

## Constitutional Facts versus Unconstitutional Fraud

The People of the United States went to the polls in November of 2008 and proceeded to unknowingly elect a President who was constitutionally unqualified to serve. But no one said a word about that fact, including the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court who knew better. Some things are just too dangerous to handle, and that issue, like unstable nitroglycerin, would not be touched by anyone.

Four years have ticked by since the appearance of a political unknown whom unseen backers pushed to the front of the race for the presidency. Back then the only candidate whose qualification skeptics questioned was John McCain since he was born in Panama instead of the United States. That controversy was perfect for his opponent since it presented the falsehood that where a candidate is born is vital to one's qualification to be President, when that misconception is totally false.

If John McCain had had an African father instead of a Navy Officer, and had been born in Hawaii, would he have been viewed differently? Congress commissioned two respected attorneys to look into the matter of McCain's citizenship and what its nature might be and they reported back that since he was the progeny of American parents he was therefore a natural born American as the Constitution requires for the presidency. Therefore it would not matter if he was born on the moon. But Barack Obama? What if he had been born in Panama to an African father? Would he nevertheless be eligible to be President?

Absolutely not. But what about his eligibility being based on his supposed birth in Hawaii? Isn't he eligible because of the constitutional provision of the 14th Amendment which covers those born in the United States?

The elegantly simple but incompetently vague sentence structure of the 14th Amendment resulted in

such an ambiguous statute that even the highest officials in the United States naturalization law division didn't know for sure what it meant since it seemed to overturned the practice of the citizenship of children being passed by patrilineal descent from father to child, -which had been the policy from the founding of the nation.

The problem was that it did so without stating so. That left it open to interpretation and the executive branch and its departments and bureaus exercised their duty and responsibility to follow the law as they understood it. They understood it to have not changed because they viewed immigrant foreigners as not being subjects of the U.S. Government since they remained subject to their own government.

Eventually, three full decades later, its lack of clarity led to the Supreme Court decision that resulted from the case of the U.S. government versus Wong Kim Ark, an American-born son of Chinese immigrants.

Upon returning to the U.S. after visiting China for the second time, he was not granted entry on the basis that he was not a U.S. citizen. The high court's ruling was to tell the Immigration Service, State Department and Justice Department that the 14th Amendment changed things and was the controlling principle in the case. Their reasoning was the result of parsing the words of the 14th Amendment that read: "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof", which meant that those born in the U.S., raised in the U.S., permanent residents of the U.S. and no other country, are to be considered, regardless of race or other background, to be native-born citizens of the U.S. because of their relationship to the U.S. government.

Their relationship was deemed to be one of being subject to U.S. jurisdiction because they were not a part of any other nation or society, and therefore their relationship to their home country was undivided by any foreign allegiance or obligation or tangible connection. Their roots being American (-by living and growing up in the American world) required that they be deemed to be Americans, and

thus the court ruled that he was indeed an American citizen, -regardless of the long historical precedence of such persons being considered to have the citizenship of the parents only. Such a person could not logically be viewed as *not* being subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. federal government because their father was.

This ruling was based on a principle, and that principle implied the existence of another principle, which is that if some native-born children of immigrant parents *are* subject to U.S. jurisdiction, it must therefore follow that there exists a set of persons who are *not* subject to U.S. jurisdiction and need to be blocked from inclusion in the American family. If the ruling declared that *all* native born persons are automatically U.S. citizens, then the clause requiring that they also be subject to U.S. jurisdiction would be pointless and unnecessary.

But Amendments aren't written with such unnecessary excess baggage. Such words absolutely have real meaning, and not meeting the meaning of those words leaves a native-born person without constitutionally legitimate citizenship.

Persons who do not meet the meaning of those words are those who were born to transient foreign visitors and government representatives who by happenstance were not able to return to their own country before giving birth. Those foreign parents were subject to the jurisdiction of their own country, -the country of their citizenship, the country of their home, and not U.S. Jurisdiction.

They, unlike Americans and permanent resident immigrants, could not be ordered to be drafted, nor to register with the Selective Service, (nor buy private health care insurance) but they could easily be ordered to be deported if they stayed beyond the limit of their visa.

The other area of ambiguity of the 14th Amendment is due to the fact that no time frame is given. Babies aren't normally subject to any jurisdiction except that of their parents, so what applies to the

parents also applies to their children. So by extension, the babies born to Visa Card visitors are also not subject to U.S. Jurisdiction.

But,...what if after they grow up abroad, then return to the United States and obtain permanent U.S. Residency? They could then claim that they are thus fully subject to U.S. jurisdiction, and since they were born in the United States, they thereby fulfill the requirements of the 14th Amendment and do not need to be naturalized in order to become a citizen. Talk about ambiguity!

If they weren't subject at birth but became so as adults, does the wording of the 14th Amendment intend that they be deemed to have been thereby transmuted into citizens? It's such ambiguous sentence construction that results in such preventable complications.

The wording of the 14th Amendment could have been made crystal clear if the authors had really thought through all the possible interpretations that their wording gave it. They could have and should have worded it something like this: "All naturalized citizens are citizens constitutionally [as opposed to legislatively, administratively or judicially] and all persons subject to the full jurisdiction of the United States at birth are recognized as citizens of the United States." That would have described all citizens, -the merely native-born as well as all natural born.

Extrapolating the true meaning of the 14th Amendment results in the conclusion that Barack Obama is not a U.S. citizen by its intent since his father was not a foreign immigrant with permanent resident status, but was merely a foreign visitor here on a student visa.

Therefore it doesn't matter that he was born in the United States. What matters is the status of his parents at the time of his birth. His father had no U.S. citizenship that he could inherit, he wasn't subject to U.S. jurisdiction when his child was born, therefore the child's American citizenship was sole-

ly dependent on the status of his mother and not on the 14th Amendment.

Mothers historically had acquired the citizenship of their foreign-citizen husbands, and he, the head of the household, was the only parent to transmit citizenship to their children. But back in the 1920's U.S. law gave women the right to pass their citizenship to their children -but only if certain conditions were met. Those conditions were relaxed further with each revision of the Nationality Act. In 1961 it required the American mother to have lived in the United States for 5 years after the age of 14 if a child was born outside the United States.

Since Obama's mother was not yet 19 when he was born, he would not be a citizen automatically via his mother's citizenship unless he was born within the United States. These facts lead to two disqualifying possibilities, of which one is certainly true.

If Barack Obama was not born in the United States then he was not born as an American citizen. Such a possibility would explain why he has not shown the American public that which all Americans can show, which is a certified hard-copy birth certificate from an American hospital.

He, like every adult in every modern country in the world would have possessed one for the many important identity-proving circumstances in life. So why, all of a sudden in 2008 did he have to request from Hawaii that which he surely already possessed just like everyone else in the country?

It must be because the copy that he already possessed indicates something that disqualifies him from being President.

Instead he's produced two fake digitally created birth certificate computer images, but has not allowed anyone competent to see any hard-copy to determine that it is not just one more of the tens of thousands of counterfeit birth certificates that have been produced since home computers, powerful software and printers became available.

Nor has he shown the public the copy of his birth certificate that his mother obtained for him in order to get a passport before moving to Indonesia.

These facts imply a high probability that the hand-written statement in the Hawaiian vital records archive, which the governor said is all that could be found (along with a typed form) reveals something that may relate to the location of his birth. Whatever it is that it states is something he does not want the American people to know. And that could be that he was not born in the United States, but somewhere else, possibly Canada, (which isn't far from Seattle where his mother is known to have been a mere two weeks after his birth).

It's entirely reasonable to speculate on the probability of a scenario in which she spent a week in Vancouver after giving birth there, possibly with the intent of giving the unwanted child of a foreign bigamist up for adoption. There is no record that proves otherwise.

But the fact that she was not living with her "husband", nor living in Hawaii, is evidence that a fraud has been perpetrated on the American public, and even embodied in Obama's autobiographical book in which he claimed that they lived together for two years and then divorced. But his mother did not return to Hawaii to live until after Obama Sr. had left to attend Harvard.

His mother lived in Seattle after his birth and went to college there where she had grown up from 13 years of age until graduation from High School. Her only connection to Hawaii was that her parents had up-rooted her for the 5th time and moved there after she completed High School.

So conclusions can logically be drawn and they don't support the narrative that everyone has been fed.

The other Article II disqualifying circumstance of Obama's birth is the fact that no one whose citizenship is defined in law is eligible to be the President

because all such persons are not natural born citizens.

The citizenship of natural born citizens is not established by any legislation, administrative ruling, Supreme Court ruling, nor by the Constitution itself. Natural born citizenship predates everything written regarding citizenship because everything written is written regarding Native Americans, or children born to immigrants, foreigners, or domestically located representatives of foreign governments, or to those born abroad.

There never has been a need to author any legal declaration regarding natural citizenship anymore than there has ever been a need to establish a right of citizens to marry or be parents. The right to marry is also not found in the body of the Constitution because it also was viewed as an unalienable human right, -as an understood fact embodied in the fundamental principles stated in the Declaration of Independence.

The citizenship of natural born citizens is based on the political equivalent of Natural Law, i.e., citizens give birth to citizens naturally.

Hybrids, or hyphenated citizens, are not natural citizens, anymore than hybrids in nature are natural off-spring. This fact, (political inheritance), has been the basis of citizenship being passed down to subsequent generations for thousands of years. The citizenship of Barack Obama does not follow this model but instead is based on the legally defined model due to the hybrid nature of his parentage.

Anyone with legally defined citizenship is ineligible to be the President because they are outside of the parameters of being natural citizens.

The public assumes that native-birth alone is sufficient to being eligible but is generally unaware that parentage is actually the true criteria.

Having been lulled into thinking that Obama has proven his birth to have been in Hawaii, they are asleep regarding the fact that Obama is ineligible to be the President because of the nature of his citizenship, regardless of where he was born, but especially if he was not born in America.

These are facts, not theories, and regardless of how far our nation has drifted into error and ignorance, the facts are the facts and cannot be changed just to suit the desires of a political party, nor the desires of the entire population.

Only a repeal of Article II Section I, paragraph 5 of the Constitution can change what is right and correct and Constitutionally binding on all candidates for the Presidency. Since Barack Obama does not meet the requirement of being a natural all-American citizen, he is ineligible to be the President of the United States.

That fact is unacknowledged in our nation today, but the day will come after Obama's days as President are over, that someone will finally raise the issue and the truth will become known. Then the law-abiding citizens of the nation will be in shock, disgust, and anger that such a thing was allowed to happen and no one raised their voice against it, including the opposition.

People will be concerned about kind of nation we've become, and question our ability to even grasp our problems, much less ever solve them.

The questions will be; "How did we become so ignorant?" "How did we become so unquestioning?" "How did we become so gullible?" "How did we become so much like sheep?"

The blame will be everywhere and those who knew the true but hid it will be pariahs. The implications for all the legislation that Obama has signed, and the persons he has appointed will be imponderable. There will be no path to follow, no guide book that explains how to respond. Then people will see that there was something seriously wrong in America which created a climate in which such a travesty was possible.

They will eventually realize that what was wrong was the abandonment of the principle of the rule of law. The proclivities of the secure, self-serving political class, along with the apathy and acquiescence of the public, led to ever greater enlargement of the federal government without having any legal basis in the United States Constitution.

By our ignorance and indifference to what was happening we allowed our country to drift away from its sole sure foundation, the hub that holds all of the spokes of our political system together.

We slept through the ever increasing usurpation of the rights guaranteed to the States and the People in the Tenth Amendment to the very Constitution, which was specifically written to avoid the very power-grab that occurred anyway in violation of its clear, unequivocal statement.

Every vote, both the necessary and the definitely unnecessary, that usurped authority away from those who were granted it by the Constitution, was a vote that was treasonous to the charter that the nation's leaders swore an oath to preserve, protect and defend.

Where was their sincerity, their honesty, their allegiance and loyalty to the one thing that they were required by their solemn oath to follow, namely the Constitution? It was all subverted and replaced by self-aggrandizement and an excessive sense of security since, as a body, they are answerable to no one, (except occasionally the Supreme Court, -which is answerable to no one).

Men and women devoid of honor have no sense of obligation to fulfill the commitment of an oath which to them is as rote as the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Oath of Allegiance taken by all federal officers, as well as State officers, requires allegiance to one thing. It's not their country, it's not their countrymen, it's not their branch of government, nor the government of the nation. It is allegiance only to the Constitution, -not allegiance to their personal sense of what is best for themselves, best for their constituents, best for their re-election, best for their political party, best for the current year, best for the ever-expanding government, nor best for the country.

True allegiance, sacred honor, fidelity and honesty are absent from the souls of the folks that citizens

rely on to be faithful to the words of the Constitution -the charter on which we depend to protect our liberties. If it can mean anything that we want it to mean, then it can also mean whatever the overlords waiting in the wings decide that it will mean.

When the new charter of how our new nation was to be constituted was completed, and then solemnly ratified by every individual State, it was viewed as the most important thing in existence, with the exception of the Holy Scriptures, because it was the only possible means to escape the morass of tyranny, injustice, corruption, and decadence of the nations of Europe. The founders feared that a lack of fidelity to it, or even a betrayal of it, would lead to very regrettable results, and those results are no longer theoretical possibilities, but are the awful realities of the present and the future.

If the founding fathers were resurrected and put in full command of the government, they would be like Jesus in the Temple driving out the money-changers who corrupted the place, -making it a "den of thieves". Heads would roll, figuratively speaking.

Just as they feared abuse of federal power, they also feared the abuse of the authority to borrow money. That authority has been one of the sources of our prosperity, but is now leading to our gradual impoverishment.

Nothing will stop our ever accelerating course toward economic ruin except a resurrection of respect for our most fundamental law, the law upon which our system is constructed.

Just as a wheel will collapse if the hub is allowed to fail, so our nation will face economic collapse if the Constitution is not adhered to, because without it there is no constraint on the desire and ability of those in power to spend money that they do not have. Some day the piper will have to be paid, and that day is in the foreseeable future. Bank on it. Doom is on the calendar because no one has it in them to dispense the medicine that is badly needed.

by A.R. Nash <http://h2ooflife.wordpress.com>