

## ~Obama: A Citizen by Grace & President by Fraud

(-citizenship by Right vs citizenship by Law)

By Adrien Nash [obama--nation.com](http://obama--nation.com)

Webster's New World Dictionary:

"Fraud: an intentional deception, or dishonesty; a person who deceives or is not what he pretends to be"

"Usurp/ Usurpation: to take or assume and hold (power, position, rights, etc.) by force or without right, "

The answer to the most important question in the 2012 Presidential election is one on which the eligibility of the candidate for the Democrat Party depends. That question, which will never be asked, is this: "Was Barack Obama born as a natural citizen of America or a natural citizen of Kenya?". But a more illuminating question is this one; "Was John McCain born as a natural citizen of the United States or born as a natural citizen of Panama?

To answer that question the mind reaches for an understanding of how things should be and how things actually are. And are things actually as they should be? And exactly how should they be? Simple, children should be born as members of the same group as their parents, regardless of where they are born. That is the principle of Natural Law and natural membership, and it's followed by possibly every people and nation on Earth.

As a result, John McCain was born as a natural U.S. citizen and not a Panamanian citizen because his parents were Americans and not Panamanians. Neither were they immigrants to Panama nor owed it any allegiance. They were outsiders. But they were not outsiders in regard to America. They were members, -they were citizens. They had certain American rights, -as did their son. One of them was the unalienable right to possess the same nationality as his parents. That was not a right bestowed upon him by any law or policy of government. It was a right bestowed by He who made all things, including the natural order of things, -an order observable

in Nature and translatable to human society and national organization.

All things that reproduce create off-spring that are the same as themselves except in the unnatural situation when unlike things pro-create off-spring that are unnatural hybrids. The equivalent in the political realm is when a couple with different nationalities produce an off-spring that is not a natural member or native of either nation because he is not the issue of solely one, nor the other, but of both, resulting in the creation of a political hybrid which has neither nationality alone, but a combination of the two.

If you combine two glasses of water in a third glass, the result is a glass of water, -one uniform singular substance. The same goes for glasses of oil. But if you combine a glass of water with a glass of oil, the result is an unnatural mixture, -an unnatural combination of substances, -substances that are entirely different and do not combine. The same with citizenship and the competing authority of two separate governments. One person with two nationalities creates a conundrum of conflicting authority and national allegiance. Such a conundrum is an unnatural national government competition.

National allegiance is incompatible with dual citizenship and dual allegiance. Dual citizenship is never a politically natural thing but rather is an unusual exception to the normal rule of citizenship:

~One nation, ~one people, ~one government, one language, ~one allegiance, ~one citizenship.

Think of how entire nations celebrate their citizens and teams winning in the Olympic games. They are all of one mind and one heart. Cities react similarly when their team wins the Super-bowl or World Series.

If one city has two competing teams and they both end up as finalists in their sport, there will be little enthusiasm for the competition because of the unnatural duality which causes the absence of a singular devotion. Dual or split allegiance mutes and neutralizes the sense of enthusiasm that would normally and naturally be

devoted to just one side. The same with nations, nationalism, loyalty, and allegiance. Only singularity (uniformity) is natural in the natural realm, -likewise in the political realm. The union of parents with a singular citizenship results in one born with natural citizenship, not an unnatural dual (or hybrid) citizenship.

Natural citizenship, like natural membership, is not something resulting from any laws other than the laws of nature. No laws were passed to bestow it. It goes unmentioned in the body of law that governs the nation. It's fundamental. It's beyond any need of being legislated. It can't be given or bestowed by man because it is an inherent inheritance of every living being. It is an unalienable right.

But not all citizenship is in that same class. There is a class of citizenship that is not natural but results instead from national law that allows it. That class of citizenship, describable as statutory citizenship, or citizenship-by-law, is not an unalienable right. It is not bestowed via the principle of natural inheritance but instead is bestowed by the choice and will of authorities, be they autocrats, monarchs, dictators, or representatives of free citizens.

Just ask any naturalized citizen about the nature of their citizenship and they will be totally clear that it is entirely the result of the grace of the government. But no natural citizen has any impression in the slightest that his citizenship is the result of someone in the government signing something that grants him citizenship.

Only natural citizenship is unalienable. Only citizenship that is unalienable is natural. They go together. But all citizens lacking natural unalienable citizenship are ineligible to be the President of the United States because they were born with foreign parentage rather than purely American parentage. They have no unalienable right to U.S. citizenship and they have no singular home country, and therefore no unquestionable singular allegiance.

Only those whose only home is America, - whose only allegiance and attachment is to

America are natural citizens. No one born of a foreigner inherits a natural right to be an American. That privilege is something granted them by law, -by the grace of a nation, -even if from birth, but it is not theirs by an unalienable right.

The man occupying the presidency of the United States is a citizen solely by the grace of the U.S. government via the laws passed by the Congress. The Constitution of the United States allows all such citizens to serve their country in any elected office in the land, except one. They are barred from serving as the President & Commander-In-Chief.

That prohibition begins with the exclusionary words: "NO PERSON.." (meaning no citizen) "except a natural born citizen...shall be eligible to the office of the President,".

The man elected President always knew about this prohibition, especially being a constitutional scholar and all, but was willingly swept-up into running for the office anyway, putting the social good he imagined he could bring about ahead of any devotion or allegiance to the Constitution.

Thus, upon inauguration he swore an oath which he was immediately in violation of by the mere act of taking it since it was an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the CONSTITUTION of the United States from all enemies, which includes those who would willfully violate it. He thus had sworn an oath to protect the Constitution from the likes of himself, -one who had no unalienable right to be an American nor any right to run for the highest office in the land. Barack Obama knowingly made that choice to violate the clear prohibition of the Constitution, and he means to do it again if given a second chance.

A.R, Nash Jan. 2012