

## Obama versus the Truth about 14th Amendment Citizenship

~the quagmire of an entrenched falsehood~

Nations, -like their citizens, reserve for themselves certain unalienable rights which no other nation has a right to abrogate. The first and foremost of which is *the right of survival* via self defense. A nation's government has as its highest priority the survival of the society that composes the nation. A member of society has as his primary responsibility the survival of his family, and then his society, and that includes the nation that is its home.

A nation, in order to mount its defense, has the right and obligation to require of its male citizens that they shoulder their responsibility to participate in that defense. It uses its authority to insure that they do participate. It is the responsibility of the society's male members to be subject to that authority in time of national threat. They, in training and fighting and dying, learn the full meaning of subjection to the authority of their nation's full jurisdiction.

Its meaning was forged in agony and written in blood in places like Valley Forge, Gettysburg and European trenches, -at Normandy, Iwo Jima, Korea, Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan. Its meaning involves full subjection to the full authority of a lawfully constituted government, and its military arm.

The self-defense of nations can be characterized by bands of patriotic volunteers joining together to mutually take on the burden of armed combat. But when the going gets seriously tough, such bands will crumble because they lack the iron hand of a powerful, dominating, merciless authority ruling over them.

The American revolution began as the former but would have crumbled if it had not evolved into the latter. General George Washington hired a Prussian military officer to organize, train, discipline, focus and harden his troops for the long war ahead. Until their contract of service expired they were fully under the military discipline imposed by that trainer and Washington's officers. They had surrendered their right to do as

they please, -to quit the fight, quit the war, quit obeying orders if they were tired of the whole thing. Their desires no longer mattered. Their preferences were irrelevant. Their personal choices were no longer legally possible.

When, after a long period of winter without adequate provisions, adequate protections from the elements, and without pay, a group of soldiers rebelled, -mutinied, and that created a horrible tension and schism that had to be resolved. It was resolved, but not to their liking. They were arrested and sentenced to death. They had committed the treasonous act of disobeying lawful orders in a time of war. Their hanging was scheduled for a certain day soon after their sentencing. When it arrived, there was a great sadness enshrouding the entire camp. The gallows had been prepared, and a hangman's noose placed around each of their necks.

Everyone was about to have their heart broken. But Washington was someone that they didn't really know at that point.

He was someone wiser than they knew, and he knew that the damage of that execution would be worse for morale than it would be good for discipline.

And so, at the very last minute it was announced that the execution was canceled and their lives were spared. A great sigh of relief was felt as that news lifted the spirits of the soldiers and united them in a bonding experience that only they had ever been through in American history.

The seriousness of such a war experience has been illustrated by other experiences depicted in many motion pictures. The authority of military command over the actions and lives of those subject to it has been demonstrated in scenes in which an officer is confronted with a soldier who has had enough and is unwilling to carry out the possibly fatal orders he's been given.

He refuses, and turns and starts to walk away. The officer pulls out his pistol, aims it at him and

warns the man to stop, -to obey the lawful order he's been given. Either he realizes the seriousness of his action or he stubbornly continues walking and consequently receives a bullet in the back of his head.

The point has been made that free-will is out, and total obedience is in. Being less than fully subject to orders is forbidden.

Washington's army had equal and greater suffering awaiting them in coming years. Conditions got so bad that a second rebellion resulted. But they were fools to think they had any chance of succeeding in achieving their righteous goals since they were vastly out-numbered by the obedient. Consequently they were captured, tried, and sentenced to death. But that time was different. The earlier lesson had been forgotten or ignored, and so the result was that no mercy could be shown.

The leaders were ordered to be executed by firing squad, and the soldiers who were ordered to form the firing squad were the mutineers' second-in-command. They had to kill their own friends and leaders, -men that they might have been willing to die for if necessary, but now it was a matter of carrying out the execution order or joining their companions in being executed.

What's the point of sharing these scenarios? It's to illuminate the fact that the civilians in the federal government are oblivious to. They who have never taken the oath, never worn the uniform, never been subject to the total absolute authority of military command, nor faced the danger, nor possibility of danger that comes with defending the nation, -they who have never fired a weapon, -not in offense, nor defense, and definitely not in national defense, have no comprehension of the foundational requirement of societal membership and national citizenship.

Thus they're completely ignorant of an important truth that's been forgotten with the passage of time. The result is that America is following and believing a false view of just what subjection really means.

The ignorance that is now almost universal is allowing foreign persons to be rewarded with the prize of American citizenship by their act of breaking our sovereign entry laws. They don't obtain it directly for themselves but obtain it for those dearest to them, -their newborn babies.

One such baby was Barack Obama. Although not born to an illegal foreign mother but to a legal foreign student father, what they both have in common is that of not being born subject to the full authority that a nation can require of the male members of its society.

If a legal permanent-resident foreigner wishes to become a new member-citizen of a nation not his own, he will swear on all that is holy that he will bear arms for his new nation if needed and be subject to its full authority. His life, his survival, is thereby made subordinate to that of the survival of the nation. Consequently he is accepted as worthy of citizenship.

If he is unwilling to swear to serve the nation when called, then citizenship is not granted to him. But if a child is born to him in the nation he wishes to join, and that nation is the United States, then that child is automatically granted citizenship because the father, like it or not, is subject to the requirement of the nation to participate in its national defense if called, because he is a legal member of American society and bears the responsibility for national defense to ensure the nation survives.

Since he is the owner of his own children, his responsibility is conveyed to them and shared by them. They are born subject to no government but the American government as long as they are minors and U.S. residents, even though their father is subject to two governments.

But the pencil-pushing government lawyers in Washington D.C. (following, an 1898 interpretation of the 1868 14th Amendment by the pencil-pushers on the Supreme Court ) had no comprehension of what the subjection in the amendment meant. Even its civilian congressional authors didn't grasp its full meaning, but many of the

American people that ratified it did, because they had just passed through the bloodiest war in world history, a war in which men were required and expected to give their last ounce of devotion and obedience. And they did so by the hundreds of thousands. They filled the cup to the full with their subjection to the responsibility of citizenship.

That is in stark contrast to the relationship a visiting foreigner has with the United States government. His or her only responsibility is to not break the law, and to obey the limitations of his or her visa. Nothing more. Guests in one's home are not required to scrub the floors, clean the toilets, or fight off marauding enemies seeking to take possession. They are under the protection of the home owner and not required to put their life on the line for a home that is not their own.

Same with temporary foreign visitors, tourists, workers scholars and students. The government labels them "non-immigrant aliens" and they are in the same class as foreign ambassadors, consuls and military attachés, except that they are not immune from punishment for breaking the law.

Obama's father was not subject to the jurisdiction of Washington's will over him as a citizen nor as a legal resident because he was neither. He was merely a temporary guest of the government in order to attend college. Nothing more. He could not stay here. He could not be drafted into the military. He was not subject to being forced to undergo the tortures of boot camp and orders to engage in combat in Vietnam unless they were given by Kenya or Great Britain, since he remained under the jurisdiction of his own government.

Similarly, a foreign woman is also not subject to the same national responsibility, especially if she is in the country illegally. But even if she's not, it doesn't make a difference, nor does it make a difference if she is an American woman. Women have never been subject to the responsibility to defend the nation.

What about foreign immigrant women who become naturalized citizens upon completing the required process and taking...

#### THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE & RENUNCIATION

by which they pledge to bear arms to defend the nation? Does that mean that they are subject to be drafted if needed? No. It means that the ancient oath was not written for women but only for men.

What is the implication of that? It's a rather profound one since it indicates a significant fact about the role of women in the world and in American society in particular. Women have never been subject to the authority of a nation's government which governs men, with the exception of Israel, because only men shoulder the burden of national defense.

The government does not retain for itself the authority to put a gun to the heads of American women and order them to advance against an enemy machine gun. But it does retain the authority to do that to men. And that is the ultimate true meaning of being subject to the national authority of a government. It means being subject to orders to defend the nation, -even at the cost of one's own life.

Women are exempt because they are women and that's what makes all the difference in the world. Men never have, -and never will, tolerate putting women in danger, but they will and do tolerate putting themselves and other men in life-threatening danger and they tolerate allowing their government to do the same.

Men of a certain age are the members of a singularly responsible group that are subject to the most fundamental responsibility of national life and that is the ultimate inescapable obligation and responsibility that comes with membership in the nation.

That obligation is to fight in and possibly die in war. Citizens are the most obligated, but if the threat is dire, then legal immigrants can also be called upon to defend the nation, as was the case during World War II.

But women can't because they are in a deliberately protected class. The men of no nation will ever require that their women be forced to fight, and possibly die in war, -although they may be allowed to do so if that is what they want and are as capable as men.

To what is this relevant? It's relevant to the national delusion that the 14th Amendment makes Barack Obama a constitutionally eligible President. That delusion results from a loss of the understanding of what its second citizenship requirement means.

Everyone understands what the first requirement means, (being born in the United States) but their understanding ends there.

The amendment's citizenship clause states: "All person born in the United States, or naturalized, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside."

That wording is very plain and simple. Too simple in fact, because its true meaning has been lost due to its constitutionally elegant simplicity. The ambiguity of that simplicity has resulted in half of its citizenship clause being totally ignored. It came to be ignored because it was totally misunderstood. Thanks to that misunderstanding, the nation is saddled with perhaps a million U.S.-born people assumed to be U.S. citizens but who in fact are not constitutionally qualified to be U.S. citizens. [There's a high-profile citizen who happens to be among them, and he happens to reside at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. His initials are BHO.]

If either of the amendments two requirements is missing, [1. birth within the United States 2. subjection to the sovereign authority of the federal government] then citizenship is not conveyed.

In essentially all contested cases, the determinant is related to the second requirement. Was one born subject to the sovereign authority of

Washington D.C.? What are the factors that determine the answer? What is the constitutional authority of Congress or the executive branch to alter the meaning of the Constitution or its amendments, -the subjection requirement in particular?

Congress has no authority to alter the meaning of what the Constitution & its amendments say. Only the Supreme Court reserves the right to trample all over the original meaning and intent of the Constitution. But Congress and the executive branch do have the ability to ignore it or misconstrue it if they don't understand it. And that is exactly what they've done for over a century.

The delusion that has overtaken the entire government is that the jurisdiction referred to is something other than what it really is. Civil authority and criminal law have become substituted for the authority that is the bedrock of a nation, and that is the right to require of its male members that they sacrifice their security, comfort, and possibly their life in order to preserve the nation from destruction.

General Robert E. Lee's soldiers understood that authority as they were foolishly and recklessly ordered to march into the withering fire of the union soldiers defending a hill at Gettysburg. The soldiers that stormed the beaches of Normandy, wading into German machine gun fire understood it as well, as did the Marines that confronted deadly Japanese Army resistance on one Pacific island after another.

But our leaders in Washington, -including the civilian lawyers in the State & Justice Departments, and the naturalization service do not understand it at all. Its meaning is not what they have erroneously and superficially assumed.

That is part and parcel of a national landscape in which men who've never received nor given a military order in their lives are elected and appointed to the most powerful offices in the nation.

Ignorance is part of what they are because they do not have the experience that brings understanding. As a consequence, no one real-

izes that that truth, -besides having a direct bearing on the citizenship of children born to illegal aliens, has a direct bearing on the citizenship of B. H. Obama, Jr. Neither the father nor the mother of Barack Obama were ever subject to the jurisdiction of our full national authority.

That means that they were incapable of bringing a child into this world that was born subject to that authority. Though his father and mother were not subject to it, he himself eventually became subject by remaining in the United States instead of living abroad, and so the provisional citizenship he acquired after his parents' divorce eventually became permanent citizenship.

[It's doubtful that he ever felt subject because his Selective Service registration card appears to have been forged.]

Since his father was merely a Visa card foreign student and not an immigrant, -not a member of American society, the subjection required by the 14th Amendment was not passed onto the shoulders of his son. He was exempt from it because he was born subject, like his father, to the jurisdiction of the British government and government of Kenya.

As his own 2008 election website proclaimed, his father "was subject to the British Nationality Act of 1948, as were his children". So he was born as a provisional subject of the shrinking British Empire. Therefore the location of his birth within the United States is insufficient to meet the second requirement of the 14th Amendment. Hence U.S. citizenship cannot legitimately be ascribed to him by it.

That only leaves the citizenship of his mother as his source of citizenship. Before the Cable Act of 1922, the citizenship of American women did not pass to their children. It was the father's citizenship alone that determined one's nationality. But thanks to that Act, if an American woman divorced her foreign husband, or he died, then she could reacquire the U.S. citizenship that she lost by marrying a foreigner, and her foreign-nationality children were then allowed to obtain derivative U.S. citizenship through her.

Eventually, following many revisions over decades, an American woman married to a foreign man, even one living with him in his foreign homeland, was deemed to have passed her citizenship to her children, which, along with that of her husband, made them dual-citizens.

But what of such a woman who (along with her foreign husband) remained in and gave birth in the United States instead of abroad? Did those nationality statutes contain any provisions for a domestic-birth situation? It appears that the answer is that no such statute was ever written.

Why would it not exist? Because no one ever thought there was a need for such a provision since everyone assumed (erroneously) that everyone born on U.S. soil was automatically a 14th Amendment American citizen except children of Native Americans and foreign representatives. But since that is constitutionally false, Barack Obama was not born a citizen either by the 14th Amendment nor by a naturalization statute written for the foreign born. So he's neither a "natural born citizen" as the Constitution requires of the President, nor a naturalized citizen via the citizenship process, nor a 14th Amendment constitutional citizen. Instead he's a citizen via an obscure naturalization statute.

But *natural* citizens have no need of U.S. statutes or constitutional amendments to make them citizens (and no such law even exists) because they are born as citizens by natural political inheritance.

The children of foreign fathers can only obtain citizenship via American law because they have no natural right to it, -nor natural acquisition of it. That's why citizenship law is needed, -to accommodate those who aren't automatically imbued with it via a citizen father.

If Obama Jr. had been born as a natural citizen of the United States, -with American parents, then he would have been subject to U.S. jurisdiction no matter where in the world he was born, raised, or lived. Natural citizens cannot escape what they are by birth no matter where they live,

unless they choose to become naturalized citizens of another nation. The United States absolutely does recognize that choice because it was the very choice which led to the War of 1812 and the near destruction of the young nation.

But only a citizen himself can make that choice, -the choice to abandon his American citizenship. The government cannot make it for him because he is an American by nature and has no other national nature. He was born as an American and as only an American, and being an American is his unalienable right, -just like the right to life.

But one born to a foreign father has no such right. If he obtains membership in the nation of his birth it's because the nation allows it for humane as well as practical reasons. But having it does not make him a natural member of the nation because he is a natural member of the society & nation of he who fathered him.

That nation has first claim on him unless his father (-with or without citizenship) had become an officially sanctioned legal member of the foreign nation in which his child was born.

If the father had become a member of a foreign nation, then he made himself one who is subject to the jurisdiction of that nation's government and become responsible to defend it if needed and called. He's then subject to both governments. That's the conundrum of dual-citizenship. Which nation has one's primary loyal?

If one is not a part of the society and nation in which he is temporarily visiting or living, but fathers a child which is born there in wedlock, his child lacks the full natural connection to that nation which the children of its citizens inherit, and therefore his child possesses no natural membership in it, even if the nation grants him membership by its nationality law or by an erroneous policy based on a misinterpretation of that law. Such children are statutory members of the nation, -not natural members, because their membership is dependent upon federal statutes, and not natural law.

Barack Obama was such a child and being such does not meet the qualification to be the President because he is not, as the Constitution requires, a "natural born citizen".

Is Obama then solely a citizen of the United Kingdom & Commonwealth? No, his membership in it was contingent upon his Kenyan citizenship. Since Obama's membership in the Commonwealth was strictly through his father's connection to it, and that connection ended along with his Kenyan citizenship at age 23, he therefore has no connection to the Commonwealth. He has no *direct* connection to Britain since his father was not a citizen of England, nor the United Kingdom, nor born of an English father. Since he wasn't born to parents who were, he's left with no connection other than a discontinued Kenyan connection.

So what is one left to conclude? It's that no provision exists in American law by which a child of a transient foreign father, though born in the United State, inherits his mother's citizenship. Without such a provision, -without the 14th Amendment, without naturalization, without natural citizenship, Barack Obama was not born with permanent U.S. nor British citizenship. Instead, he was born with only provisional citizenship in the British Commonwealth.

Obama returned to Hawaii from Indonesia at age 10 to live with his grandparents. At age 14, Obama began fulfilling the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act's five-year continuous residency requirement to become a U.S. citizen. (INA) 301(a)(7) and 301(b) See 8 U.S.C. 1409(c) [http://www.theodora.com/ina\\_96\\_title\\_3.html](http://www.theodora.com/ina_96_title_3.html)

His provisional citizenship (dependent upon his mother divorcing his foreign father) became permanent then at age 19.

But from early childhood the INS deemed Obama Jr. to be a native-born 14th Amendment U.S. citizen due to the six-decade old error that pervades much of the government. But by actual U.S. law he had no U.S. citizenship at birth.

So, being neither a natural citizen, nor a naturalized citizen, nor a constitutional citizen, nor a derivative citizen, he became a statutory citizen by a provisional statute in the U.S. Code that very few know about and which applies to very few.

But although he is a U.S. citizen, Obama still has a big problem. It's not a matter of whether or not he's even a citizen, nor whether or not he's the type of citizen qualified to be President of the U.S. Senator, or Speaker of the House, or Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He *is* qualified, (all citizens are) but he is *un*qualified to be the President and Commander-in-Chief.

Is his type of citizenship "natural"? No one who has become a U.S. citizen via some form of naturalization (which only pertains to persons with one or two foreign parents) possesses natural citizenship. No one with a foreigner for a parent is a natural American because natural Americans are purely American.

Their American lineage may go back hundreds of years, or only one or two generations. If their father, who's married to their American mother, is a naturalized citizen when they are born, then they are a natural American citizen because they were born to American parents.

Obama wasn't fathered by an American, a naturalized American, nor an Green Card legal immigrant, but a non-immigrant visa card foreigner, and therefore is not in the same ballpark as the natural citizens of the nation, nor the constitutional citizens either, and consequently has been allowed to unconstitutionally usurp the office the President.

But who can blame him? If you were what he is, -believed what he believes, and someone offered to pave the way for you to rise to the highest office in the land, how could you refuse the offer? You couldn't, anymore than you could resist driving to a distant town if you could there obtain a winning, huge-payoff lottery ticket for free

Until our modern era of ignorance, (including the entire 20th Century) birth within the United

States was not viewed as a prerequisite for citizenship, nor did such a meaningless fact automatically result in a natural American citizen, even though the law and custom in some colonies/states was that all those who were native-born were deemed to be citizens.

But that was never federal law, practice, nor policy. The federal government required the children of immigrants to undergo the naturalization process if they reached adulthood before their father completed it. If he completed it first, then through their blood connection to him, they became what he had become, -a new American possessing derivative citizenship.

A "son of the soil" (one born of immigrants in a State that allowed their children to be citizens from birth) would be a citizen of their home State, and a citizen of the union of the States, aka the United States, but not a citizen of the United States government. It's citizens were those born within its territory, on federal land, -the federal district and any of its territories. They were not citizens of any State because they belonged to no State. They were Americans citizens by being federal citizens, -not State citizens.

The federal government had total sovereignty over how it ascribed citizenship to such persons, and no one born of a foreigner within its jurisdiction was deemed to be a citizen. One consequence of that was that without naturalization they could never be qualified for any federal elected office, including the Presidency (because they not only were not natural born citizens, -they were not even citizens at all.

Before Barack Obama Jr., no child born in a State to a foreign father ever attempted to run for the presidency, so there was never a court case brought to contest the refusal of the federal government to recognize "a son of the soil" as being a natural born American citizen, although one such citizen did once become President (Chester Arthur, born to an unnaturalized English father) but it was via assassination of the President and not via election.

The federal policy that recognized only patrilineal descent was based on Natural Law, Roman Law, Natural Rights, and the principles elucidated in a major legal work of their era titled "*The Law of Nations*" by [Emmerich de Vattel](#). It was an important staple of the Founding Fathers and the law colleges that they founded. George Washington failed to return a copy to the library that he borrowed it from, but curators of his estate finally returned it in the 21st Century.

Patrilineal descent was the American way, and remained so until the 14th Amendment of 1868, -written to declare the citizenship of freed slaves, was applied also to children of immigrants when, in 1898, the Supreme Court interpreted its words to mean what they seem to say [-the Wong Kim Ark decision].

Ever since then, -following the Attorney General's misinterpretation of the Supreme Court's misinterpretation of the 14th Amendment citizenship clause, the meaning and significance of what federal jurisdiction involves has faded from the collective consciousness of the American people, including those in its government, its Congress and its courts. It's possible, perhaps probable, that none of them understand it. And that is not likely to change.

As a result of that ignorance, the practice and policy of the executive branch is contrary to the 14th Amendment. Their views and policies currently are law. Everything that has been related here is irrelevant because the authority rests with them even if they apply it incorrectly and unconstitutionally generation after generation.

What can change our current situation?

Nothing. Regardless of which party is in power, neither will enforce the true meaning of "subject to the jurisdiction thereof" because it would alienate Hispanics whose votes are needed.

The Supreme Court could, if given the chance, turn everything upside down, but that would require an opponent to the current policy having standing to sue the government, and only states would possess that standing because illegal immigration affects them directly. But if they did so, it

would create an administrative nightmare involving unraveling decades of error, and children and grandchildren of citizens who should never have been viewed as citizens. But I digress.

Just as correcting the mistake of the presumed citizenship of those born to illegals and non-immigrant foreigners would be a nightmare, so unraveling the impact of the execution of presidential authority by one ineligible to wield it would also be a nightmare, and that's a headache that no one in Washington or the courts is willing to contemplate. It's the unthinkable thought. The aversion to it is so strong that our leaders would rather hide in a closet than confront it.

Maybe they are right to fear it so. Maybe they realize things that the rest of us don't. I hope so, because if their silence is strictly out of cowardice, or aversion to a sticky, messy situation, then the betrayal of the Constitution has been and remains totally unjustified because it is far more important than our or their comfort.

The constitutional criminality at the heart of an illegitimate presidency is accepted and unmentioned in the corridors of power in Washington, and around the world. Meanwhile, no competent government in the world is unaware that Barack Obama posted on the White House website a nine-layer fake image of a Hawaiian birth certificate because they have examined it just like tens of thousands of Americans have done, and found that it is totally unexplainable as being the result of the scanning of a real document. It was clearly constructed on a computer.

The only conclusion that can be drawn from that fact is that no original exists, and that must be because his actual birth place was somewhere other than a hospital in the United States, -and he also is unwilling to reveal the birth certificate that he has used all throughout his entire adult life.

It's evident that he's boxed-in on every side when it comes to the nature of his citizenship and his unconstitutional presidency. But knowing about it and being able to do something about it are two very different things. Congress definite-

ly will not act since no one in it will speak the unspeakable truth, -especially if they're ignorant of it. So that leaves only the courts.

But they've been unwilling to get involved in a process that could de-legitimize their Progressive political champion, or, if they're neutral, place themselves in the cross-hairs of nefarious men who will do anything to protect their usurper-in-chief, including making frightening reference regarding the safety of their spouse or children.

So the status quo holds for now, but like a dam with a serious crack in it, time will eventually exact its toll as the cracks increase and the truth begins to gush out and spread far and wide. Will you help spread it?

The biggest crime committed against the country was not the assumption of the presidency by Barack Obama, -it was what he did once he was in office, in addition to the trampling of the Constitution in order to make it possible. To be an ineligible President is not an actual crime, but to violate one's sacred oath to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution is constitutional treason.

How many traitors do we have to kick out of office before we finally return to a government that acknowledges and obeys our most fundamental law?

Answer: ~a whole boat load. So let's begin.  
All sane, informed, and concerned Americans must work together to reset our course and save the future.

by a.r. nash 2012 <http://obama--nation.com>

[Update, Oct. 2012: The U.S. Supreme Court declined, without an explanation of any sort, to hear the appeal of the case against an unconstitutional President (-rejected at every level in Georgia) which was decided in favor of a defendant whose lawyer refused to even appear before the court, -that defendant, -Barack Obama, was unwilling and unable to defend his eligibility to be President, nor his counterfeit birth certificate image. Nevertheless, the umpires called it for the team that refused to even show up. Now are you beginning to understand what constitutional treason is?]