Natural Law versus Natural Rights; Genesis vs Obama

When it comes to the legitimacy of the presidency of Barack Obama and the issue of whether or not he is constitutionally qualified to serve, the entire Washington establishment and the American legal community are as silent as a graveyard. But there is a voice that is not silent to the ears of those who hear it, and that voice is found in the book of Genesis.

The origin of Genesis, and its assumed divine inspiration, is not relevant. What's relevant is its inescapable impact on Western Civilization through the adoption by Emperor Constantine of the Christian faith as the only state sanctioned faith & religion of the Roman Empire.

By his conversion, the Judeo-Christian scriptures and tradition of the Church became the bedrock of society in fundamental ways. One of those ways was the relationship between husband and wife.

Before then, Rome had never been under the influence of Judeo-Christian tradition regarding the status of women but instead was under the more liberal tradition of their pagan theology. When it came to women, it followed natural rights to a more liberal extent than Christian tradition & society. Roman woman enjoyed a higher status in society and marriage than Christian women.

The difference between the two cultures regarding women bore a similarity to the difference between the status of Eve before “the Fall of Man” and her status in relationship to Adam *after* the Fall.

If you’re unaware of the influence of the Fall on Western psychology, you will not understand the societies that evolved from The Holy Roman Empire. It’s central to everything. From it the status of women was determined for all time, -or until the age of the 19th amendment came along and changed things. What was that change? It was a reset back to the original order in Eden, -kind of.

Genesis paints a picture of how originally in Eden Man & Eve lived in perfect harmony and blissful ignorance about good and evil. They were co-created as equals in one version given in Genesis, while in another Eve was created later from the marrow of Man's rib. The two versions aren't naturally reconcilable so instead of ignoring either one, we'll look at both because both are part of the story.

Chaper 5: This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created Man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them and called their name Adam (Man), in the day when they were created. -(followed by the genealogy of the first born)

Chapter 1. verse 26: And God said: "Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness, and let <u>them</u> have dominion over the fish, over the fowl of the air... (the human species having dominion over all life)

Both mentions agree regarding the simultaneous creation of the human species, like all other lower forms of life that preceded them. But then another accounting appears in the story, -one in which Eve was created as a kind of after-thought.

Chapter 2, verse 7: And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden and there he put the man whom he had formed.

verses 15-17: And the Lord God took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying,

"Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat, for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.

Verse 20: And Adam gave names to...every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found a help meet for him.

Verse 18: And the Lord God said: "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him."

Verses 21-25: And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took

one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh thereof; and of the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.

And Adam said, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; -she shall be called Woman because she was taken out of Man".

Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be **one flesh**.

And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

~ ~ ~ ~

So far we see two pictures; one in which they were created together and as co-equals, and one in which the man was first and the woman was later generated from his DNA, his flesh & bone as a secondary creation.

Then the serpent appeared and invited Eve to try the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge.

Chapter 3, verse 6: And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food…and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked...

verse 13: And the Lord God said unto the woman, "What is this that thou hast done?" And the woman said, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."

Unto the woman he said, "...in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall **rule over thee**."

And unto Adam he said "cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;...in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken, for dust thou art and to dust shalt thou return."

The elements of that story became the foundation of the husband-wife relationship in Judeo-Christian civilization, including our own. It structured it in both social and legal ways.

The citizenship law of our civilization flows from the laws of the Church, -the church being the lone authority in the sacred union of Holy Matrimony and family life. The relationships adopted from Church Law became the basis of secular law, and remain so today to a significant degree.

Let's put them in the spotlight. Before the Fall, Eve was the equal of the Man, but not as a separate entity apart from him, but as a new manifestation of him; she was Adam with the opposite gender. She was essentially his identical twin but with the tweaking of the gender genes.

That is the original state of mankind, the natural state, but then the Fall changed the relationship and the woman was blamed for her naivete (disobedience) and was thenceforth assigned an inferior role in relationship to her previously equal mate.

From then on, their relationship no longer followed the principle of Natural Rights, but instead followed the principle of Natural Law.

In the natural world, there's a fundamental principle, and it is that greater force dominates weaker force, -whether it be gravity or energy or biology or psychology. The stronger will dominate the weaker. The male is stronger than the female and therefore is responsible to face far greater dangers in life. The females, as well as children, are the subjects of the males' protection and provision.

Mothers, sisters, wives and daughters are therefore the subordinate center and highest priority of male lives, -for both natural and biblical reasons. One could speculate that the biblical story was shaped to fit the physical and psychological reality of the male-female relationship, (to conform to the male ego) but only the relationship itself, and its biblical origin and impact on Western Civilization, is of significance.

Two major aspects of that relationship are the foundation of fundamental citizenship law; -the subordinate role of the wife, and the fact that she and he are one, and not two. The latter makes the former natural, because if she was not of him, then her subordination would be a stark violation of natural rights. But the story, and the text of God's words to her, along with the natural weaker nature of the female body, combine to make her subordination of similar weight to the opposing principle of Natural

Rights that requires equality. The matter was decided by the overwhelming weight of divine authority taking sides.

But at the heart of making it work is the other aspect of the Genesis relationship. He and she are one, and therefore the rough edges of individuality are not going to rend it asunder. When two similar elements are combined, they blend easily and naturally, but when two *dis*similar elements combine (oil & water) unity is impossible.

The union of marriage was regarded as holy and sacred and spiritual. A merging of hearts, psyches and bodies that results in a union of identities; she being a part of him and he being a part of her, and the friction of human individuality being modulated by the model mandated by God, as well as the natural pattern (-that being the structure of a singular entity).

Having become one in marriage, the couple then modeled the pattern of nature for physical bodies, namely that they have one head, and one body. A body doesn't have two heads. So one of the two must be the head. And which one that would be was decided by the factors found in the Genesis story and the factors found in the natural structure of male and female. That appeared to be not only the Divine order but also the natural order, and vice versa.

That order is the basis of Church law, which is the basis of Secular law, including that of the States of America. Every state followed that model or pattern, and when it came to the federal government formulating national Naturalization Law & Policy, it was followed as well.

But both were a reflection of the traditional social structure of the nation. It contained the perennial conflicts of what seemed to be Natural Law versus Natural Rights in both the areas of male-female relationships, and also White-Black relationships and the owner-property relationship maintained in the institution of slavery.

But only one side could be the law at a time, and so the struggle went on for a long time before either won a final victory, and the situation was resolved in favor of over-throwing the tradition of the Church-Bible centered society and its unity based model, and switching to the secular, Natural Rights based model built on Individualism and Equality. No one can say for certain which is better, only which one seems more "fair" versus which one is more supported by God.

Now that the background is clear, let's examine how it impacted American law.

The strongly patriarchal nature of most civilizations, along with the Judeo-Christian model of matrimonial unity and single-headship, resulted in nationality laws that followed that model.

The issue of one's nationality was based first and foremost on universal natural law. Parents of all species produce off-spring identical to themselves. Dogs don't produce cats. Horses don't produce Zebras. Like breeds like. The off-spring are of the same nature as their origin. That's the biological reality of natural law, but there is more. There's the social reality as well.

The off-spring are not born as members of communities of other species, but of their own. They are the natural members of the community of their own kind. They are members because they are born of members and born into the community as its new members. That is the principle of natural membership. It underlies all nationality law based on natural principle.

But the realm of natural law is not encoded into the realm of human law, -at least in America. It is absent altogether. Law is not needed to proclaim, declare, mandate, or order to be true that which is already naturally true. Hence there is no law by which 97% of the American population possesses their American nationality.

There is a law (the 14th Amendment) which describes their natural citizenship from the point of legal theory, but does not legislate it. It merely affirms that which was already true. A cat is born a cat; you cannot legislate that it *be* a cat.

That is the alternate-reality truth about Natural Citizenship. It is not given by nor governed by legal mandates because its origin is from outside of the legal system. The legal system is a man-made construct designed to maintain order. But it is not

the entirely of the the ordered universe. The Natural realm is the real universe and has its own order separate and apart from what legislators mandate.

They operate or sail on a lake of man-made mandates while thinking that that vast lake constitutes all of reality, when in fact it is just a superficial thing on the surface of a much greater reality. Natural membership and its national form known as citizenship is not a part of that great lake of law, but is the bedrock on which it lies.

It is a part of the natural order of things, not the legal order. The legal order recognizes that fact and thus the framers of our Constitution didn't meddle in such a fundamental area. But it was the job of the Congress that the founders created to provide order in situations outside of the natural order. They had to fashion a legal order to deal with relationships that did not follow the pattern of nature.

Those relationships, American male and foreign female, or American female and foreign male, produced children that could not possibly be from a unified source / single origin unless the Genesis-Christian pattern was followed to a "t". Relationships that didn't follow it were fully regulated by law determined by tradition, international law, or congressional choice. It was in fact a combination of all three.

The American male, following the patriarchal biblical tradition of society, was the head of the family. His children were what he was since they were of him, -just as Eve was what Adam was, because she was of him.

Following that pattern completely meant that the American equivalent of Eve was also a part of the American Adam. She was of him, part of him and one with him. They were "one flesh", one body in the community of society. Whatever was his nationality was hers also because they were inseparable. That was not only the theoretical view, but the actual view of the American government. It followed the inherited Church Law pattern as part of the semi-natural order of things.

How did that play out in real life? When a foreign woman married an American, she became an American also, just like her new head. She left the headship of her father, -who gave her away to the headship of her husband, and she took his name and swore obedience to him as the new head of her life, and they became one. One unit in the eyes of God and man. United under one nation, one government, one allegiance, one national charter of Liberty, Unity, Order, Security, and Civil Rights.

What was the proof of her new citizenship? It was her marriage certificate and her husband's birth certificate. Her citizenship was not a tangible thing because she was not born as an American, but then even those born as Americans had no substantial proof of citizenship. Rather it was deduced from the location of their birth because that was always an indisputable fact thanks to written records.

One could prove that they weren't born as a member of a foreign nation since they were born in America. But that was not what made them Americans. It was merely the only practical means of showing one's origin that was tangible and transportable. They could not carry their parents with them to testify that they were born of American parents, which made them natural citizens like (almost) everyone else.

So birth certificates came to substitute for parental testimony. It was accepted that if you were born in America then you weren't a foreigner. But that view overlooked a very serious problem. Some persons born in America were born to foreigners, and thus were also foreigners just like their father, the head of their family.

That dichotomy created a problem eventually when the numbers of immigrants (like my great-grand parents) swelled to the millions. Were their U.S. birthed children also just simply foreigners like their father? Could their American birth make a difference, or would the fact that they were being raised in America and being Americanized all throughout their upbringing? Could they be considered Americans and yet not be citizens?

The Supreme Court ruled in 1898 that they were born under American authority and therefore by the

words of the 14th Amendment, they were American citizens. And that settled the matter...-of the children. But which children?

Children of only married foreign immigrants? (If the father was subject to the full authority of the American government, then so were his children as required by the Amendment.)

But what about children of foreign *non*-immigrants? [tourists and visitors] Their father was not subject to American political authority. They could not be drafted to fight for America like immigrants could following the court's opinion.

And what about children of a non-immigrant father (Barack Obama Sr.) and an American mother? Or children of American mothers married to foreign fathers and born in foreign lands? Was there some natural law that covered such situations? Of course not because they were not natural situations.

Positive naturalization law needed to be written by Congress exercising its constitutional plenary authority over naturalization. And so in time laws to cover every possibility were written. Except one. That was the situation of one such as Barack Obama, -born of a "non-immigrant alien" who was not subject to the American federal authority that dictated the requirements and responsibilities of American citizens and immigrants.

That authority was extended over foreign immigrants by that Supreme Court ruling in 1898 (The U.S. vs Wong Kim Ark) but the issue of the citizenship of children of *non*-immigrant aliens was never addressed.

But...the Attorney General at that time, John Griggs, assumed that it had been, and therefore declared that the new policy of the United States government would be that *all* children born in America to foreigners would be viewed henceforth as being American citizens (except those of foreign diplomats) regardless of being born to a father who was not subject to the full American authority that the amendment requires one to be born under.

His misinterpretation then became national policy under the guise that it was actually national law mandated by the Supreme Court in interpreting the 14th Amendment. Ever since it has been deeply entrenched as the established American way, though in fact it is merely established policy and not true law. It is our calcified established institutionalized error.

But getting back to our focus on American women and their role in marriage, nationality, and naturalization law, we find that nationality always flowed from the head of the family, and that was always the father, unless he died or they divorced, or the mother refused to reveal who and what he was. If he was not or could not be known, then his child was the flesh and blood of only the mother, and her nationality became that of the child. Otherwise, it was only the father's nationality that determined that of their child. That was the way the law was written and carried out.

But that pattern became even more deeply entrenched in 1907 when the naturalization act of that year stripped American citizenship from women who married foreign men. Then, not only were her children not Americans, but she was not an American any longer herself, since she became what her husband was, and became a citizen of his nation, since she then belonged to him, and he belonged to his nation, therefore so did she through him. That was the law of the land for 15 years, -until it was rescinded by the Cable Act of 1922.

After the passage of the Cable Act and the 19th Amendment which granted women the right to vote, naturalization law gradually came to impute the American mother's citizenship to her foreign-born, foreigner-fathered children. Those laws came into effect within the life time of many living Americans.

The view that Barack Obama is eligible to be President is based on multiple bastardizations of reality. It begins with the false assumption that American nationality from before the founding of the nation was based on where one was born, -being based solely on British common law that held that all children born within the one-state nation of England would be considered to be natural born subjects even though they were not, since children of immigrants were in fact alien-born subjects.

That kind of label and view became politically incorrect because it fostered discrimination, so children of foreigners were given the same label as children of subjects, and that was that. It became a British fiction of law that all subjects were the same.

But in the new United States, there were no subjects nor any King, so no one was a subject, nor a natural born one. In the real world, English common law had no place or authority once the legislature or Constitutional convention of a state agreed on what the state law would be regarding who is recognized as state citizens. So one by one, each state determined its own law of citizenship. Both those whom it recognized and those it naturalized became citizens also of the new nation (by extension).

But the new central government was not in the citizenship business, except for the writing of a rule of naturalization that would make the laws of all of the states uniform. Under that system, children of foreigners were foreigners also like their father, unless they were born in a state that granted them citizenship from birth as new members of the state society.

That was something that the otherwise sovereign states held control over because such children were not foreign born. At least one had such a law, but whether or not other states did as well, the federal government never had any such law because Congress never passed one. Why would it since that was the province of the states, along with immigration?

So unless Barry was actually, provably born in one of our States, and that state grants citizenship to children of non-immigrant fathers, then he would not be a citizen of that state nor the nation through his state citizenship. As explained, the federal government has no law which grants citizenship to children of "non-immigrant aliens" nor does the 14th Amendment provide it, nor did the Supreme Court opinion which interpreted it. But it does have the entrenched Griggs policy by which such children are presumed to be American.

So Barry isn't a citizen via adopted English common law since Congress never adopted it regarding citizenship, -nor via state "son of the soil" laws, nor via the Supreme Court ruling of 1898 regarding the 14th Amendment, and so his only basis of assumed citizenship was the error of A.G. Griggs which became the policy of the State Department and Naturalization Service, and has been so ever since.

But let's suppose that Congress had passed a law that was contrary to their Civil Rights Act of 1866, which required that in order for native birth to convey citizenship, one must be "not subject to any foreign power" (meaning not having a foreign father), -and that that law had done what the Supreme Court and the 14th Amendment did not do (make citizens of U.S. birthed children of non-immigrants , -meaning children of foreign guests), then Barack Obama would have been a bona fide American citizen if he was born within the territory of the United States. He therefore would be a citizen of the nation. But that would still leave him with a huge problem.

The Constitution prohibits "legal citizens" of the United States from serving as President. Instead, one is required to be born a *natural* citizen, -which is something that one Barry Obama Jr. can never be.

What prevents him from fitting that description? His father. By American law, by English law, by Church law, and probably by Roman law and Greek law, his nationality was determined by the man who produced him and through whom his primary citizenship was determined, -just as his own election web-site freely shared in 2008.

It made it clear that the citizenship of Barack Obama Sr. was governed by the British Nationality Act of 1948, as well as that of his children. This was in the words of his own ignorant supporters, making it clear that he was a dual-citizen at birth.

He was at best a dual citizen, possessing provisional citizenship in two nations. But if born outside of the United States, he would have been British only because his mother was several months too young to convey her citizenship to her child according to naturalization law in effect when he was born.

That would be similar to his status if he had been born 40 years earlier. Between 1907 and 1922, he

would have also been British only because his mother would have lost her American citizenship due to a supposed marriage to a foreigner, -a marriage for which not one shred of evidence exists, -of any sort. No love letters or notes. No cards, no photographs, to witnesses, no record. And that is along with there being no photos of his mother pregnant with him, nor photos of her along side her boyfriend and husband. No proof they even knew each other much less had a relationship that led to marriage and a child, -nor that they ever lived together, -while there is proof that they didn't.

And on top of that is the fact that a month after his son's supposed birth, he didn't even know he had a son because if he did, he certainly would have trumpeted that fact to the immigration authorities who were at that time weighing whether or not to extend his student visa or expel him. Instead, he failed to even mention it in his submission to them.

To be fair, perhaps he knew but was afraid of legal repercussions of impregnating a 17 year old white girl. But if they were actually married there would have been none. So either they weren't married or he didn't know that a son was being attributed to him at that time.

There is little doubt that he was the father by the fact that he traveled all the way back to Hawaii for a custody hearing regarding the child of their mysterious marriage (for which papers were never submitted).

That reveals that the relationship actually existed, at least the sexual relationship which was kept on the down-low,..very down low; so low in fact that no one even knew about it, -at least until Obama's mother became pregnant. But even then, it may have remained a secret since there is no record of her whereabouts between February of 1961 and late August of '61 three weeks after the birth of Jr. when she registered for college classes in Seattle. No one can prove where she was or where she wasn't during that time.

If she spent the tail end of it in Seattle, she could easily have decided to have her baby across the border in Vancouver if she found a couple or institution there that would adopt the mixed-race baby that she sought to make someone else's problem. That would explain much.

But it wouldn't explain why in the British Archives, Obama Sr. has been discovered to have an entry for a son born in Kenya in 1961 even though no known Kenyan child was born to him between 1960 and 1963. That fact gives fuel to the belief that Jr. had been born in Kenya, as his self-authored publisher's bio stated for over a decade and a half. It also comports with the fact that the INS records for inbound flights into the U.S. between Aug 1, 1961 and Aug 10, 1961 are the only ones known to be missing from the national microfilm archive.

While a Senator, he and his wife openly stated that Kenya was his home. But that may have been to support his long-standing story that he was a product of two different international cultures, which gave him a unique perspective, -one worth writing about in a biography that was certainly worth purchasing (?) if he ever finally got around to fabricating one (which took over ten years even though he took a huge advance for it).

So neither by Church law, nor English law, nor State law, nor Federal law, nor constitutional amendment, nor Supreme Court opinion is Barack H. Obama Jr. even an American. His supposed citizenship rests entirely on the institutionalized error of Attorney General Griggs. He depends entirely on that error. Well, not entirely because he depends even more on another error, a "common knowledge" error of ignorance.

The American people are ignorant of the fact that the President must be a natural born citizen.

I wasn't aware of that fact until I got an email from my sister about the issue. That email changed the focus of my attention for three solid years. And I was a straight-A student. So if I wasn't aware, it's for sure that it isn't common knowledge.

That other error is the belief that citizenship universally results from being born in the United States, with all citizens being eligible to be President if so born. That works for him and against him, because his proof of being born in the United States is non-existent.

He has successfully maintained the pretense that the state of Hawaii has officially verified and certified that his original birth certificate is in their possession. There's a few huge problems with that.
1. No one from Hawaii has ever sworn under oath to anything, though they have issued lawyer-crafted statements intended to be ambiguous enough to successfully deceive, -none of which have ever described his birth record as being a Hawaiian birth certificate.
2. Abercrombi, the newly elected governor of Hawaii, (-Obama's biggest fan) announced that he would prove beyond doubt that the doubters were wrong and that Obama was definitely born in Hawaii by locating the original birth certificate using his subpoena power. Well, he never brought the subject up again after failing to find it anywhere. He later told an old friend that they only found something hand written in the State Archives instead of an original Hawaiian birth certificate in the files of the Hawaiian Bureau of Vital Statistics.

3. No hospital in Hawaii has claimed to be his birth location. Because none of them were.
4. The White House lie is that the image posted on its web site is that of a scan of a real Hawaiian Certificate of Live Birth when no such document has been seen and examined by anyone with an objective eye and an inquiring mind. Not any news magazine, TV host or producer, respectable newspaper or professional forensic magazine, nor the Enquirer. It does not exist in the real world, only in the cyber world. That is why it can't be scanned and therefore wasn't, evidenced by the nature of the pdf file and the fact that no scanner in the world would produce the image claimed to be a scan. Scanners produce one layer images, -not nine-layer files.

5. The two digital images of birth certification documents (short & long forms) are both counterfeit and easily shown to be so. Besides the manner in which they were constructed, there is the fact that they lack the official seal of the Department of Health. Along with that omission is the absence of any actual signature, it being substituted with a worthless rubber stamp signature facsimile.

6. On top of that is the fact that the image is not certified to be a True Copy of anything since the registrar's rubber stamp text labels it as a true copy OR an abstract.

An abstract is not a true copy of anything and so it can't be certified as being a true copy, and since all Hawaiian vital record documents are superimposed on a security paper background, it is therefore clear that the text of all documents has been extracted and digitized in order to be able to do that within a computer program. That is unmistakable evidence of the creation of an abstract, a manipulatible abstract, and hence the need to mention that possibility in the stamp text, -all while lying that it also might be a True Copy (this OR that...) when they in fact no longer issue True copies since that requires actual photocopying reproduction and not simply computer print-out fabrication.

Much of that would not be a recognized problem if only the long-form digital fake had been flattened into a single-layer image before being up-loaded to the White House web site. But when the counterfeiter hit the save command for the final time, it was saved in the multi-layer default format of the Adobe Portable Document Format (pdf) instead of in the flattened format of the Joint Producers Group (.jpg). Once people downloaded it and opened it with a pdf reader, all of its nine layers were revealed. They are the nail in the coffin that seals the proof that it is a computer fabricated fake.

And the efforts of numerous experts have uncovered element after additional element of proof of fraudulence hidden in that pdf file. And it isn't going away.

But Obama's flying monkeys have managed to scare every judge that has been touched by the court cases brought against his eligibility and perpetration of fraud, and forced them to rule in his favor even when his lawyer didn't even bother to show up. The travesty of non-justice that took place in Georgia was then repeated all the way to the Supreme Court which declined to hear it, with Obama's two appointees not recusing themselves from voting against it.

The supremacy of Law was displaced by the supremacy of men, -corrupt men who would resort

to any tactic necessary to protect their criminal-in-chief.

The problem is that any judge with children and a spouse is vulnerable to coercion that comes in the night in the form of an anonymous phone call that mentions the safety of one's children who go to school at such-and-such location, and visit such-and-such establishments. What husband and father wouldn't cave to serious implied threats against his own family?

The anonymous communications come in and then they aren't able to trust that their family can be protected because the message, the threats are implied, subtle, ambiguous, -not direct, -not deserving of law enforcement protection.

If the courts with pending cases base their rulings on anything other than the law, then you will know that they were reached and dissuaded because their written justification for their ruling will be missing or be full of superficial and inaccurate explanations of the law.

But like the Benghazi events, only the truth will stop the nagging questions and reveal the hidden facts. Where there is a whole lot of smoke, there is certainly fire, but when it comes to Obama's legitimacy, the smoke is camouflaged by a whole lot of fog of confusion and ignorance. That ignorance permeates the entire Congress and military.

But it may be inaccurate to call Congress ignorant, when in fact they may not be. They may instead be simply complicit in the massive lie and cover-up, -making them cowardly co-traitors to the United States Constitution and the American people.

If anything has become clear in the last half decade, it's that Washington exists for its own benefit, -not that of the American people.

They certainly can't be looked to to investigate their own complicity and so we are at a stalemate. Until enough men and women of position and authority come forward, we, the pawns in this giant game of chess, are powerless because the big players hold all of the power. When they are willing to twist, omit, lie, fabricate, hide & destroy evidence, intimidate and threaten those who seek the truth, and bribe those who are their friends and go along with or facilitate the fraud of his counterfeit documents and illegitimate citizenship, and our legal system is compromised, then only a very fearless jurist can open the giant can of worms that is Obama's legitimacy, -or a strong shift in the sentiments of the voters.

So in case nothing effective is done in our generation, I write this for the future, -for a time after a great national calamity has ripped the rug out from under our current corrupt system, -our uninformed and complacent society, and re-set it.

Perhaps in such an age, the truth will be valued once again and sought out. Perhaps then at a new beginning the nation will start anew with the light of truth shining into the minds and hearts of America's citizens.

If that age ever comes to pass, then I hope that the new American patriots will stand strong against the forces of selfishness and adamant, clever, and insistent deceit that will resort to big and bold lies, as well as subtle and invisible intellectual distortions of truth and reality, using words to manipulate the masses which are vulnerable to such manipulation.

We are all sub-normal specimens of humanity. Our capabilities, physical and intellectual, are deficient compared to men of the past who built the greatest structures of all time, including feats like mechanical computers that computed Time and the movements of the planets decades in advance, and included the cutting and moving of a block of stone that weighs 4 million pounds, -the cutting and fitting of massive walls of stones so finely shaped and fitted together that a piece of paper can't pass between them.

Sub-normalness is revealed in contrast by the examples of Leonardo di Vinci, Shakespeare, Isaac Newton, and, in the physical sense, by Secretariat, and by Sergeant York whose vision was so superior that he not only could see German enemies during the first World War from over 1,000 yards, but he could use his standard rifle to take them out. Annie Oakley was a great example as well.

Such examples are what we must consider to be normal, while the rest of us are sub-normal. We as

a race suffer from deficiencies in the logic center of the mind, -the place from where deduction is drawn. Our logic ability and our process of drawing conclusions is as defective as the eyes of the color blind, or the hearing perception of the tone deaf. Something significant is missing, -something vital to its flawless function. We don't know how to think in a flawless manner. We are not Mr. Spock.

And so we are vulnerable to our own delusions which spring from our biases. We know which conclusion we wish to arrive at, and so we subconsciously distort the facts, the path, to arrive at the desired destination.

The majority of voters did that in electing Barack Obama. We can only hope and pray that the swing-vote independent voters will recognize the mistake they made and swing away from the total transformation path that the counterfeiter-in-chief has put us on and kept us on.

But it will require a whole lot of *un*transforming to fix the damage that a hundred years of statist, socialist, progressive, nanny-state, big-government politics and academic propaganda has wrought. That war may be just beginning, and it may in time be seen as the second American Revolution.

by A.R. Nash May 2013

* "the English law...clearly held that native-birth was not sufficient to make a natural born subject and that native-born children of non-subject parents "are no subjects", because they would be "not born under the ligeance of a subject".

To the English, "aliens, while residing in the dominions possessed by the Crown of England, were within the allegiance, the obedience, the faith or loyalty, the protection, the power, the jurisdiction of the English Sovereign" were in fact subjects by local ligeance.

It is false to claim that unnaturalized immigrants are within the faith, loyalty and allegiance of the Crown because those attributes were still owed to their own sovereign. All they were/ are within is the obedience, power, and protection. But those are temporal and local relationships, and not life-long subject-hood (as was the case with natural subjects).

Being a natural subject was like being a slave. It was for life with no escape. But being an immigrant subject was like being an indentured servant. Obedience is only owed until the debt is paid, just as obedience is owed to the Crown until one ups and leaves the jurisdiction of the Crown. Slaves can't do that but foreigners can. Subjects could also move out of England, but they would still be attached to the Monarch by a life-long bond of belonging, like children who are forever the off-spring of their parents.

No one born of one who owes only temporal obedience would be born owing life-long obedience since such a subject-monarch relationship would not be inherited.

It's not complicated. It's as plain as day. You are what you inherit. That's natural law.

If you are born of natural subjects, then you are one also, regardless of where you exit the womb. If you are born of aliens, then where you are born is of paramount importance because your national membership is then determined by the rule of law, and not the rule of nature. AN