

Delusion, Corruption & The Election of a Charlatan President

The organization and governance of any sizeable group of people must be based on simple rules that are easily understood so there's no excuse for breaking them. That avoids one being able to claim that they were confused and didn't understand the rules since the rules were confusing.

An early historical example is that of Moses and the 10 Commandments given on Mount Sinai. They were short and simple and clear. Anyone hearing them would understand them without the need of a scholar (or lawyer) to explain the nuances of the words and phrases.

All fundamental law since time immemorial has followed the principle seen in that example, including our own United States Constitution of government. It was written to be concise, not verbose; simple, not complex; crystal clear, not ambiguous. It wasn't enough to just write the document, it had to be easily understood by the citizens of the 13 States and their representatives because they were going to have to make a choice as to whether or not they would accept it, ratify it, and thereby make it the fundamental law by which they, and all others, would have to abide for the rest of their lives.

The simplicity and clarity of the Constitution laid out the skeleton of the government. The flesh would be added later by the Congress in conformity to the skeleton. Building and administering a government around the wording of the Constitution required that everyone fully understand it. That universal understanding was not muddied by uncertainty here and ambiguity there. Its meaning was not confusing, vague, or open to various interpretations (with the exception of the power to tax -having no limits placed on it). Those problems came later via the amendments added to it.

But in the body of the Constitution there was no confusing language. The only uncertainly resulted

from what was not written, -from the details that were missing and had yet to be fleshed out.

Nevertheless, one of its clauses wasn't exactly clear. In fact, it's contended that it's downright confusing, vague, and probably ambiguous. It's contended that only the Supreme Court can interpret and explain the true meaning of the words of the Constitution regarding who is eligible to be President, -but that's false. Their true meaning is evident to anyone with a brain, just as it was when those words were written, read, ratified and adopted. They were crystal clear when written, easily understood by all, and it's only our distant modern ignorance and bias that prevents the universal acknowledgement of their meaning.

To which words do I refer? These: Article II, Section I, Clause V: No person *-except a natural born Citizen*,...shall be eligible to the Office of the President,".

It's strongly in the interest of a particular party in American politics to distort, confuse, obfuscate, and dilute the meaning of the words; "natural born". Everyone understands the meaning of "citizen" but if everyone understood the meaning of "natural" and "born", then a certain sitting President would be found to be illegitimate.

That understanding is something the establishment can't allow because it would result in a constitutional crisis like this nation has never seen and probably will never see again. But in defense of the truth, let's examine the facts as they existed when the Constitution was written, -as well as throughout all of human history.

The meaning of "natural" and "born" are derived from natural law. They're so closely related that together they create a sort of reinforcing redundancy. The meaning of natural is uncontestable, but dishonest minds have worked to completely twist

the meaning of "born", -thereby creating confusion and an impression of ambiguity. Their goal is to convince all that "born" and "birth" are somehow synonymous with geography, namely national boundaries, and the magical power of being born within them. They do this by using false logic.

The concept they push is that by simply being "born in the United States" one is automatically a citizen "by birth", -regardless of the fact that there is no basis in American law to support that claim, -and in fact, there is a long history, both administrative and constitutional, that counters and refutes that claim.

The falseness of their logic is exposed by untwisting the concept that by being a citizen at or upon birth, one is therefore a citizen by birth. Reality is understood by looking at what is natural. One is not a human being merely at birth, but is a human being by birth to human parents.

Being human does not begin at birth but at conception. One is human by nature, not by the event of birth. This relates to the two types of citizenship connected to birth. One is natural, the other is legal or statutory.

There's a principle that pertains to children born to foreigners. In many countries, (the U.S. included,) the law is that such children are members of the nation where they're born only if their parents are immigrants and not mere visitors or diplomats.

By law they're considered to be naturalized from the foreign citizenship of their father and/or mother into domestic citizenship and that automatic naturalization begins at birth. They're natural-ized citizens from/at/ upon birth, but they're not natural citizens because they were born to foreigners. If foreign parents first become naturalized, then their children will be natural American citizens because they would be born to citizens and not foreigners.

As for the word "natural", in every group, whether family, clan, tribe, or nation, the most fundamental

element of group association is that of identification. Is one an enemy or a friendly? Is one a member or a non-member? Is one a natural member or an adopted member? One's status is determined by the answer to these questions.

Natural membership in the group is the result of being born into the group. No persons who were not born to group members will ever be describable as natural members. What is true in a family sense, is also true in a tribal and national sense. But outsiders are not natural members, rather, they become members by adoption.

The group leaders agree to adopt outsiders into the group and allow them all the privileges of natural members except one, and that is that they cannot be permitted to assume the office of the Chief. That's a responsibility reserved solely for natural members because their allegiance to the group is unquestionable.

But what if the daughter of the chief is impregnated by an outsider and gives birth to a son? What will his status be? It depends on how they choose to deal with him. They can abandon him near a gathering of female outsiders (like the mother of Moses), they can kill him, or they can adopt him. Whatever they choose, the result is one that is determined by human choice and not by nature.

If he's adopted, his adoption into group membership is by permission, not by nature. He would be an adopted member, not a natural member because he was not begotten by a father who is a member. Only male members can father natural members/natives/ citizens. Outside males cannot father natural natives or citizens.

Consider the example of artificial fertilization. If a queen is married to a King who's sterile and she therefore resorts to achieving pregnancy via another man's sperm, is the off-spring truly the King's seed and of his blood-line? Obviously not. Such a son

would be a half-blood heir. If later, the King becomes potent and impregnates his wife, the child will be his full-blood heir. Which will the King choose to inherit his throne? The half-blood first born or the full-blood child born later?

He would choose the full-blood child because he's his natural off-spring and carries his blood-line. One is fully natural while the other is artificial, or half-blood. The same natural principle applies to citizenship.

The citizenship that's natural is never half-blood. Rather, it's always full-blood. Any mixture of another bloodline/group membership/nationality results in an off-spring that's accepted by the principle of adoption, not natural birth. The fact that such an adoption is from birth does not make one a natural member, it only makes one a life-long member with all the privileges of membership except one, -ascent to the Throne. Or in the case of the United States, -the Presidency.

In 2008 the Constitution of the United States was ignored like it didn't even exist. All the powers-that-be remained silent lest they be accused of racism for attempting to block the first candidate of color from attaining the American dream. Now it's too late for them to say what they know or suspect because they would look like the cowards that they are.

So we as a nation are riding on a giant train that is no longer rolling on the tracks because we've been bamboozled into thinking that everyone couldn't get it wrong, and especially not get it wrong on purpose. But that's exactly what has happened.

Congress is stupid or complicit because the Senate passed a resolution declaring that John McCain is a natural born citizen of the United States because he was born to American parents. They got that right by a vote of 99-0, but what of his fellow Senator and presidential opponent who wasn't born to American parents but was instead a half-blood statutory citi-

zen? They, and everyone else, remained silent as he was illegitimately certified by the Democratic Party leadership to be a presidential candidate in all 50 states -with the initial exception of Hawaii because they doubted that he was born in the United States. But after secret talks with the authority that blocked the ballot certification, suddenly it became OK. The fix was in and it was in big time.

And now we will soon be witness to a repeat of this deliberate deceitful travesty against the Constitution and rule of law as he's again certified to be eligible in all 50 states because all of the systems of our society and government have been slowly but surely infiltrated for over 100 years by the enemies of the Constitution and the principles on which our nation was founded.

They can't get their way via constitutional amendments so instead they resort to simple majority legislation, supreme court decision, and totally ignoring fundamental law that impedes their goal of creating a centrally planned and controlled utopia of complacent sheep who obediently follow the wise orders of their masters, -the elites, the academic and professional class that knows for certain that it's superior to the masses and far more capable of wisely making all the decisions for them.

Welcome to the impending future. -the paradise of a democratic Marxist autocracy. It began back in 1942 in the biggest way possible with the Supreme Court decision in *Wichard v Filburn* in which the court ruled that Americans do not have the right to grow food on their own land for their own use.

That was when the dictatorship of Washington took a giant leap forward. After that Congress could do pretty much anything that it wanted, and that's exactly what it has done. Liberty had a limb chopped off and today the public is just becoming aware of how much individual autonomy and state authority has been ceded to Washington and to bureaucrats in general.

In this Bizarro world, the American people have ignorantly elected the man that spoke great platitudes with a great voice even though he's constitutionally barred from serving in the office of President. Superficiality is what gets people elected in contests that in the end boil down to a beauty contest. Obama was more attractive than McCain.

Words matter, but ones voice and appearance matter perhaps as much or more. Would Barack Obama now be President if his voice was similar to Barney Fife's voice? Or Pee-Wee Herman? Or Kermit? One will win any contest in which charisma and big promises are combined into one nice big idealistic package of Hope and Change.

Why shouldn't such a candidate be allowed to win? Because he isn't what he's supposed to be. He isn't a natural American. He's an adopted, half-blood, statutory, naturalized American and he isn't even that if he was born abroad (such as Kenya or Vancouver) because his mother was too young when he was born to convey citizenship to him if born abroad.

So we had an attractive, unvetted affirmative action stealth candidate with a black hole where a public background should be, and instead of being a natural American citizen with parents having a singular, not dual, citizenship, he's a hybrid off-spring of a foreign outsider, the product of two different continents, countries, empires, societies, and nationalities.

Diversity can be a good thing, but it is not a natural thing. Just ask the Japanese if they prefer the natural uniformity of their nation to that of the unnatural Islamic diversity of say London or Paris. But even with the American lip-service toward diversity, no outsider's son is ever allowed to become Chief. No half-blood prince is permitted to become King, and no person, except a natural born citizen, is eligible to become President.

by a.r. nash Jan, 2012

<http://obama--nation.com>

http://photobucket.com/obama_bc