

A Zombie Press, Lobotomized Government, & A Naturalized President

~mongrels, mules, Obama & nuclear Bombs

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 men, -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 legal tradition that was once followed and made perfect sense and worked perfectly well even though it was based on Judeo-Christian subjugation of wives to their husbands, -as was justified in the book of **Genesis** where it's stated that it shall be so because Eve tempted Adam with the fruit of the tree of the Knowledge of Good & Evil, and therefore **subjugation to her husband** was her punishment since it led to "the Fall of Man" and their banishment from the Garden of Eden. Women got the blame and that justified and fortified **patriarchal authority** which followed human nature even without religious justification.

In the male dominated traditions of the world, women are not endowed with the many rights that are reserved only for "the real 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.

But the tradition that is most curious from today's perspective is that American women once lost their national group membership when/if they married outside of their national family. Their citizenship was then switched from American to that of the husband. It's known as "**expatriation by marriage**".

Whatever the foreign 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. Under that system no submissive wife would be heard saying; "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 the governments of two different nations.

That policy became the U.S. law in 1907 and remained so until 1922. All of the children born to those American women were born without U.S. citizenship. They could not become citizens except by naturalization as adults or by repatriation of their mother following divorce or death of their father. For many years, those native-born American women could not become United States citizens again until their husband renounced his own citizenship and became a naturalized American, or they divorced.

The situation of those American women demonstrates that citizenship through one's mother has always been a matter of state and federal law or policy. It has never been equal to the citizenship obtained from one's father. The citizenship from a father is the birthright of his children and is theirs automatically even without benefit of any law or government permission. That citizenship is their natural citizenship, while that of the mother is dependent on laws, judicial rulings, or current administrative policy.

What does this have to do with anything relevant? Only this; if between 1907 and 1922, Barack Obama's mother, Stanley Ann Dunham, had become pregnant by a foreign student and then became married to him, by the legal tradition described above, which became American law through the Nationality Act of 1907, she would have, at that time, become a subject of the British Empire only and the only citizenship that would

have passed to her son was that of the husband and father. So at birth, by the British Nationality Act of that era, 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.

Blog quote: "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, from birth, **native-born** statutory dual-citizens due to naturalization law.

Although they would inherit their mother's citizenship as a recently-granted right, 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 political nature/ nationality as their mother and therefore their nature could not be describable as purely & naturally American.

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 a little less equal than others when it comes to being the Commander In Chief.

Barack Obama's United States citizenship has its origin not with his Kenyan father by blood connection, nor with the 14th Amendment since it wasn't written to apply to foreign visitors, tourists, or students but only to State Department sanctioned legal immigrants subject to the full authority of the federal government of the United States.

Thus his citizenship was dependent on that of his mother alone and that form of citizenship is dependent on the machinations of government and is not an unalienable natural right but a government-granted privilege.

Understand this; any citizen whose citizenship is ascribed to them by human decree is not a natural citizen but a man-made, half-blood, statutory, naturalized citizen.

He is therefore not a natural citizen of the United States as the U.S. Constitution requires of anyone elected to serve as President. Anyone found ineligible to serve was to be disqualified by the U.S. Senate following the presidential election. But they are like lobotomized zombies when it comes to the unmentionable subject of Barry Obama's constitutional eligibility.

Many will erroneously assume that Obama obtained American citizenship automatically by being born in the United States, (a "fact" not yet proven by any legitimate certified and authenticated hard-

copy birth certificate evidence) but that belief is not backed by actual U.S. Law.

The 14th Amendment, written for freed slaves, and not written to apply to foreign guests or diplomats (nor even for children of immigrants) 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.

But since Obama Sr. was merely a Visa Card student from Kenya and not an immigrant with permanent resident status granted by the State Dept., making him subject to the full jurisdiction of the federal government, 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 would be under his jurisdiction and therefore, through him, under British jurisdiction, -not American. The 14th Amendment language excluded his child from U.S. citizenship since the father was a non-immigrant alien.

That's the law, even if it's ignored by the liberals and ignorati in the State Department, in the White House, in the Congress, and in the Courts. The actual law is not being enforced because it is not inclusive enough for the open-border liberals who represent enough votes to intimidate every politician from calling for fidelity to the actual law.

Barack Obama openly affirms that he was a British subject by birth but he relies on the widespread false assumption that by being born within the borders of the United States he magically pos-

sessed a birthright to claim American citizenship, which is simply false.

But even if born 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 of either nation since natural citizens are saddled with no duality, -no foreignness, -no alienage and no secondary allegiance. Instead they're the product of only one uniform nationality.

But was he even a U.S. citizen at all? That depends on where he was born. Under naturalization law in effect in 1961, if he was born outside of the United States then his mother's citizenship would not have passed to him because she was a few months too young for that to happen.

That's obviously an excellent reason to have a counterfeit digital image of an official Hawaiian birth certificate fabricated and then to post it online, -all the while pretending that the image is from a scan of a real document even though no real document exists.

But even if he was actually born in Hawaii, that wouldn't make him somewhat more eligible to be President because you either are a natural citizen of the United States or you are not, and he is not. No matter where he was born, no birth place can make him a natural U.S. citizen because it's not about where he was born but to whom he was *not* born.

He was not born to an American father and that fact disqualifies him from serving as President because only American fathers can produce natural American sons.

Obama had a foreign father and that resulted in a child that was a hybrid cross-combination of two competing nationalities. Cross-breed hybrid combinations are the opposite of natural combinations and can never result in a natural member of a single uniform group.

In the natural realm, that fact is seen by the results of crossing a pure-bred poodle and a bull-dog. The puppies will be canines (just as cross-combinations of political parentage results in children that are citizens), but they will not be pure-bred poodles nor bull-dogs.

An example from the human realm is that of a Kenyan man, who visits China to study the language, -and impregnates and marries a Chinese woman, -and then has a child by her. Will the child be a natural born Negro or a natural born Asian? Will it be a natural born Kenyan citizen, or a natural born Chinese citizen?

The question itself seems as unnatural as any attempt at a logical answer, -because there is no logical one-or-the-other answer. That's because such a child would not be a natural anything.

It would be an un-natural combination of disparate origins. It's citizenship could not be derived from any principle of the natural world because it would not even exist in the natural world. Like mules, which are a more extreme version of poodle-bull dog mongrels since they are sterile and can't produce off-spring like themselves nor their parents (a male horse and female donkey).

Such off-spring are hybrids and the test of whether or not a person is eligible to be President is extrapolated from the situation of political hybrids. They can't beget citizens that are like themselves nor like their parents. If the citizenship with which one is born is not identical to one's father then one is not a natural citizen. Natural citizens have the same citizenship as their father, and their children do as well (unless they produce children with a foreign woman).

Barack Obama Jr. cannot produce children with the same citizenship as Barack Obama Sr., but his children can produce children some day with the same citizenship as their father, thus passing the test of Presidential eligibility which shows that they are natural born American citizens.

Obama Jr. could have fathered Kenyan citizens if he had embraced his Kenyan citizenship after reaching adulthood and renounced his United States citizenship, -thereby choosing the opposite of what he chose, but if he had then he would have been incapable of fathering U.S. citizen children. Being a hybrid, he had to make a choice upon reaching adulthood because Kenya does not or did not bestow its permanent citizenship upon foreign-born children who do not pledge their allegiance to Kenya and Kenya alone.

Natural born citizens never have to choose between two competing allegiances, citizenships, and nationalities because none exist. They are born of members of only one group, one tribe, one nation, with one allegiance, one citizenship, and one government.

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.

Hybrids are rather rare since the situations that produce them aren't common. But modern high-speed travel makes it much more possible for Americans to live, work, and marry abroad (as is true of some in my family) or to visit the homeland of one's foreign father and possibly meet and marry someone from his country, -thus producing hybrids that are not natural but are less *un*-natural. Their children's background would be 75% from one group and only 25% from the other. But none of them would be natural citizens of either country, -though to unequal degrees.]

Hybrids are never natural, -not in the plant, -the animal, -the human, nor the political realm. They are akin to conjoined twins with one pair of legs. Two origins, -two natures, when its natural to have only one.

Obama Jr. was born with a political nature that's akin to being a hermaphrodite, -to being a mongrel, -a cross-breed, and it is that type of citizenship (distinctly *not* 100% American) which the framers of the Constitution expressly forbid.

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 97% 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 after their generation had passed, and they wrote that in stone into the Constitution. "No person, except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of the President."

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.**”

If they had allowed national citizenship to be determined solely by place of birth, then the sons of royals and British aristocrats, even, hypothetically, the son of the King of England, if born within the territory of one of the States of America, could have one day commanded all the military power of the nation after winning election to the presidency.

Alternately, if the son of the dictator of Mexico had been born say in Texas or a border state, then, even though raised in Mexico to be its ruler, he could also run for the office of the President of the

United States. Does any sane person really think that that is what the founding fathers intended? -That they didn't require that the Chief of all of the American military (and now also nuclear) forces be 100% American? Why in the world would they allow anyone with less "American-ness" have such command authority?

Does the United States military allow foreigners, naturalized Americans, or hybrid Americans to have access to, knowledge of, and control over nuclear bombs? Absolutely not. They must be vetted to have a spotless, non-foreign background because it's already proven that even high ranking natural born Americans can be traitors and spies, -so how much more is there reason to be unsure about the allegiance and loyalty of one fathered by and raised by a foreigner?

We've learned the hard way in this age of radical Jihadist terrorism that enemies may live among us and pretend to be just like us while they await the day that they will no longer be "sleeper agents", -or self-appointed future warriors for the Grand Caliphate fantasy, and will finally attack American citizens and cities.

We are not the only ones to ever have such concerns because the founding fathers had very real similar concerns about the loyalists in America who supported the British instead of the revolutionaries. But they were magnanimous and trusted in the wisdom of the authorities that managed immigration in each of the individual sovereign States and believed that immigrants could be trusted in time, with naturalization, to hold every office in the land, except the one that holds the reins of absolute power over the military might of the nation. That person must be a natural citizen of the United States.

And when, after the passage of decades, -after all of those who fought the enemy through a bitter war, and served the struggling nation in its quest to survive, -after all of them had passed away and there were none left to serve as President,

who could be entrusted with the office of the President among those who would be born into the nation without having had any experience in its creation?

The undivided, unquestionable loyalty of the Commander-in-Chief could be best assured if he were an American through and through, -with no direct roots in any foreign land, nor any direct connection to any foreign power, -a connection that would result from birth to one still possessing membership in, and perhaps loyalty to, a foreign nation.

But those who fought, bled, suffered and sacrificed for the revolution, whether immigrants, or children of immigrants, -they were not barred from serving as President as long as they were resident naturalized citizens for 14 years and 35 years of age.

But among later generations, it was required that they be not just citizens, -nor just "born citizens". Rather they must be natural "born citizens" -and only those who are natural Americans by birth to Americans (that's maybe 96%+ of us) are eligible to be the President.

The Constitution is clear in its limitation on the presidency. If the wording has been simply a prohibition against all but "born citizens", that would have been all that was needed to prevent naturalized citizens from becoming President. But it went one step beyond that, and included in its exclusion the children of foreigners. That limitation 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, -nor any reporter or TV news operation, no talk-radio pundit, no syndicated columnist, no celebrity, no Judge nor 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 candidate for President. The Constitution was nationally violated and no one who knew it said a word. That's 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 over 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 thus strangle the future with choking debt and strangling bureaucratic authoritarianism, -like an ever-enlarging anaconda encircling the body of individual liberty and fiscal responsibility, -slowing but inexorably tightening its crushing hold.

It can and will eventually led to the demise of its host, namely, healthy free enterprise and a republican government that protects the rights of individuals and minorities against the tyranny of the majority that feels secure and protected in the hold of the government snake that wraps itself around every limb of one's life.

Then the socialists with have won and liberty will have lost, and all will experience the ship of state go down; -slowly or swiftly, but it *will* go down as impossible mandates and entitlements raise the debt so high that eventually those who fuel it with loans will close their pocket-books and walk away. Then the whole house of cards will collapse.

When that finally happens, there will be more than enough blame to go around, -between the traitors to the Constitution and betrayers of future generations, and those who went along to get along, and of course all of those who slept until the very end.

We can hope and work to wake people up to the need to elect people who will put us back on track to a responsible and limited government, but if we can judge the future by the past, it doesn't look good because finding enough people who have a spine and the willingness to use it is almost more than we can hope for. Self-interest is what has created the very sick status quo in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the federal government, and there's little to no hope on that horizon.

If rescue comes, it will have to be from the States. More and more of them are willing to stand-up for the Constitution and fiscal responsibility, but they face enormous opposition from Washington and spoiled socialist unions which control many state governments and hold them hostage to unsupportable pension and medical care contracts.

But for the present, enjoy the sunshine while it lasts. Don't assume it will be around forever because we've tied heavy weights around our collective waist and the bottom of the boat is beginning to disintegrate.

by A.R. Nash April 2012
<http://obama--nation.com>