th Amendment. It in fact was not and here's why.

Though jurisdiction is only one word, it does not have only one meaning because there are several different kinds of jurisdiction. One is civil, one is criminal, and another is political. Every soul who walks out of the wilderness into civilization, or flies in from a distant foreign land, or high-tails it through the border desert into American society is subject to both civil and criminal jurisdiction of the local, state, and national governments to various degrees. Even foreign Ambassadors, Consuls, and Diplomats are subject to such jurisdiction and are required and expected to follow all the laws like everyone else. But if they break them anyway, then they are immune to prosecution. They get a free pass in the same way that a person who's been involved in a criminal enterprise gets immunity from prosecution when he turns "state's evidence" and becomes a witness for the prosecution. He was fully subject to the law, as are foreign representatives, but like them, can't be prosecuted.

No foreign representative in history has ever been told by his government that the laws of the nation where he would be stationed did not apply to him, -that he can ignore them completely. He can rob banks and rape women because he is above the law. Instead the international agreement is that he is immune from prosecution if he violates the laws that he is rightfully subject to.

So understanding the truth about the difference between political jurisdiction and all other forms of jurisdiction, and between subjection to law and immunity from prosecution, serves to correct the common misconception held even by people who happen to work for the government, -including serving as judges at all levels. The misconception that that understanding dispels is that merely being born in a country does not automatically make one subject to the political jurisdiction of the central government because political jurisdiction is different from all other kinds.

It's tied to the responsibility of membership. Capable members of every family, tribe, and nation are responsible in ways that their guests are not. Their guests, while under the roof of their host, is subject to the rules of the house; -no spitting on the floor, -no urinating in a corner, -no stealing the silver wear and jewelry. But they aren't subject to orders to risk their lives fighting a fire, or defending against attack by renegades or robbers. If danger arrives, they are free to leave through the back door, -they do not have to confront it because they are not members and don't have the responsibilities of members.

An excellent larger illustration is that of an ancient city-state like Sparta, Athens, or Troy, which has a strong stone wall surrounding the city and a drawbridge across a moat. Those who are from outside can enter the city via a walkway alongside the drawbridge, which remains closed to them. Those visitors, who enter to visit, or shop, or attend classes, or speak to the king as representatives from another city-state, are equivalent to foreign diplomats and Visa Card visitors to the United States. Those visitors come for the day and then leave at night because their home is elsewhere. Since they are outsiders, they aren't allowed to stay longer than guests are allowed because they have no loyalty to the city, no natural connection to it, and therefore have no right to residence in it.

But any outsider who obtains the king's permission to become a permanent member of the city, after the king's investigators have determined that he isn't a threat, is allowed to move in permanently. For him the drawbridge is opened and his big moving van (cart) is allowed to pass into the city. He is no longer among the excluded outsiders who must leave when their visit ends because he received permission to enter via the drawbridge, and not just the foot bridge. He received a Green Card that made him a permanent member of the city, and thus became charged with the same responsibilities as all of its other citizens.

If the city is attacked, the visitors can leave like rats escaping a sinking ship, but he cannot leave because he lives there, and therefore is responsible for the defense of the city, even though it is not the city in which he was born and raised. If that state is the United States, and he is between 18 and 25 years of age he must register with the Selective Service in case the military draft is ever reinstated.

I first learned of this principle of responsibility when an old man in Mexico who was my host for many visits over many years told me that during World War II he was tried and convicted for refusing to be drafted and was sent to the federal penitentiary for several years. He, and the U.S. government, had a different view about the responsibilities of foreign permanent residents.

The point is that visitors-guests are not subject to the same jurisdiction as the members of a family, tribe, city-state, or national society. The father of Barack Obama, was not subject to the political jurisdiction of Washington because he was a guest visitor allowed in on a temporary basis in order to attend college. He could not be drafted and sent to fight in Vietnam or anywhere else. He was instead subject solely to the political jurisdiction of London, i.e. the British government, and was under the protection of international treaties.

Since he was free from Washington's jurisdiction, the 14th Amendment had no application to anyone born to him within U.S. borders. The amendment does not use the word "or", it uses the word "and" -as in "and subject" along with being U.S. born. It must be both, -not one or the other. But the perverters of its clear and unmistakable language, whether in government, or courtrooms, are either suffering infection with the urban myth and are ignorant of the truth, or know better but are harboring an agenda to promote ever greater numbers of government-dependent Democrat voters created via "anchor baby" citizenship. That's their agenda, -not the intent to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States".

They despise the Constitution because it's self-evident words are a giant road-block to national and world domination by the foolishly unwise, naive, and idealistic Marxist elites who know for a fact that they know what's best for you and should therefore be allowed to make major decisions on your behalf, in other words, -be your master. They mean to be good masters (by any means necessary) but first and foremost they mean to be masters. Elections are the means to that end, but if an inflexible, out-dated thing like the Constitution gets in the way, then it must be "tunneled under, pole-vaulted over", or just plain ignored. And that is just what they've done, -have done for 100 years, and will continue to do as long as they have breath.

Let's reword the 14th Amendment to convey its actual meaning, -how about this: "No person is a citizen of the United States who is not understood to be subject to the political will of Washington, but is subject instead to the political will of a foreign nation." That would describe everyone with every type of citizenship, whether naturalized, derivative, native-born or natural born. But obtaining citizenship would be a problem for foreigners because it has one short-coming. It doesn't require birth within the United States. Children of legal permanent resident aliens must be born within the United States or else the 14th Amendment grant of citizenship doesn't apply to them. But children of natural citizens can be born anywhere on earth.

No one has ever said, nor will ever say, that Barack Obama could have been born anywhere on earth and yet still be an American citizen (much less President) through the historical and tradition means of being born to an American father. It wouldn't have been true before nor after the ratification of the Constitution, or the 14th Amendment because citizenship was passed from the father to the children. His children were his property and they were, via birthright inheritance, whatever he was. It was their natural unalienable right to be a member of the group into which they were born, and that group was the group to which their father belonged.

That right is the third natural right that all social creatures are born with. The first and second are the right to live, and the right to belong to one's own parents. If those three unalienable rights could be eliminated, the basis of civilization and social cohesion, whether human or animal, would not exist. Life would end as we know it because every social creature would not belong to anything or anyone. All would be individuals. Membership in any group would not be natural but random. Cougars being members of wolf packs, lions being members of hyena packs, American citizens being also citizens of North Korea, and vice versa. Somali pirates being citizens of Israel, etc. Parents would have no responsibility toward their young, and the young would have no right to have parents or membership in any natural human group. Those three rights prohibit abandonment, murder, cannibalism, infanticide, genocide, and an "every man for himself" barbarism.

The right to live and the right to belong are the lowest foundations upon which all societies are built. In addition to belonging to one's own parents, one also belongs to their group. That is the Law of Natural Membership, and it conveys a right via blood connection which no man or government can legitimately abrogate.

It's also the principle by which Barack Obama is not a natural member of the American tribe since his blood connection was to an outsider who possessed no right of membership in the group that owned the land on which he produced a son. He was totally an outsider, -a foreigner, -a guest in the society to which he did not belong and to which he had no responsibility of membership. Therefore his son was, as was declared on Barack Obama's own website, subject like his father, to the authority of the British Nationality Act of 1948 (not to U.S. jurisdiction).

But why am I having to figure all this out and share it with everyone? Why isn't the government telling people these facts? It's because thick, heavy curtains of secrecy and silence have fallen across the entire land, including around all of those in the government and the main-stream media. As far as conspiracies go, this is the biggest one in world history because it involves such widespread complicity (via silence) from those who know the truth but fear it as unspeakable, -almost unthinkable, -failing and refusing to alert, educate, warn, or acknowledge the truth to the vast numbers of ignorant citizens who go about their lives oblivious to the situation of an unconstitutional President occupying the White House. If only Barack Obama was ignorant of the truth, but he knows it all too well and has unknown supporters who resort to fear-inducing intimidation which its victims can't resist yielding to.

Barack Obama's citizenship is totally dependent on his birth place having been within U.S. borders and yet if the 14th Amendment did not apply to him through his father, then what is the source of his citizenship? It is only through his mother's citizenship, but citizenship being derived from one's married mother did not even exist a century ago. Its existence today is due to immigration law. If Barack Obama had been born a century ago he would have been born to a British father and mother because his mother would have been "expatriated by marriage" to a foreigner. By the Nationality Act of 1907 she would have lost her American citizenship. No children born to her would possess American citizenship. They would be purely British.

That law was eventually repealed (1922 Cable Act) but what followed it was immigration law that allowed the mother's citizenship to be conveyed to her children if she divorced her foreign husband. Later still, she didn't have to divorce him. Her children would be born with dual-citizenship, -something that was always antithetical to American principles, just as bigamy is antithetical to American religious values, so dual allegiance, like dual marriage, was unacceptable also. You were married either to the United States or to another country, -like that of your foreign father. If you truly wanted to become an American, you had to go through a complete severing of all ties of allegiance to your homeland. In other other words, you had to divorce your motherland. You had to cut the umbilical cord via the Oath of Allegiance and Renunciation. All naturalized citizens still must take that oath. It's no small thing. It's like a divorce and remarriage on the same day at the same time. They have to become just like a natural citizen, they have to be natural-ized. It doesn't take a genius to know that one who is a citizen via naturalization, or naturalization law, is not a "natural born citizen" as required by the Constitution.

But the ignorant public has been duped by the urban myth that anyone and everyone born on U.S. soil, -except children of foreign representatives, automatically is an American citizen, and that every American child born outside of U.S. borders is an alien who needs government permission to be a U.S. citizen, (even if born to the son and grandson of U.S. Presidents), and therefore would be ineligible to be President one day because without the magical moment of delivery happening within America's man-made borders no one is a natural member of the American nation and therefore describable by the Constitution's language as being a natural born citizen. Transient, impermanent, irrelevant location within abstract, artificial man-made borders is EVERYTHING, but blood-connection birthright inheritance from U.S. citizen parents is NOTHING.

Think about this fact; if a teleportation device were to be invented in the future, then millions of citizens of India and elsewhere would teleport into an American location at delivery time, and after filling out birth certificate information they'd teleport back home. That would result in them obtaining a state birth certificate, and

that would be accepted as evidence of U.S. citizenship, even though it isn't. The teleportation device is fictional but the rest is totally representative of how the bastardization of U.S. citizenship concepts has led to us being the laughing stock of the world. European nations aren't laughing though because they've been the victims of the world's most asinine immigration policies for many regrettable decades. And now Canada isn't much better. Our punishment for foreign women entering the U.S. to give birth here is to reward them with the greatest gift they could hope for. It's like one's punishment for stealing lottery tickets is to win the lottery. We truly are living in a convoluted, Twilight Zone of national stupidity.

Where are the men and women who will fix the situation? Regrettably, there aren't many, but those who exist are met by an impenetrable wall in Washington where they discover to their frustration that we are ruled by an elite oligarchy of 11 kings who are answerable to no one, nine of whom reign in the Supreme Court, and two of whom rule as gods in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Nothing happens without their permission. Nothing is even voted on without their permission. And so nothing can become law unless they and they alone give their consent. Maybe democracy once existed, perhaps in the first Congress ever, perhaps for one bright shining moment there existed an American democratic Camelot, but in order to avoid chaos, humans eventually return to the autocratic, monarchical, strong-leader model and that model rules our Congress. Democracy deliberately prevents democracy, but I can't recall even one person ever raising a complaint. We accept such a state of affairs as the sheeple that we are. We either have a huge problem with rules, or a huge problem with fools, -or both. But I digress.

We have a sitting President, running for reelection, who is constitutionally not eligible to serve but everyone who should realize that fact either does not or remains silent. Just as the nation did when 100,000 fellow Americans were ordered out of their homes during WWII and sent off to concentration camps out in the middle of nowhere, and no one complained for decades. He has sought to bolster his eligibility credibility by having a computer-fabricated image depicting an official birth certificate abstract representation of an original micro-film photo released on the internet under the pretense that it is a scan of a real document when no such document exists, and never has. No person, group, authority, or organization has ever received a certified copy of Obama's non-existent long-form birth certificate because there is no U.S. hospital birth record upon which it would need to be based. No authority of any type has ever examined what the White House conspirators want us all to believe actually exists, -expecting us to unquestioningly believe based simply on a nine layer imitation image that every national security service in the world knows is a total fake. The security services of nations like Russia, England, France and Germany do not tell their leaders what they know because they know that they would not want to know such a thing when they have to deal with the American leader as if he is totally legit. It's like the butler knowing that the master of the manor is cheating on his wife but his wife doesn't want to hear such a thing and so he remains silent. That is the reasonable choice because silence is the path of least resistance, and because of that fact we can be assured that we will see much more of it. No one will speak the unspeakable. No one will say that the emperor has no constitutional clothes, and so powerless voices crying in the wilderness are all that is preventing a total black-out of the truth. But when it seems there's no reason to hope, something might happen like what happened with Emperor Constantine when a miraculous sign appeared and changed the whole course of history.

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