

## The Constitutional Truth About An Unconstitutional President

(President by other than lawful means)

The man elected President of the United States is supposedly qualified for that office by somehow fitting the requirement of the U.S. Constitution which states in Article 2, Section 1 : No person except a natural born Citizen,... shall be eligible to the Office of the President,".

Those words were not invented by a King, a Lord, a Parliamentarian, a Governor, a Judge, or a legal scholar. It is not an invented phrase with a meaning assigned by its inventor. It is nothing more than simple English words used in conjunction for emphasis of what they were intended to describe. They were intended to describe Americans who were born to American parents and no others.

The words "natural" and "born" are closely connected and related in a semi-redundant way that reinforces the purpose and meaning of both of them.

The were strung together as a combination of two related descriptions, namely; a natural citizen, and a born citizen.

The word "natural" relates to Natural Law, and how in nature things are what they are due to natural processes, such as pro-creation following a natural pattern.

A natural citizen is one who is a citizen through the union of two members of a single group. The union of two members of dissimilar groups is unnatural. A horse is a natural animal. A donkey is a natural animal. But a mule (a cross-breed of the two) is a natural nothing. It is unnatural. It's a mongrel off-spring and is sterile. There is no mule family or group that can produce off-spring or natural members.

No form of mongrel is ever a natural member of the group to which the parents belong because the parents do not belong to a group, but belong instead to two dissimilar groups. And dissimilar groups can only produce mongrels, cross-breeds, -hybrids, -not natural members.

A born citizen is one who is not a citizen by any means other than birth, -born as a citizen. One who was born to foreigners was a foreigner by birth and could only manage to become a citizen by means of naturalization, i.e. by law, not birth, not nature.

If the father became a naturalized citizen of one of the States, then his children obtained State & national citizenship through him. That naturalization could, by the law in some Colonies/States, occur automatically at birth if the father was an immigrant but as yet un-naturalized.

Such a child can be called a "born citizen" also but its citizenship is not natural citizenship. It is instead natural-ized citizenship. It was the result of State law which grants citizenship to one with foreign or politically mongrel parentage, i.e. one with an American mother and a foreign father.

The word "born" relates to the natural pattern of conception, gestation, and birth. That process produces a natural progeny. Born does not have any connection to geography, nor man-made boundaries. It has no connection to location. In the natural realm, where a birth takes place has no connection to the nature of that which is born.

Born only refers to the conclusion of the organic process of the reproduction and transmission of life & nature from parents to child. The product of birth is a replication of the nature of the parents, whether it be their species, breed, race, or group membership. The principle is the same in the political realm in regard to citizenship. The one born is endowed with the same nature as the parents. And group membership, along with that nature, is also transmitted to them.

That membership can be in a clan, a tribe, a colony/state, or a nation. They are born into it, -not adopted nor granted membership as is required for outsiders. Membership is theirs as their natural political inheritance by birth.

Their membership is natural membership and doesn't result from reproduction via a union with one who is not a member. Such a union

only produces a hybrid; -a half member--half outsider. That membership is not describable as natural because its origin is not via the pattern of natural membership since hybrids of all kinds are unnatural, whether they be in botany, animal husbandry, the wild, human society, or the political construct of national membership.

Any type or source of membership that is other than that produced by the natural pattern fails the test of being natural. The source of its legitimacy is not natural inheritance but human choice, human permission, human law. No one whose membership is via human permission is a natural member of his group. No one whose citizenship is only via human law is a natural citizen in any nation. Instead he's an unnatural dual-citizen because he possess another citizenship through a parent who's a foreign national of a different nation.

In America, there is no law by which natural citizens possess citizenship. Such a law was never written and never will be. It never needed to be written because it was an unalienable right and an element of Natural Rights that humans are endowed with by their Creator.

With a father who was a foreign student (a non-immigrant, non-permanent resident) whose membership in the British Empire was the natural inheritance transmitted to his child, Barack Obama possessed no unalienable right to American citizenship because he was not a natural American, but was instead a hybrid with no natural citizenship in any nation.

This is all plain and clear, but what is not so clear is the issue of whether a person such as Barack Obama is even a U.S. citizen at all. According to an accurate reading of U.S. law, the 14th Amendment does not apply to him because it didn't apply through his father since he wasn't an American immigrant but merely a Visa Card foreigner still subject to the jurisdiction of Britain and International Law, and not, as required by the 14th Amendment, subject to American jurisdiction.

Could it be argued that the 14th Amendment applied to him through his mother since she

was subject to U.S. jurisdiction as it requires? To find the answer one must travel back in time to an era in which women did not possess civil rights equal to men. That was in part due to a historical tradition dating back to the beginnings of human societies and was manifested in that era by the fact that women did not shoulder the responsibility of men for the defense of the nation. They could not be required to bare arms and fight in the Army and thereby be equally responsible as men in that most fundamental way.

Single immigrant women could not apply for naturalization because it requires that one swear to be willing to bare arms to defend the nation, -something that only men could do, -though exceptions were made sometimes for mothers who were widows and thus head of their household. If they could not be naturalized then their children could not be citizens (unless, as adults, they completed the naturalization process individually).

No such child would ever have been considered to be a natural American citizen even though native-born, in fact it was exactly such children that the Constitution barred from ever becoming President because their loyalty and allegiance to America had to be assumed to be limited and divided and possibly attached to a foreign government or the King of a nation where they might be raised.

If his citizenship is not derived from the 14th Amendment as written, then from what is it derived? In the zillion words that I've read about citizenship, I've yet to learn of any statute that addresses the the type of situation in which he was born because the assumption has been for over 100 years that the 14th Amendment practically applies to everyone born in America. But it doesn't apply to children of fathers such as his. Statutes that impute U.S. citizenship to children of foreign fathers are written only for situations of birth outside the U.S. That is why no one has been able to make public the law by which Barack Obama is a United States citizen. And yet he was elected President anyway.

I believe his citizenship is based on a statute that's the descendant of the Cable Act of 1922.

It would say that when an American woman divorces a foreign husband, her child automatically obtains provisional citizenship which requires that he live in the U.S. for five years beginning at age 14 in order for it to not expire at age 21. By it American citizenship would be ascribed to her child in addition to her foreign husband's citizenship.

Besides the nature of his citizenship being improper for the presidency, there's the issue of the nature of his birth record. It's shrouded in mystery and unanswered questions. The head Obama supporter in Hawaii, the governor, confirmed that no original hospital birth certificate could be found, -only something like a half hand-written/half typed statement or affidavit, -no doubt by a parent or grandparent attesting that he was born in Hawaii, presumably in their home.

Thanks to that statement by his mother or grandparent, whether true or false, and the impression it gave that he was born in Hawaii, Obama came to be viewed to be a U.S. citizen by the U.S. government. But it does not follow that that was the view at his birth.

No one knows how the INS in 1961 would have viewed his nationality if they had known the specifics of the record of his reported birth facts in the possession of the Hawaiian Dept. of Health. But as a state, Hawaii had the authority to set its own vital records policy, and that policy included registering foreign-born children of American mothers as having been born in Hawaii in order to be able to provide them with a birth certificate.

That policy was perfectly fine since essentially all such births didn't involve foreign fathers, nor one who would one day have to constitutionally qualify for the office of the President supposedly based on place of birth.

All in all, the nature of his citizenship is not such that he is ineligible to be the President.

Barack Obama knows all of this and knew it long before he opened the door to running for

the presidency. He knew from the first moment that he read the presidential eligibility clause of the Constitution that he couldn't qualify.

He had to have thought to himself that it excluded him thanks to his foreign father, but his desire to achieve some great socialist utopian good was not accompanied by an equally strong desire to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies, foreign and domestic, including deliberate violators of the Constitution such as himself.

When he clumsily and insincerely took the oath of office, he did not swear to defend America, nor the American government, nor the American people, nor American Commerce. He swore to defend one thing and one thing only, and that was the Constitution. Everything else is secondary.

Without the Constitution there would be no United States, -no United States military, no American government. Like an upside-down pyramid, everything rests on it. If it is corrupted, rotted, and eroded then what is built on it is put in danger.

But those who are doing the weakening believe they are doing it for the greater good. Their intentions are honorable, even though unfair and even unconstitutional. As the saying goes, "The path to hell is paved with good intentions."

When the pavers are using really nice paving stones, all they're focused on is how nice it is, not where it's leading. They're not concerned that it's leading to socialistic, bureaucratic, and regulatory excess, rampant unsupervised corruption, and deficit spending that will cause the entire system to collapse of its own colossal weight. Who will there be then to praise the magnificent path that they've paved? -The path that begins at idealism and ends at oblivion?

by a.r. nash april 2012