

National Ignorance & A Constitutional Travesty

~questions never answered, nor ever even asked

Life holds many mysteries, and questions for which we have no answers, such as; "Where do UFOs come from?" and "Is Bigfoot real?" (note: one was seen and reported just a block from where I live, so I think I know the answer to that one). But more than the known unknowns, there is also the unknown unknowns. There are facts & truths that we don't even know exist.

But there is still one more area of ignorance, and that is unknown knowns. That refers to things we think we know but in fact do not. The histories of science and medicine are histories of beliefs that were eventually proven wrong by an outsider who didn't toe the consensus line. As in assumptions about the size and shape of the earth, or the center of the solar system, everyone thought they knew the truth but everyone was wrong.

The most wrong belief ever was the assumption that all the visible stars in the heavens constituted the entire universe, i.e., the Milky Way universe. Even Einstein held that consensus, common sense view, which prevailed until one night when Hubble did some calculations about the red-shift in the light from some distant stars and found that they were traveling at speeds so immense that they could not possibly be a part of our known universe. In the space of a few hours his discovery expanded the universe by a factor of a few hundred billion, -realizing that the Milky Way was a singular island in space (dubbed a "Galaxy"), -just one universe of many, -billions in fact.

That demonstrates that it's possible to not know something that we think we know, -to in fact be clueless about something of which we think we are knowledgeable. One subject about which Americans are unaware that they are clueless resulted in the election of a President who actually was not qualified to serve as President, and yet few were aware of that fact, (nor are today) nor

aware that what they thought they knew to be a fact was in fact a falsehood. The subject of that falsehood is the subject of citizenship.

Are you an American citizen? Are you sure? Why are you sure? Do you know why you're a citizen? You think you know but you don't. What you think is the answer is actually the wrong answer. But you are not alone. Every person you see interviewing and being interviewed on TV, -every journalist, reporter, anchor, politician and government official suffers from the same erroneous assumption. That ignorant assumption is almost universal in the ignorant America of today. That assumption is the one which makes you think that being born in America makes you an American. But if you are a normal American then that assumption is false.

It's not universally false because it is true for 4% or less of the population. They are legally Americans because they were born in America to immigrants. If your parents were not immigrants then it is not true for you because your citizenship is not dependent upon the declaration of the 14th Amendment. Your form of citizenship pre-dates the 14th Amendment. In fact it pre-dates the United States of America along with the Constitution. It pre-dates the British Empire and the Roman Empire, and the Chinese Empire and the Egyptian Empire. It pre-dates all empires and all nations that ever existed. It's not dependent upon law because it pre-dates law. It pre-dates everything except Nature because it's an element of the natural world. It's what's best described as:

THE PRINCIPLE OF NATURAL MEMBERSHIP.

Societies of all forms throughout the history of life on Earth have been a product of that principle. Its effect is universal, whether or not a society is in the animal kingdom or the human kingdom. All societies result from it because all societies

produce off-spring, and those off-spring are the same as their parents. Just as elephant herds produce new elephants, wolf packs produce new wolves, flamingo flocks produce new flamingos, and humans groups produce new humans. So also tribe members produce new tribe members, clan members,...likewise, and citizens produce new citizens, -members of their national society and nation.

Whatever the parents are, -so are their children. Law doesn't make it so, and law is not needed to make it so because it is so even in the absence of law. It is so by nature, by the nature of the personality and psychology of social beings who live in groups because they prefer it for the safety of their young, and for the benefits of family companionship.

Where a new member leaves the womb is irrelevant to its membership in its parent's group. Geography is meaningless, and borders are non-existent except in the minds of humans. Invisible, intangible man-made borders have no impact on biology, nor membership in the group into which one is born as a new member. But the immense power and influence of the entity known as "THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT" alters the way the mind works when it comes to recognizing that which is natural. That interference happens in the mind by superimposing ideas about how the power of government works in place of how nature works.

In the United States there is no law that establishes the principle of natural citizenship because it is a natural self-evident fact, so no law was ever needed. But a legal citizenship law was needed because many foreigners had children in a country not their own, lacking any natural right of membership, and thereby creating an unnatural situation requiring a law (the Civil Rights Act of 1866, and the 14th Amendment of 1868) to provide citizenship for those children who were not born in the country whose membership they

inherited from their foreign father, but in the country to which he had emigrated but did not yet belong.

The situation of the election to the presidency of a man fathered by a non-immigrant foreign visitor precipitates a need to understand the truth about the nature of citizenship and the requirement of the U.S. Constitution that the President be a particular type of citizen and no other. To get to the truth, questions must be asked and answers found. The answers are known by very few, and the questions are known by even fewer. They include the following:

- By what legal authority is Barry Dunham-Soetoro-Obama a U.S. citizen?
- Is his citizenship due to having been native-born in the U.S.?
- Is he a born citizen, and if so, which type and by what law?
- Is he a native of the United States? What makes him one or makes him not one?
- Is he an automatically-naturalized, constitutional citizen?
- Is he an automatically-naturalized, statutory citizen, and if so, by what statute?
- Is he a natural citizen, and if not, why not? Or if so, why so?
- Is he a natural citizen or is he some form of naturalized citizen?
- Is the nature of his citizenship determined by the citizenship of his father?
- Does having a foreign father result in a different type of citizenship than having an American father?
- When he was born, were his parents subject to the jurisdiction of the federal government?
- What would be the consequence if he had been born outside of the United States?
- What would the consequence have been if he had been born 100 years ago?

Answers to these questions have been provided in dozens of expositions, graphics, and treatises by this author and are available online as <http://obama--nation.com>

There are secondary questions that arise in relation to his citizenship, such as;

- Does he have a U.S. passport, and if so, when did he acquire it?
- What identification was used to acquire it, a birth certificate?
-
- If so, why has he not shown that birth certificate to anyone?
- What birth location does that birth certificate state?
-
- Where is the certified copy of his birth certificate that he has used throughout his adult life for proof of identity or citizenship?
-
- How could he obtain a legitimate social security number, driver's license, or a passport without one?
-
- How could he have lived his entire life and working career up until running for the presidency without a certified copy of his birth documentation?
-
- If he already had one, -like everyone else, why did he then supposedly order a new one from Hawaii in 2008? (one with a date stamp from a year earlier?)
-
- How could he just happen to be the only professional adult citizen (former Harvard graduate lawyer and constitutional lecturer) in the entire country without a birth certificate and also the only one running for President; -and the only one ever to have been known to have a foreigner for a father, and

with no proven birth location nor witnesses to the unforgettable birth of a Negro baby to a young white woman?

-
- Why has no hospital in any state identified itself as his birth location, and capitalized on that valuable fact?
-
- Why has every hospital in Hawaii stated that he was not born there, or, in the case of the one where he supposedly was born, refused to answer?
-
- Why has no one ever been allowed to examine the supposedly real hard-copy paper birth certificates, -not just images available only in the digital realm which is not a form acceptable by any authority of any nation on Earth as evidence of anything other than the ability to produce a look-alike image on a computer screen?

These questions have not only never been answered by the Main Stream Media nor the Republican Party, nor any constitution-defending conservative commentator, they haven't even been asked!

It's like the minds of Americans exist in a dream-like state with their eyes covered by veil upon veil, -going about their business without important answers nor even a curious thought that would raise the questions.

Some people *are* curious as I see from the locations of visitors to my blog. There are a few individuals in each of more than 70 countries as far flung as Tibet who are seeking answers. But the American people in general are fast asleep to the issue of the Constitution, the nature of citizenship, and birth certificate authenticity.

But they need to be awakened.

Maybe this will help:

YOU ARE NOT AN AMERICAN BY LAW!!

(unless one or both of your parents was a foreigner when you were born).

Rather, you are an American by nature. The reason that's so is revealed by exploring the nature of Barry Obama's citizenship.

Before asking the obvious question of whether or not he is a citizen due to being native-born, one must first ask if he actually was native-born. Strangely enough, there is absolutely no evidence nor eye-witness testimony that identifies his birth location (aside from his grandmother in Kenya who spontaneously responded in a telephone interview with the answer "Mombasa" when asked where he was born, claiming to have been present during the birth. And she stated that twice.

That answer was hurriedly "corrected" by others around her and the relative doing the translating, to identify the U.S. as the birth location. Such is the nature of the testimony of witnesses to his birth and its location, i.e., non-existent or questionable.

But what about the testimony of the Hawaiian "officials" who claim to have seen his original birth certificate and state that he was definitely born in Hawaii? Think about it. How naive and gullible do you have to be to believe that no human being who ever served in government would ever lie about anything?

When the stakes are high enough, the only person that people won't lie to face-to-face is the Almighty himself. If your family, your loved ones were being threatened with extreme harm, would you lie to protect them?

If you could win a \$500,000,000 lottery by means of a little lie, would you refuse what fate had put in your hands? If your wife or husband or child were accused of murder and you knew

he/she was innocent but would go to prison for life unless an alibi could be offered, would you refuse to supply one if there was no other alternative?

If the life of the President of the United States was at stake, would you not lie to protect him? How about the life of his presidency? If he is your champion, your dashing White Knight who carries your banner and is a fellow native son and political brother, why would a little white lie be out of the question? Wouldn't you fib a little to defend your brother? Or would you be racked with unbearable guilt if you didn't confess the truth that would result in him crashing and burning from a great and powerful height?

Everybody knows that everybody lies, they lie about little things that protect others from having their feelings hurt, or protect themselves from shame for deeds done or avoided. How much more are people willing to prevaricate about the biggest and most important things in their lives?

Ten percent of Americans are thieves, and all thieves are liars. And they aren't people you would automatically suspect of being a thief or a liar.

Two words: Bernie Maddoff. Yes, people lie, government people lie just as much, but politicians lie the most and they expect their loyal government people to defend them and their lies, and they do exactly that because they are loyal and "it's what's best" and "the ends justify the means".

It's very easy to rationalize telling falsehoods. We all learn it from a young age when we have to protect our younger siblings from the sad truth that Santa Claus isn't real.

Lies that protect people are good lies, especially if the person they protect is the President of the United States and his presidency.

That's why 18 minutes of the Nixon White House tapes were erased. That's why national secrets get classified as secret for 50 or 75

years. Someone needed protecting. That's why not a single "reputable" news or entertainment outlet in the whole country reported on things they knew about John Kennedy or John Edwards or Rock Hudson.

The issue of Obama's citizenship and ineligibility to be President is at the top of the list of things that no one will talk about. Sometimes, where there is no smoke, there's fire, as when alcohol burns. An invisible flame is burning all across the country as Americans one by one come to question whether or not their previous assumptions about Obama's legitimacy are true.

Nothing validating Obama's place of birth can come from those who whole-heartedly embraced him, because their word is not credible since people lie, and certainly lie about things that are of immense importance. Such as impeachment and disqualification to serve as President. But the importance of a foreign birth location is only a legal impediment to his qualification to be a citizen, and not a constitutional impediment to his qualification to be President.

The public ignorance of that fact is relied upon to validate his citizenship and presidential eligibility while keeping the spotlight completely away from the brick wall, found in the Constitution, which bars him from qualification to serve. That brick wall is the nature of his citizenship.

No one asks about that because everyone is ignorant about the basis of citizenship. We live in a very ignorant age when it comes to the roots of our nation and we've been led off-track by simplistic policies that took the short-cut to determination of citizenship (the use of birth certificates) because it was the only practical course to take, but in the switch from the real to the practical, the knowledge of the truth was lost. That truth is that the source of one's citizenship is not in geography, nor soil, nor man-made borders, but in one's parents.

Their citizenship, their political nature, became their children's citizenship just as their physical nature was passed to their off-spring. The incidental, irrelevant location of one's exit from the womb passed nothing to one in the form of inheritance of the status of one's parents.

One inherits nothing from the soil, nor from borders, so when the ingrained thought goes through the minds of Americans that they, and everyone else born in America is a citizen due to where they happened by happenstance to exit the womb, it never occurs to them to wonder why that is accepted as true. They think that that is just the way things are and have always been. But that impression is false. Things have not always been that way. In fact things were once quite the opposite.

When the United States came into being, citizenship, as well as immigration and naturalization, was a state matter. One was only a citizen of the United States by being a citizen of one of the states that comprised the union (unless born within the Federal District or on federal property). State citizenship was primary, federal citizenship was secondary and derived from state citizenship. No foreigner could father a federal citizen of the United States, though one could father a state citizen of one of the several states of the union which granted citizenship to "sons of the soil" They were not natural citizens but citizens by adoption via the law of the state of their birth.

Such persons were not viewed as natural citizens and thus could not serve as a Governor nor as President. It didn't matter that they were born in America. Children of foreigners, if they were born in a state without any "son of the soil" law, then they were viewed as possessing only the father's citizenship, making them foreigners also, -until he took the steps to become an American and completed the process before a naturalization magistrate involving reciting the Oath of Allegiance and Renunciation.

Then his minor children, through him, automatically shared his U.S. citizenship and became Americans also.

The citizenship of American females was never equal to that of American males because only the males shouldered the burden to defend the nation at risk of life and limb, and so U.S. policy treated them differently.

One example is the policy of "expatriation by marriage". By that policy an American woman would lose her U.S. citizenship by marrying a foreigner, -becoming a citizen of his nation, along with any children born to them. That uniform citizenship prevented the possibility of conflicting dual allegiance such as was experienced in America during the Civil War when brother fought against brother, and son against father. That policy became official United States Law via the Nationality Act of 1907, and remained in effect for 15 years, -and longer if she moved abroad to live with her foreign husband.

Similarly, if a foreign woman married an American man, she immediately became a new U.S. citizen without need of naturalization because she was "naturalized by marriage". She was his and shared what was his, namely his name, his social status and his citizenship status. Their children did not inherit her foreign citizenship (unlike today), but only that of their father.

Her proof of citizenship was his birth certificate and their marriage certificate. Neither she, nor her children, nor her American husband, nor anyone else in America had any Certificate of Citizenship by which to prove that they were an American, -except naturalized citizens who would have needed one, and foreign-born Americans who also might have needed one upon entry into the country since they would lack any exit identity papers.

Hence, for some 97% or so of American citizens, there was no evidence of the nature nor origin of their citizenship. But it didn't matter at all for 99.9999999999% of Americans because they

were never in their lifetime going to be running for the office of the President. If one did run for President, then the nature of one's citizenship did matter because the Constitution requires that he be a "natural born citizen".

Everyone who ever ran for President, except for the founding father's generation, (for which an exception was made) was a natural born citizen of the United States because they were born to fathers who were United States citizens, -with the exception of Chester Arthur who kept secret the fact that his father was an un-naturalized British subject when Chester was born, as well as Barack Obama, who was openly known to have been born of a foreigner, -the only person ever thusly elected in American history.

That was possible because everyone at this stage of our nation's life is ignorant of what a natural born citizen is. Or so I wish. If only it were that simple. But it isn't, because many people in important positions knew perfectly well that Senator Obama was not a natural born American citizen and was constitutionally ineligible to serve as President, -including Obama himself, as well as the leaders of the Democratic Party and the Justices of the Supreme Court. The first time that Obama ever read the Constitution's presidential eligibility clause, he knew instantly that it excluded him from being qualified. That was why he was willing to describe himself as being "Kenyan born" in his publisher's bio pamphlet for 17 years, until after announcing his unexpected candidacy for the presidency in 2007. Then he immediately switched to being Hawaiian born.

No one fathered by an un-naturalized immigrant, nor a non-immigrant Visa Card foreign visitor ever thought of himself as a natural citizen of the United States, i.e., -citizens with direct roots in a foreign country, -roots connecting him to a foreign people, foreign relatives, foreign culture, foreign history, foreign language, and a foreign political system.

Natural citizens have roots in only one country, one people, one government, one history. They are not dual citizens, bifurcated citizens, hybrid citizens, "cross-breed" citizens, possessing Siamese twin/ hermaphrodite-like citizenship. They were born of a mother and father who were the same, -of the same people, same country, same government, and same history. They are the natural citizens of the nation, -the natives of the country, -the natural members of its society, -the natural defenders of its freedom.

Foreigners are not required to defend the nation unless they are legal permanent members of the nation's society, but they are not citizens nor do they give birth to natural citizens. Their offspring are citizens by the generosity of American law, -not by nature, and as such they do not qualify to be President.

Many erroneously believe that Barack Obama is one of them, but he is not. He is doubly ineligible to be President because he was not fathered by a legal immigrant who was required to register for the draft. Instead, he was fathered by a Visa Card foreign student who was a subject of a foreign empire and was born with membership in that empire and his political status was subject to its jurisdiction, -as was stated on his own election website which shared that his father was "subject to the British Nationality Act of 1948, as were his children".

It's been said that Barack Obama has never stated that he is a natural born citizen. To state that he would be to knowingly lie since he knows full well that he isn't. He prefers to limit his lying to political and economic statements and not include legal statements. But he depends on the ignorance of the American people of all strips and positions that equate a native-birth with being a native of the nation even though only native parents can beget native children, -foreigners can not. They only produce hybrid children who are not *natural* members of any country but are members of two or more nations. They could even

possess four nationalities, inheriting them from parents each with dual-citizenship (in four different countries). *that* is not natural citizenship in anyone's definition.

Obama's dual-citizenship and foreign roots disqualify him from the presidency, regardless of where he was born. The flip side of that coin is that John McCain's uniform American citizenship qualifies him to be President regardless of where he was born.

John McCain's American parents produced an American son and it didn't matter where his mother was situation when it happened, -whether or not she was inside the U.S. border, outside the U.S. border, one top of the U.S. border, or a hundred or a thousand miles above the U.S. border. Location was irrelevant, -parentage was everything, just as in nature. The sons or daughters of a George W. Bush (President and son of a President) are not rendered ineligible to be President if their mother happened to deliver them just over the U.S. border while stuck in bumper-to-bumper border traffic.

Natural citizenship is an extension of Natural Law and its principle of natural membership. By that principle, Barack Hussein Obama is unconstitutionally occupying the office of the President of the United States because he was not born as a natural citizen of the nation. The nature of his un-natural citizenship can best be shown by a simply hypothetical.

Suppose that General George Armstrong Custer, (sent to deal with the Sioux nation), had brought his pregnant wife along with him when he and his cavalry traveled to Sioux territory. Suppose that this wife delivered George Custer Jr. while on Sioux land. Would he be a natural member of the Sioux nation? Would he be a Sioux native? Would he be eligible to be the Chief one day?

The Obama situation is identical except his mother would have to have been the Kenyan wife

of Obama Sr. In that scenario, what would Obama's nationality have been at birth? Would he have been viewed as a natural American citizen even though the off-spring of foreigners? Would he not have been a natural born Kenyan just like all other Kenyan children born of Kenyan parents?

A similar situation is that of John McCain. Did his location of birth being Panama mean that he is not a natural American? Did it mean he was a native member of Panamanian society and thus a natural citizen of the nation and eligible to be its President one day? Or was it irrelevant since he was born as natural American citizen?

If Obama had been born to his American mother in Kenya instead of Hawaii, what would his citizenship have been?

Answer: Kenyan only. At eighteen she was too young by several months for her U.S. citizenship to have been imparted to him when he was born. By U.S. law in 1961 she needed to be 19 years old.

But if he had born in America, would he have been a legal U.S. citizen at birth? Not by any law ever passed by Congress because the granting of U.S. citizenship to a child with a non-resident foreign father is only extended to those born outside of the U.S. to American mothers, -not inside.

Don't you think it odd that the qualification for the presidency is primarily based on a particular type of citizenship, and yet Obama's is not only not that type, but is dependent on an Attorney's General misconstruence (1899) of a Supreme Court's distortion (1898) of a constitutional amendment (the 14th, 1868) whose authors didn't explain the full meaning of the words they used in writing it?

No one can point to anything by which Obama clearly was born as a U.S. citizen, nor to anything that indisputably caused him to be born as a natural American citizen.

It doesn't matter though, unless you are Barack Obama, because no one else is affected by the Constitution's prohibition against such a citizen serving as the Commander-in Chief and President of the United States.

But he is affected, -or at least he should be and would be if the nation wasn't ignorant of its own fundamental law, -and knew enough to ask the right questions. You can't be knowledgeable of the right answers if you don't even know the right questions.

And no one is going to educate hundreds of millions of ignorant people. So don't hold your breath that anything is going to change in any foreseeable future, -unless a fearless, incorruptible judge makes a ruling that pulls the rug out from under an illegitimate presidency.

One would hope that such a judge exists, but will a lawsuit ever land on his or her docket? It's possible, and dedicated patriotic lawyers have worked hard to make that possibility a reality. But the resistance is very strong and the legal establishment won't allow any such suit to proceed. Blackmail, coercion, or bribery are waiting in the future of any judge who seeks to do the right thing, as we've seen in Georgia.

That's the inescapable conclusion drawn from the disposition of the ballot-challenge suits brought so far. Unexplained and unexplainable rulings have been silently issued which have been some of the greatest travesties in the history of American jurisprudence.

That's the new normal in American politics since the corrupter-in-chief was fast-tracked into the White House. And that's the way it will stay until he's booted from office, along with the two justices of the Supreme Court that he illegitimately appointed.

by a.r. nash june/ nov. 2012

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

http://obama_bc.wordpress.com