Is Obama Jr. a Caucasian Kenyan?

~the enormously significant answer

Mariah Carey is Caucasian. Vanessa Williams is Caucasian. Haley Barry is Caucasion. Barack Obama is Caucasian. None of them are Negroes.

Who says so? I say so. And who has any standing to contest what I say? No one, unless they have some facts that refute my claim.

What facts might they offer? They might argue that just because they had a Caucasian parent or grandparent, -that does not make them Caucasian. To which one must reply that neither does having a Negro parent or grandparent make them Negro.

So if they can't legitimately be called either of those two possibilities, then what exactly are they and what should they be called? To what natural group do they belong?

Can the Peach family claim Nectarines belong to it? Or does the Plum family own that right? Of course it's neither. Nectarines are a combination of both, being a hybrid that belongs to neither group.

Can Murray the Mule be called a natural horse because his father was a horse? Or can he be called a natural donkey because his mother was a donkey? Since he is neither of those two he can't be called by those labels. One can say that he is neither of the two or that he is both, sharing the nature of both, but one can't say that he is a natural member of either group because natural horses do not have donkey mothers, nor do natural donkeys have horse fathers. Instead he is something else. Something different.

So, cutting to the chase, is Barack Obama a natural Negro or a natural Caucasian? More importantly is he a natural Kenyan or a natural American? Or is he neither because he is a hybrid combination of the two, resulting in something different and not natural at all?

Is there such a thing as a natural group of Kenyan-Americans? Are any hybrid creatures or hybrid people natural members of any group? How can they be natural members when there is no such natural group to which they could belong?

There is no such thing as a natural mule group because mules are sterile and unable to produce group members. Similarly, there is no such thing as a natural Kenyan-American group which can reproduce members because their off-spring will be a members of legal groups, -not a *natural* group . Kenya does not, or did not, allow dual-citizenship, -just as the United States for over a century (from its inception) did not allow dual-citizenship.

Kenyan hybrids born abroad, (like Obama Jr.) at the age of adulthood must swear sole and undivided allegiance to Kenya or their citizenship (provisional) expires.

Barack Obama allowed his provisional Kenyan citizenship to expire, while assuming that his supposed American citizenship would be preferrable. But there is no law by which he ever possessed American citizenship. Nor is there any contitutionally legitimate Supreme Court opinion which allows U.S. citizenship for off-spring born on U.S. soil to foreign Visa-card visitors. But he chose to have it both ways in a sense since he labeled himself for perhaps two decades as being Kenyan-born, and thus assumedly a naturalized Kenyan-American, when it fact he knew that he was neither.

In his Marxism-steeped mind the truth is what you choose it to be, it's all relative to your needs, to your most beneficial narrative. He practiced that approach to his utmost benefit when it came to *not* explaining the Fast & Furious operation (claiming "executive privilege" -as in privilege to hid the truth and cover your own political behind) as well as Benghazi-gate and the cover-up of what actually happened, why it happened, and why it was lied about.

But there is an opinion offered by the Attorney General in 1898 (John William Griggs) which

opined that the Supreme Court interpreted the 14th Amendment in the Wong case of that year to mean that children of all foreigners born in the U.S. -except those with foreign ambassador or military attache credentials, are U.S. citizens at birth. But that is not what the court asserted. They instead asserted, contrary to the entire previous history of the republic, that children of *immigrants*, (like children of slaves), -being members of American society, are therefore subject to the full authority of Washington just as are children of citizens. That meant that they fulfilled the requirements of the 14th Amendment citizenship clause.

What did that opinion imply? They didn't say explicitly, but anyone who knows something important about history knows the result. It was that the subjection that was imputed to the children of immigrants was also covertly imputed to their fathers (through whom subjection descends).

What was the consequence of that covert arcane implication? It was that foreign immigrants, like citizens, became subject to the most fundamental responsibility of members of American society, and that responsibility is to defend the nation if called. They, after that, were no longer exempt from the draft. They had to fight for the nation that was not their own because they were members of a society that *was* theirs and for which they shared the responsibility to preserve, protect, and defend.

Obama Sr. was never subject to that responsibility and thus neither was his son through him. Their responsibility was toward the father's nation of Kenya. Obama Sr. was obligated to help defend Kenya if it was invaded by a neigboring state, and that obligation was a latent responsibility of his son as well, which would come to fruition if he choose Kenya as his one and only nationality as an adult.

Did he also latently bear responsibility toward the United States through his mother?
Not exactly. Mothers are not subject to that responsibility because they are not and have never been the warriors and defenders of any group or nation. Rather, he bore responsibility because of two other things. The first was that the INS assumed that he was a U.S. citizen because he was born in the U.S., and that assumption was based on the opinion of the A.G. Griggs who didn't take into account the yet unforeseen possibility of widespread cases of children born to illegal immigrants, nor the possibility of children born to transient visiting foreigners.

Thus his simplistic opinion was given or understood to state that birth in the United States conferred citizenship to children of foreigners, -all foreigners, even if they were not legal immigrants, and even though the Supreme Court had never rendered such a simplistic opinion, having limited its ruling solely to children of immigrants domiciled in America.

So, was Barack Obama born as a natural Kenyan or a natural American? The answer of course is "neither". Does it make any difference that he was not a natural American? It only makes a difference in the rarest of circumstances, -so rare in fact that such a case is only one in 315 million.

There are hundreds, thousands, millions of positions in which children of immigrants can serve their country at the federal level, and many million more at the state and local levels. But there are three positions in which neither children of immigrants, -nor children of visiting aliens, can serve their (or our) country. One is any position related to the protection, control, servicing, and launch of nuclear bombs. Another is in the Secret Service detail of guarding and protecting the President and Vice-President of the United States. The third one is the office of the President himself, -along with the Vice-President.

Any citizen of the United States, including naturalized citizens, their children, and even native-born children of immigrants, can serve in Congress and as federal judges. They can even serve as the President of the Senate, and the Chief of the Supreme Court, but none of them are allowed to serve as President of the nation and Chief of its federal and military and nuclear command. Only

natural Americans are allowed to occupy that position because it entails too much power to entrust to one whose loyalty to America can be questioned due to the possible influence of a foreign father who may have raised his child to love and be loyal to a foreign power (like the King of England and the nation of Great Britain).

That risk of a divided or disloyal heart was removed from contaminating the office of the President by the authors of the Constitution when they mandated that "NO PERSON *Except* a natural born American shall be eligible to the office of the President" -but instead of using the word American they used the word citizen, which is its equal. One can't be one without being the other.

So, being as Obama Jr. is not and can never be a natural American since natural Americans, like horses and donkeys, only have parents with the same nature, whether biological or political, and nationality hybrids are no more natural than mules, he is therefore an unconstitutional charlatan illegitimately sworn in and occupying the office of the President in direct and open violation of the United States Constitution.

Clearly it is a travesty that a non-natural presumed American citizen is knowingly, subversively, and autocratically in hypocritical and on-going violation of our Constitution, but it's even worse than that because he is not a legitimate hybrid-citizen of the U.S. since by U.S. statutes he was not even an American at all via birth within U.S. borders (since his father was not an immigrant) but he also was not an American via his mother because the laws of the last century that grant U.S. citizenship to children of American mothers only pertains to children born *out*side of the United States, -in foreign nations.

So if he wasn't born with traditional natural citizenship via American parents, nor did he obtain hybrid dual-citizenship through native-birth to an immigrant father, nor provisional citizenship via foreign birth to an American mother, nor naturalized citizenship as an adult, then exactly what is the nature of his supposed citizenship? It is citizenship that federal policy presumes to exist based solely on the force of the simplictic opinion rendered by the unelected A.G. in 1898 and which carried only the tenuous authority of the executive branch even though it does not comport with anything ever passed by the United States Congress nor "settled" by the Supreme Court.

In other words, he is presumed to be an American solely because of one man's opinion, -an opinion which failed to provide any guidelines as to what its limits were. Barack Obama (and his Attorney General) possess the authority to declare himself to *not* be an American citizen due to lack of any controlling legal authority that constitutionally, legislatively, or judicially grants him that status.

Congress lacks the constitutional authority to legislate citizenship law over any but those born with an American parent and a foreign parent outside of the United States, as well as those who wish to undergo naturalization. It also lacks any authority to control immigration, which constitutionally remains a state matter since it is not even mentioned in the Constitution. The 14th Amendment of 1868 bestowed citizenship rights to all born in the U.S. who are born subject to full federal authority, meaning the children and descentants of imported slaves. The Supreme Court in the 1898 Wong case then extended the meaning of the Amendment to include children of immigrants, but nothing in legislative nor judicial history has extended citizenship to children of foreign *visitors* even if born on U.S. soil.

If Obama Sr. was an American and his wife was a Kenyan woman, then Obama Jr. would be a legitimate statutory American citizen no matter where he was born. Likewise if Kenyan Obama Sr. was a U.S. immigrant; -but neither of those two possibilities were the case with Jr. Contrary-wise, if Jr. had been born in Panama, like John McCain, he not only would be recognized as not eligible to be President, but would not even be an American if it were not for INS statutes passed within the last 75 years to allow American mothers to pass their

citizenship to children with foreign fathers. No one whose citizenship depends on statutes passed by Congress is eligible to be the President. The Presidential eligibility clause was written before Congress existed, nor any laws passed by it.

American mothers can only pass their citizenship to children of a foreign father if they are born abroad, assumedly in his country. That is the only provision in U.S. law by which a mother's citizenship is inherited by her children. Congress never thought about the situation of a domestic birth because the assumption was held by all that mere birth in the U.S. conferred citizenship, but that is a completely erroneous and ignorant view based on the universal assumption that the interpretation of the Attorney General's opinion in 1898 got it right.

Either the Justice Department's interpretation of his interpretation of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the 14th Amendment was wrong, or else his interpretation itself was wrong. Having never read it, I can't offer my interpretation of what it said. But I read a cable from the U.S. embassy in Italy asking about the citizenship of one born in the U.S. to Italian parents visiting America, wondering if the child must be considered to be an American citizen. The assumption sent in reply was that he must. It was dated 1901.

So the new erroneous opinion was already being universally disseminated at the beginning of the last century. If the *correct* opinion had been disseminated, then Barack Obama Jr. would never have been elected President, and millions of people born here to illegal foreigners would not be considered to possess U.S. citizenship either.

It's like Fate rolled the dice and we came up losers when A.G. Griggs made his huge mistake. Such is the history of many travesties inflicted upon our nation by misinformed, uninformed, unwise, simplistic, disinterested, and self-serving dunces and corruptocrats who managed to get elected or appointed to federal office. That is the nature of the entire federal bureaucracy and the lobbying groups that provide them enormous salaries and a revolving door.

Such situations almost never get resolved or corrected. But sometimes they do, as via the horrors of the Civil War, followed by the 14th Amendment, and the Civil Rights laws a century apart, and the recent appeals court unanimous ruling that Obama's "recess appointments" to the National Labor Relations Board were unconstitutional and therefore null and void. But the pattern is usually like ten steps forward (toward statist, totalitarian federal authority) and one step back.

Can we hope that some court will be equally fearless when it comes to ruling on Obama's presidential eligibility? Not based on the pattern that his thugs have managed to perpetuate so far. No judge, even the Chief Justice, have stood up to their threats and/or bribery, caving-in in astonishingly illogical, illegitimate, and transparently influenced manners.

We've gotten much unconstitutional legislation from congress (including obumercare), many unconstitutional rulings by five supreme court justices, and an unconstitutional president presiding over the whole corrupt unconstitutional mess. Other than that we're doing OK, (at least some states are) except for the fact that Washington D.C. is a hypocritical self-perpetuating moral septic tank and we have a national debt that will crush our future, with no credible change seen coming anywhere on the horizon. Don't hold your breath waiting for Washington to do the right thing.

Have a nice day!

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

The comments by Lord Coke fail to get to the heart of the matter because he apparently was not conscious of what the core or fundamental issue was. The issue determining subjecthood was not ligeance or one's loyalty, -they were merely symp-

toms of something more fundamental, and that was *blood* and the inheritance it passes-on to the next generation.

That inheritance is one of social and national responsibility to assist in the preservation of the society and nation. One born to a member of a society is bound by blood inheritance with the same responsibility as his father to defend his homeland. That obligation binds him to obedience to the powers that conduct the defense of the nation, that being the King and his subordinates.

One born to a foreigner is under no such obligation unless his father has taken up residence within the land and become a member of its society. Then domicile is a preeminent issue. Transient foreigners owe no loyalty to defend a nation not their own and a society of which they are not a part.

But via immigration, one joins that nation and is obligated to help defend it when it's threatened.

Until one understands the primary issues underlying citizenship and subjecthood, one is not grounded in the fundamental natural law principles that define them. It all goes back to natural groups and inherent responsibility to defend one's group. All group membership includes that responsibility as its primary obligation.

That was the reasonable and natural reason why women were not viewed as equal citizens as men. They were not obligated to shed their blood to defend their homeland. Without that primary citizenship responsibility, they also were not seen as responsible to determine the leadership of the society and nation via voting. If they were not created to fulfill the first responsibility, then they could be viewed as rightly excluded from the second, at least until after the war to end all wars.

by a.r. nash Jan 2013 obama--nation.com