

THE BAMBOOZLING OF AMERICA AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL

You're about to read what to many unaware and uninformed Americans will sound like fantastic claims, -like crazy conspiracy theorizing, but sometimes "crazy" conspiracy becomes "factual" conspiracy when the truth becomes known. Recall the office of President Nixon being involved with covering-up a crude break-in of the Democrat Party office in the Watergate Hotel? And perhaps the President himself involved? That's just crazy talk! But in the real world, often the truth is stranger than fiction.

Let's begin. One of the greatest, if not *the* greatest travesties ever committed against the American electorate occurred in the presidential election of 2008 in regard to the candidacy of Senator Barack Obama. It involved all five areas of the national election arena, beginning with the Press, -the main-stream-media.

It's job is to ferret out the truth about candidates for elective office and share it with the American public. We all realize what a great job they did in regard to one John Edwards and his mistress. (No one would touch it with a ten-foot pole except the National Enquirer.)

Similarly, they stayed ten miles away from the issue of Barack Obama's constitutional eligibility for the office of the President. Instead of vetting him they praised and adored him. Not a peep was heard from any corner of the land on that vital issue, and that included conservative and independent media types alike.

He got a free pass because he was very inspiring, charming and charismatic, as well as being the first party candidate of color in our history. So his candidacy was attended by only silence on the issue of whether or not he was even qualified to run for the office.

There are guardians in all 50 states whose job it is to guard against ineligible candidates being placed on their state's ballot. They constitute the second area in which the travesty took place.

Every single one of the officers, Attorneys General, or commissions that approved the placement of Senator Obama's name on their ballots was either bamboozled by the DNC or were complicit in the conspiracy because they all went along with it. And they'll repeat that crime.

The third area is that of the Democratic Party leadership which conspired to alter the traditional wording of their presidential candidate certification document. They secretly removed the language stating that their candidate was constitutionally qualified for the office of President, and instead substituted language stating only that he was legitimately certified as the official candidate of their party.

There was only one reason to do that, and that reason was because they knew that by making that omitted statement they would have been making themselves liable for charges of various sorts, including probably some form of perjury for making a false legal certification. But they got away with it for four years, so the second time they've fearlessly reinserted that false qualifier.

The fourth area that assisted in the conspiracy was the United States Senate. It had two members running for the presidency who had odd backgrounds. It authorized a research investigation, but the results it produced contained both the solid truth but also a huge lie. The truth was in regard to the citizenship of John McCain and the lie was in regard to one such as Barack Obama. Both having quite different birth circumstances. So the Senate knew the actual truth but embraced the lie also, and so remained silent.

The final area in which the conspiracy was allowed to transpire was that of the Supreme Court. They all always knew the truth about Senator Obama's constitutional ineligibility to run for the presidency but the buck stopped at no one's desk so they all were silent en mass during the election period. No one had the spine to speak out and warn all of the known violation of the Constitution that was a very possible out-

come. Then after it had happened, they continued to remain silent and even complicit by swearing into office a candidate that was not eligible for that office. The five areas of American society meant to serve as watchdogs to defend the Constitution all failed to do their job, even though many of them had taken an oath to do so.

Like what happened at Chernobyl when the reactor managers illicitly allowed five or six processes/tests to take place which caused it to explode and its nuclear core to totally melt down, -when avoiding any one of them would have prevented the disaster, so the American political process saw five areas of society lead in unison to a melt-down (when any one alone could have prevented it) and thus the process meant to elect a legitimate President, instead elected an illegitimate one.

The conspiracy involved three significant falsehoods. Two are related but the third is completely apart from the other two. The two related ones were connected to the proof of Senator Obama's place of birth. The third was related to the United States Constitution and its restrictions on who is allowed to be the President of the United States. Efforts were made to falsify facts, manipulate fallacious ideas, promote untruths, and distort the significance of facts in evidence. Let's examine the constitutional issue first.

U.S. Constitution: Article Two, Section One, Clause Five reads: "No person except a natural born Citizen...shall be eligible to the Office of the President,..". If we ignore the issue of where Senator Obama was actually born, then we can presumptuously agree that he could be described as "a born citizen", but the question remains as to whether or not he is a natural citizen. The meaning of the term "natural born citizen" is not provided anywhere in the Constitution. That means one of two things, -possibly both, but not likely.

There is no definition for only one reason, -because the author's, -the founding fathers and framers of the Constitution, all knew perfectly

well what it meant and assumed that everyone else did also. If so then there are still two possibilities. It either had a set, clear legal meaning, or it had a set, clear non-legal meaning. Or possibly the two were the same. But it can reasonably be assumed that there was never a need for a distinct legal definition to develop in America because there was as yet no such thing as the presidency to apply it to.

Under British and colonial law, natural born subjects had no more rights than naturalized subjects, although appointments to certain critical offices which held authority, assets, or information which a traitor could exploit to great harm, were reserved to natural born subjects, but such an appointment was not "a right" anymore than being President is.

So if the meaning of "natural" isn't found in American/Colonial legal history then it is found in common English, common sense, and "Natural Law". The Constitution was not written to be read only by legal scholars but by the common man whose acceptance was important in order to pass it and maintain national unity. Therefore it can't be argued that the meaning of the word "natural" is found only in esoteric, complex legislative and judicial documents, but is found instead in common language. No one needs to tell you what natural means, anymore than you need a lawyer or legal historian to tell you what "unnatural" means. Remember, the Constitution was written almost entirely in plain English, not legalese.

So the constitutional legitimacy of Senator Obama's candidacy was dependent on the meaning of that one word "natural" -what it means as well as what it doesn't mean. A "natural citizen" is also a "born citizen" but not all born citizens are natural citizens because they were born to immigrants, -foreigners, and not to Americans.

All Americans are U.S. Nationals, but not all U.S. Nationals are Americans because they do not possess United States citizenship (being Samoan). Similarly, all persons born as citizens are Americans, but not all were born as natural Americans.

America has always had a divergence regarding citizenship from before the founding of the nation. Some colonies ascribed citizenship to all born within their borders, even if they were born to foreigners. The logic was that those children were going to live in and grow-up in America as Americans and therefore should be citizens just like those who came before them.

Other colonies required foreigners to become naturalized citizens first and only then would their children be automatically granted citizenship in that sovereign colony. Which method became the law of the land after the Constitution was ratified? The later. That was the law of the land for over a century.

That changed forever in 1898 due to a Supreme Court ruling (Wong Kim Ark) in which the State Dept. had declared a San Francisco-born son of Chinese immigrants to not be an American citizen. The government prevail all the way up to the Supreme Court but the final court opinion altered the meaning of the citizenship statement of the 14th Amendment (1868) and reversed the government's position.

But one must not confuse being a natural citizen with being merely a born citizen. The distinction is best illustrated by two comparisons. If George Washington was visiting Canada with his wife in 1787 and she brought forth a son while there, what would be the nature of his national status? Would he be an alien? (-born outside the United States of America) Would he be a born subject of England? Or would he be a natural born American?

There was no Constitution or 14th Amendment yet. But that would have no bearing on the status of their natural born child because he would not have been registered as a foreign national at birth but recognized as a natural American by birth.

Even if Senator Obama truly was a born citizen, was he also a natural citizen? The answer is "no", -not by any principle that any imagination can come up with. But the liberal legal scholars (Olsen & Tribe), hired by the Senate to research the matter managed to invent one anyway. They

rightfully determined that John McCain, having been the progeny of American parents, was therefore an American by birth and as such his citizenship was natural citizenship because he was born with it as his natural right.

But the matter didn't end there because another Senator was running for the Presidency and he was not born to American parents, -in particular to an American father, but to an alien student here on a visa. Those two legal "experts", seeking to mitigate the impact of the accuracy of their McCain finding, therefore concocted the theory that both kinds of citizenship can be viewed as natural since historically both had been citizens from birth.

But that was deliberately fraudulent logic because it's the circumstances of their births that distinguish the two from each other. One with citizen parents is by nature a citizen also, but one with foreign parents is a legal citizen from birth only due to the Supreme Court's re-interpretation of the 14th Amendment handed down in 1898.

Barack Obama's citizenship has the law on his side, but the problem is that no one who is a citizen by law is also a natural citizen since natural citizenship is not granted by any law every written. Nor by the Constitution, because it was viewed as a natural unalienable right that neither the government nor the people that it represents have any authority to grant or rescind. It is a natural right that all humans are born with, and which government did not create.

Just as a baby tiger inherits its nature and species from its parents, so Americans inherit their parents' national membership in the American family. Just as a natural-born Chinese couple cannot produce a natural-born African child, -just as a natural born Jewish couple cannot produce a natural born Arab, so a natural born American couple cannot produce a natural born foreign child, nor can a foreign couple produce a natural American child

Either "natural" has meaning solely in relation to ones parentage, or it has no meaning at all.

One who is a "born citizen" via birth in America to immigrant parents is a constitutional 14th Amendment citizen, -not a natural citizen because their citizenship, though acquired automatically from birth, is not natural citizenship because it was not a natural inheritance from their parents.

The second significant falsehood is connected to the significance of birth within U.S. borders. Much importance was placed on the belief that Senator Obama was born in America but that importance was a sham. It had no connection to presidential eligibility nor could it alone convey constitutional citizenship which requires one to be subject to the jurisdiction of the federal government at birth.

All natural citizens are subject at birth because their parents are, but not all children born to foreigners are subject because some foreigners are not immigrants but instead are mere transients. Transients are not legal permanent members of American society and thereby subject to U.S. jurisdiction, but instead are foreign diplomats, visitors, workers, professionals, and students. They are subject to their own government and protected by International Treaty, including Barack Obama Sr.

Therefore Senator Obama was not covered by the 14th Amendment through his father and thus his native-birth was not enough to convey 14th Amendment citizenship from birth. Consequently he was not a natural citizen through his father, nor an automatically naturalized 14th Amendment statutory citizen through him either. So the resulting importance of his Hawaiian birth was zero. It didn't relate to constitutional eligibility nor fulfill the requirements for 14th Amendment citizenship.

The third great falsehood regarding Senator Obama deals with the extensive evidence that both birth-document digital images posted online contain manifold signs of illegitimate creation and the fact that no hard-copies have ever

been produced and shown to the public or document experts to verify that the images posted online were results of the scanning of real paper documents.

But even real paper documents cannot be verified as authentic because of the bastardized nature of the digital reproduction and alteration process used by the Hawaiian Vital Statistics Office which results in an unauthenticatable "ABSTRACT" instead of a "TRUE COPY".

How shall one respond to this, and what measures can be taken to insure that such a travesty is not allowed to transpire a second time? Challenges to his legitimacy as a constitutionally qualified Democrat Party candidate in each state can be attempted if a legal channel is available for such a challenge. His backers must get his name placed on the ballots of all 50 states one at a time, and that can be opposed one at a time across America. But that won't happen because of ignorance and indifference. The travesty of 2008 will be blindly, stupidly, and deliberately repeated.

One challenge was mounted in Georgia. Senator Obama's attorney failed to appear as required and thereby should have lost by default. That would have blocked him from appearing on the Georgia State ballot if the Secretary of State in Georgia concurred, but some underhanded chicanery took place out of sight. It appears the judge in the Georgia case, without explanation, threw the verdict in favor of the defendant Obama even though his legal council failed to appear to offer any rebuttal to the charges of his client's ineligibility. Even worse, both the Secretary of State and the Appeals Court and Supreme Court of Georgia followed the same pattern; they gave the appearance of impartiality and the supremacy of the law, then threw the case to the defendant that failed to appear! -There's nothing suspicious about that; move along folks, there's nothing to see here, just move along.

by a.r. nash 2012 obama--nation.com