

Dangerous Questions...& Explosive Answers

(the untouchable Nitro of Obama's ineligibility)

A Supreme Court Chief Justice wrote in a ruling:
"Citizenship is nothing more than membership in a nation"

An Obama supporter wrote: "*Citizenship is a legal concept, not a matter of Natural Rights.*"

That statement begs the question: "Well where did the concept come from?" It has to have a source, and that source is...

The Principle of Natural Membership

By that principle, animals and humans are, by birth, members of the group into which they are born. They are natural members of their group. They are natural children of their society. They are natural citizens of their nation. They aren't outsiders because they were not born to outsiders but to members. Their membership is therefore natural membership.

The Constitution reserves one and only one office solely for a "natural born citizen" and that is the office of the President. The use of the word "natural" actually means natural. It does not have any reference to the location of one's birth. Instead, it refers to the nationality of one's father. A "born citizen" is one with citizenship from birth. A *natural* citizen is one with citizenship also from birth but, more importantly, citizenship *by* birth, -a citizen by being born as a natural member of the national group.

If one is a citizen *by birth* then one is not a citizen *by law* because law only relates to the citizenship of those who are foreigners and children born to them. No other law regarding citizenship exists nor *can* legitimately exist because no authority is provided to Congress to legislate regarding the citizenship of natural members of our country.

The citizenship of natives of the American nation is beyond the authority of Congress to touch. Also, since 1898, thanks to a Supreme Court opinion regarding the 14th Amendment, the same is true in regard to children of immigrants.

But even though the amendment is a much higher law than what the Congress can pass, it nevertheless is law, and is necessary in order for U.S. born children of immigrants to obtain citizenship.

Without it, (and a domestic birth) they have no U.S. citizenship because they have no natural right to membership in a group to which they inherit no membership from their outsider parents. Thus, instead of being dual citizens, they would be citizens of only their father's homeland.

The difference between natural citizenship and legal citizenship raises many questions. But Mr. Barack Obama won't and can't answer them because the answers destroy any illusion that he is truly constitutionally qualified to be the President. Obama knows full well that he is required to be a "natural born citizen" and he also knows full well that he is not that kind of citizen and the reason is very apparent.

But the minds of the American people aren't as clear as that of the self-described "Kenyan-born" "constitutional scholar" Barry Obama. So, in order to dispel ignorant and false certainty about the nature of his citizenship, a few well conceived questions for him are in order.

The questions are the following:

- Mr. Community Organizer, if John McCain, born of American parents (on foreign soil), is (as declared by the U.S. Senate, -including yourself as a member) a natural born American, then what are you?
- Mr. Obama, if like John McCain, you also had been born in Panama, (to your American mother and foreign father), would the Senate have declared you to be a natural born American as it did on behalf of John McCain?
- Mr. Dunham, if you had been born in the United States, but your mother was the Kenyan wife of your father, would you not be a natural born Kenyan by the same principle of patrilineal descent that made John McCain a natural born American citizen?
- Mr. Soetoro, is it possible to be a natural citizen of more than one nation? If one had parents who were dual citizens (with parentage in four different nations) would one nevertheless be a natural citizen of four different nations? Or merely a statutory citizen?
- Mr. "Columbia graduate", if you had been born in Kenya to American parents, would you not have been a natural American citizen just like John McCain?
- Mr. Constitutional Scholar, if one of the twin daughters of President George W. Bush had been born on the American side of that house situated directly on top of the U.S.-Canadian border, but her twin sister had been born across the room on the Canadian side, would that sister (though having a father and grandfather who served as U.S. Presidents) be ineligible to be President? Or would they both be eligible because they were Americans by birth? And what principle do you think the authors of the presidential eligibility clause intended when they used the word "natural" in the term "natural born citizen", -geographical location? or blood-connection natural inheritance?
- Mr. Commander-in-Chief, If the pregnant wife of George Armstrong Custer had accompanied him and the Seventh Cavalry to Sioux Territory, and delivered George Custer Jr. on the Sioux land, would his son be considered a natural native-born Sioux? Would he be eligible to one day be the Chief of the Sioux nation?
- Mr. Citizen of Hawaii, if you were really born in a Hawaiian hospital, why does no hospital in Hawaii claim bragging rights to you?
- Mr. Unvetted Candidate, If one's citizenship does not exist without the intervention of passed laws or an amendment to the Constitution, how exactly could such citizenship be considered natural when it's wholly dependent on human law and not natural law?
- Mr. World Citizen, How is it possible for a citizen of one nation to father a natural citizen of a different (foreign) nation?
- Mr. Women's Advocate, If you were born a century earlier, during the period of the Nationality Act of 1907 (by which your mother would have lost her U.S. citizenship by marrying a foreigner) -with your mother being a British citizen only, as well as yourself, how then could you be considered to be a natural American citizen today when the nature of natural citizenship hasn't changed, and is not dependent on nor alterable by the convention of human law?
- Mr. Questionable Citizenship, Should someone who has avoided calling himself a natural born citizen be considered by others to be one ?

- Mr. "Native-Born Citizen", If one is part and parcel of their parents, sharing their name, status, and nationality, then can one's "native land", somehow be a foreign country, -one other than their parents' country? Are they a "natural" member of a society which is foreign to their parents, or are they a natural member of only their parents' society and nation? Can they be a natural native member of a group/tribe/society/nation in which their parents are outsiders?
- Mr. "Kenyan born" "foreign student", Can someone with dual nationality, dual allegiance, dual attachment to two nations be viewed as a natural member of either nation?
- Mr. Duly Elected President, Can someone born with two nationalities be regarded as a natural American citizen and therefore fully eligible to command all the federal bureaucracy and policing agencies, all the military power of the nation, even including at one point tens of thousands of nuclear bombs? How can someone who could not qualify to guard the President with a loaded weapon because of dual-citizenship at birth, be considered to be eligible to *be* the President? How can someone who couldn't qualify to have access to American nuclear weapons be viewed as fully qualified to command the use of those weapons?
- Mr. U.S. Law Historian, Can someone be a natural American if they self-admittedly were born subject to the Nationality Act of a foreign nation even though the Civil Rights Act of 1866, expressly bars U.S. citizenship from those so born?
- Mr. Statutory Citizen, Can someone born of a foreign visitor, (-a guest of the government via a student visa), be an American citizen by the 14th Amendment when it expressly requires such a child, through its father, to be fully subject to federal authority, (and not foreign authority) -the kind that can strip one of nearly all of their civil rights, throw them into military boot camp, force them to undergo torturous combat training, and then send them to their death in war, (an authority that no government on earth claims)?
- Mr. Mystery Citizen, Can one whose only claim to citizenship is through an administrative policy based on a perversion of a Supreme Court opinion, -a policy that's demonstrably erroneous, be considered to be a natural born citizen even though natural citizens have no law, amendment, judicial opinion, nor federal policy granting them their citizenship?
- If one is born as a natural member of their parents' nation, then how can they also be a natural member of a foreign nation in which, by happenstance, they were born, even though their parents have no connection to that nation and are mere guests?
- How can anyone be a native member of a country in which neither of their parents are members? What powerful nuclear nation on Earth trusts a non-native or a half-native member of their society to control the full power of their military, and all departments of government, (including nuclear weapons)?
- How does a teacher of the Constitution, one fathered by a foreigner, upon his first reading the of Constitution's requirement for the presidency, ("No person, *except* a **natural** born citizen shall be eligible..." not know that he is excluded by it?
- Mr. President, By what warped, stretched, or convoluted logic are you even remotely qualified under the the Constitution to be President?

How does any American, or any citizen of any modern nation, go through his entire adult life, through his young adult years, his college years, professional years, married years, political years, and not possess a birth certificate? How is that not an impossibility?

How can one be forced to request a copy of their birth certificate for the first time when they are in their forties and running for President? It wasn't lost in any fire, flood, or tornado, so where is it?

Why would one not simply show the birth certificate that one has always possessed unless it contains something that would reveal one's disqualification for office?

If one were to realize that in the minds of the ignorant population, mere birth on U.S. soil would qualify them, then why would a determined office-seeker not do what determined teenage alcohol-seekers do and concoct a fake ID or birth certificate in order to obtain what they seek?

How does one who's offered the chance to be President not accept the chance when everyone is willing to overlook the inconvenient truth about the little road-bump of the Constitution having something uncomfortable to say about his qualification? [If no one else cares, why should he? And why the heck should the Constitution matter anyhow? Who made it the boss of us all?]

We would like answers, we are entitled to answers....but we'll never get any answers because no one dares ask the questions. Cowards on the left of us, ignoramuses on the right of us, hypocrites in front and in back of us. Or is it that they aren't merely cowards, but they know the truth and fear that it will split the nation in half like we haven't seen since the Civil Rights era? No doubt it's both, -some silent out of ignorance, some silent out of fear, or plain old indifference,

But they are not charged with the duty of remaining silent if ruled by fear. They are charged by the Oath of Allegiance to the Constitution by which they were sworn into office to be faithful to it, and defend it against all enemies, both foreign and *domestic*. Enemies are not simply those who are hostile to the United States. Enemies are those who trample the Constitution underfoot (including the enemy that occupies the White House) as well as those who silently permit it to happen and say and do nothing.

But he is the President. Legitimately elected by a majority of the American people. But illegitimately seated and validated by the cowards and ignoramuses of the U.S. Senate who failed in their constitutional duty to vet the qualification of everyone elected to serve as President & Vice-President. Instead, they, and the Supreme Court, remained silent and complicit as the crime of the century against the presidency occurred.

But that crime is small potatoes compared to what occurred when the tyrannical Health Care legislation monstrosity was ruled by the court to be constitutional. In relation to individual rights and fundamental freedom, that was the equivalent to having an arm amputated. Everything rested on the outcome of the presidential election. Now it can, and probably will, permanently alter the path America takes into the future because the SCOTUS traitors will probably allow it.

Will Americans tolerate the health insurance mandate being distorted by being labeled a tax instead of a penalty? Apparently they have. If the monstrous usurpation of State authority by the socialism-loving Progressives populating the federal government doesn't inspire the kick-start of a new American revolution that succeeds at taking back the government that has been stolen by an oligarchy of interests aligned against the American character, economy, history, fiscal integrity, and foundational principles, then we will have gone past the tipping point, (-the likes of which we've never seen in our lifetimes) through the looking glass and down the rabbit hole into a socialist future under a Queen of Hearts BIG GOVERNMENT in which "All ways are my ways".

Free will and free choice will then be relegated to history. We will have become the United Socialist States of America, -unless some States rebel, as with the marijuana legalizations.