

## Alien Babies versus Immigrant Babies

In the Bible (Exodus?) there's an account that illustrates how sometimes things can be something other than what is expected. It describes how during a military struggle between the children of Israel and the Canaanites, Joshua encountered a stranger whose loyalty was unknown, and so he asked him: "Are you with us? -or against us?"

His answer was completely unexpected. He said: "No." "I am a messenger from the most High God." (clearly an answer straight out of left field).

The truth isn't always found in conventional dichotomies and assumptions. Obama-defending lawyers claim that Obama is "a natural born citizen", as the Constitution requires, because that term is "a term of art" which is translated to mean; "a native-born citizen".

A conservative lawyer might agree that it is "a term of art" but argue that its meaning combines the *jus soli* citizenship of native birth with the *jus sanguinis* citizenship of Natural Law, "requiring" both.

They both attack each other's historical proof, oblivious to the fact that a third possibility exists, and may be the true explanation of what a natural born citizen is. What's that explanation? It is that native-birth citizenship has always been a gift of law, of government, of permission provided by actual natives via their representatives. It is *legal* citizenship. It is in contrast to citizenship provided naturally. Such national membership has no use for functioning government in order to exist, because it is naturally provided via one's political inheritance from citizen parents. It is their inherited political nature.

Such national membership has no umbilical cord tying it to human law, to government permission, to *jus soli* tradition, to feudal, medieval society and its inescapable chains of perpetual debt that was inherited, -locking one (and possibly their children) to the estate on which they were born until the debt was paid in full.

On the national level it was manifested as royal ownership (for life) of every soul born within the King's domain. What the heck does that have to do with Natural Law? Natural Law has no connection to geography nor artificial human-concocted borders that are usually invisible, -and not natural in any way since they are merely the result of conquest and not natural relationships born of life and its connections.

Such a combination of human law (*jus soli*, -the law of human ownership) with Natural Law (*jus sanguinis*, -the law of natural membership) is a Frankenstein hybrid monster that only the mind of man could have come up with.

Nature sure didn't. It is 100% an invention of creative thinking that misconstrues a description of natives (given in a legal philosophy book about Natural Law written in 1755 by E. Vattel) as being a legally-binding "definition" based on that description being recognized as accurate in various American federal court cases, even though never recognized as being a comprehensive and complete definition. (Saying all poodles are dogs does not make all dogs poodles)

Such a misconstruence results in a false presumption that something is what it is not, -that it is more than what it is and that that "more" defines American presidential eligibility qualification. So lets get to the heart of that error by spotlighting its absurdity.

### Membership in the American Family

Membership comes via two main means: one is being born as a member of the American family, while the other one is being adopted into the family.

Those born into the family are born of Americans. Those adopted are born of foreigners and become new Americans by means other than birth, i.e., by a process dependent on law.

There are three ways to be adopted into the American family. 1. Via the process of nationalization by voluntary effort and naturalization law. That involves being a foreigner who's voluntarily adopted as an adult (a naturalized citizen by law).

2. Via absorption of the adopted new nationality of one's parents or father, -making one an automatic involuntary *derivative* citizen as a minor (deriving one's new citizenship from one's parents).

3. Via automatic (involuntary) adoption of a second nationality granted at birth to children of foreign immigrants (in addition to their father's foreign nationality). They are 14th Amendment citizens by law (thanks to a Supreme Court ruling in 1898).

Natural citizens are not citizens by naturalization law nor by the 14th Amendment, but by birth. They are born as natural members of the American family because they are born to members. They are not adopted. They are not *legal* members like the adopted

members. They are *natural* members, *-natural* citizens, and make-up about 97% of the population. They are eligible to be President if they met the other qualification requirements, -none of which are connected to where they were born. Their membership in the American family is passed from the head of the family to the children, automatically, without any intervention of government. All government can do is facilitate and require the recognition of their natural citizenship.

Vattel wrote: "...these children naturally follow the condition of their fathers and succeed to their rights.

"The country of the father is, therefore, that of the children,..."

"By the law of nature alone, children follow the condition of their fathers and enter into all their rights."  
"This [is a] law of nature, ..."

It is crystal clear that Vattel never, ever tied geographic national territorial boundaries to the inherited national membership of children of citizens. Not ever.

He associated those born in a country of its citizens with natural membership in the country (how could he not) but that association is quite different from being  *tied*  to the location of one's birth as an essential factor in establishing that membership. *It is not tied to it!* It is simply naturally coincidental to it.

An analogy would be saying that children born to parents in the home that they own are natural children of that family. Is that a "legal definition"? No.

*That* is exactly a reflection of the Vattelian statement that attorney Mario Apuzzo misconstrues to assert that, by analogy, the children are not members of the parents' family unless they are born in the home. Rather, they must be adopted by law if born elsewhere.

Well, they are *associated* with the home because that was where they were born, BUT their membership in their own family is *not* determined by where they were or were not born. It was determined by their father (and mother) -by blood and not boundaries. *That's* Vattel, -that's Natural Law. Parentage is everything.

Those who tie citizenship to the citizen mother's location during delivery cannot explain how natural citizenship in a nation is different from natural membership in a country, nor how a mother's child is not both regardless of which border it is born within.

They cannot explain how a father's child becomes an alien if born somewhere other than on the soil of the nation to which he belongs.

They cannot explain the natural principle by which off-spring do not belong to their parents' group if not born within the boundaries of their habitual territory.

They cannot explain what natural membership is because it is something that destroys their theory of a Frankenstein hybrid of natural law joined to the artificial human contrivance of national borders.

If they are wrong then life is fair, and children of former and future Presidents who are born abroad, as well as all U.S. diplomats, American Embassy employees, generals, admirals, military personnel, businessmen, students, entertainers, and scientists are also American by nature, just like their siblings, and thus also eligible to be President.

If they were right, then a U.S. President must be more than a natural citizen. He must be a native-born citizen as well, even if he lived most of his life outside of the United States. That would have excluded John McCain (born in a Panamanian hospital) had his father not been in the Panama Canal Zone while in the U.S. Military. (otherwise, with citizenship by descent alone, he could have lived for over 50 years of his life in Panama where he was born, then moved to the United States, (-a place he might have never even visited) and after 14 years of being a resident, be eligible to be the President.)

Barack Obama also could have been such a person, -one who lived most of his life away from the United States, or, as is the case, all of the formative years of his youth (except his first year of life) without ever stepping foot on mainland America.

Can you image living your whole life up until college, and you are an American, yet you'd never been to the contiguous United States in your living memory? (such is life in Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico & Guam.)

In Obama's case, his whole school career in Hawaii was separate and philosophically apart from the United States. It was in a school that did not focus on American values but taught instead "a world perspective", with any focus on American values being subjugated to international viewpoints and orientation. How fully-American of a perspective would that have produced in you?

If your outlook is geared to a mainly international orientation, then your priorities will not be those of the heartland of America. They will be secular, humanist,

New World Order, big-government, elite-manager focused, with American cultural and philosophical values relegated to the backseat of the vehicle of international cultural diversity & equivalency and non-exceptionalism.

In such a world, everyone in every country is exceptional. America is just another ordinary member of the world community. In Obama's eyes, no country in this world that does not honor Islam and its "Prophet" can be viewed as being exceptional.

America's problem is that the inexperienced, "world citizen" dynamic-orator that was placed in the oval office is neither a *jus soli* citizen nor a *jus sanguinis* citizen. He is neither a citizen by human law-&-native-birth nor a citizen by natural law-&- citizenship inheritance. Instead, he is like Hitler, -an Austrian. Not born, (-as required by the German Constitution) as a natural German by birth, -nor born in Germany. That's the exact opposite of fulfilling a hybrid combination of qualification.

He thus was the modern world's first openly unconstitutional leader. Obama is the second. Venezuela recently elected the third, he being born in Columbia as a Columbian national. But that topic was and is off-limits in nation's that elect unconstitutional leaders.

Hitler was accepted not merely because of his dynamic brain-washing of the German ego, but because he was "ethnically German". Obama, similarly, is half "ethnically American" via his mother, but citizenship does not pass from one's mother because she is not, and never has been, recognized as the head of the household (unless not married when her child is born, -or widowed). She was headed by her father or husband.

So the citizenship of Obama's mother is irrelevant, unless he was born outside of the United States. For that there are now statutes that allow an American mother's nationality to be conveyed to her children.

So he is not an American by *jus sanguinis* (right of blood) via his mother, and he certainly is not through his father either. That only leaves *jus soli* (right of soil) through native-birth. But America is not a *jus soli* nation from the perspective of the law, even though it is from the perspective of institutionalized federal policy.

What is missing in regard to Obama and *jus soli* is the fulfillment of the requirement that one be born, per the 14th Amendment, fully subject to our national government, but he was not so born. The subjection required in order for citizenship to be conveyed to children of aliens born within U.S. territory is that the

father be potentially liable to the citizen's obligation to bear arms to defend the nation from all foreign enemies.

Since Obama's father was merely a foreign student and not a settled, permanent-resident Green Card recipient (a legal immigrant) he therefore was not subject to that obligation nor to the government's authority to compel one into military service with all of its dangers. As a consequence, neither was the child he fathered. They were both tied to the father's nation as Obama's own election website acknowledged by stating that his father was subject to the British Nationality Act of 1948, "as were his children".

The consequence of that legal fact, unknown to most of the American immigration-law community, is that his supposed citizenship is just that. It is something that is presumed but not something that is in fact *legally* real even though politically real as a result of executive policy. Such citizenship could be nullified by the executive branch with a signature on a presidential order since it is backed by nothing but executive authority. And executive authority must be rooted in actual law or it is not legitimate.

Obama's citizenship is therefore not legitimate since neither the Attorney General nor the President were ever given the authority to declare all native-born persons to be American citizens, including when a mother was only here for a day, or just hours. during which she gave birth and then left.

Such babies may be viewed to possess American citizenship but it is not reflective of legal reality.

Were Bernie Maddoff's investment account statements reflective of reality? Was Arthur Anderson's audit of Enron reflective of reality? Both were "official". Did the government's confidence that a problem with sub-prime mortgages wouldn't cause any problem for the economy reflect reality? Disaster demonstrated the what everyone assumed to be true was not reflective of reality. The same goes for the supposed American citizenship of Barack Obama.

The 14th Amendment, and the Supreme Court that re-interpreted it, only grants citizenship to children of members of American society, meaning immigrants. Obama's father was never an immigrant and therefore Obama was never a citizen. Still isn't. Not American, -not Kenyan, -not British. He, like the anti-Christ, belongs to the whole world, or at least the elite, redistributive, Islam-loving part of it. Is that so bad?

It could be worse, but it sure as hell could and should be a whole lot better. What did we do to deserve this? We went to sleep and didn't awake until it was too late.

Eternal vigilance was out-of-sight and out-of-mind. Now we are suffering the consequences. And they will continue forever. Twenty Trillion dollars in debt before he leaves office, (Big Government having added eight trillion during his presidency). Is that more dollars than stars in the universe? Rhetorically speaking, it's in the ball park.

If that path doesn't spell eventual doom, then what does? It doesn't take a political ideologue to realize that we need to change paths. But it's not at all certain that that can be accomplished. Sometimes problems and situations grow so uncontrollable that they can't be fixed. Like Chernobyl.

Vast, ever-expanding bureaucracy and limitless regulation are just like cancer. They have no built in mechanism that tells them to shrink or how to shrink. They only know how to expand; -more money, more employees, more regulations, more authority, more promotions, more "conferences", more bonuses, etc. "Less" is an alien concept missing from their vocabulary.

Like cancer, the only way to rein them in may be drastic surgery. That surgery won't happen unless it first happens with the Congress, and the White House. Then, after that, the bureaucracy and the military, and finally the Supreme Court. If it doesn't happen, then sure as hell, we will become, over time, a pock-marked reflection of opposites; Detroit & Disneyland.

### Kate's Baby & Obama's Ineligibility

It was reported that it came as a surprise that Kate had a boy when everyone was expecting a girl. Why were they expecting a girl? Because it's what they wanted, and wished for. It was the only outcome in their minds because it would have been so wonderful.

That is like the election of Barack Obama in two ways. The first is that everyone who wanted him to be elected also did not want to believe that he was ineligible to serve, just as everyone who wanted a girl did not want to think about the chance that it might not be a girl. Both views turned out to be wrong. Obama was not, and never can be eligible to be the President because he is not a natural citizen of the United States as is required.

Secondly, everyone wanted a girl because she would be historic, -the first to ever be born eligible and firstborn in line to inherit the throne. No girl in British history was so born. Similarly, fans of Obama wanted to see the first African-American ever elected to the highest office in the land, thus ushering in a new era of Peace & reconciliation, ~an age of Aquarius so to speak.

Well, neither got what they wanted because Obama was not legitimately elected. Meaning that although he got the votes, he got them illegitimately because he was not qualified to run for the office, much less be sworn into it by a traitorous Supreme Court Chief Judas who had to have known that the Constitution had a big whole blown into it by such an open and flagrant violation of the very thing that the usurper would swear to protect and defend. It needs protecting and defending from enemies both foreign and domestic, including, and especially, the likes of he who took that lying oath, and then broke it on a regular basis, beginning with taking it.

~~~~~  
Is Barack Obama a white Negro? Or maybe a black Caucasian? "Neither", you say? But can't we just use words anyway we feel like it? Like "natural born citizen"? Can't we just make "natural" mean "native" instead? Just because a Black and White couple have a baby, should we have to distinguish it as neither one of those races? Do we have to call it a no-race aberration? A "cross-breed"? A hybrid? Not a natural Negro nor a natural Caucasian?

If an alien & American couple have a baby, should we have to distinguish it as being neither a natural member of either the father's nation or the mother's? Can't it just be both 'cause that would feel nicer?

Why do we have to discriminate and distinguish and differentiate between those whose parents are the same and those whose parents are different? After all, the TSA isn't allowed to discriminate.

A young, bearded, Saudi in desert garb, holding a Koran and prostrating himself in the airport to pray should receive no more scrutiny than an 90 year old American grandmother in a wheelchair and adult diapers, right? Profiling is bad! Stupidity is good! 'Cause it makes everyone feel equal! Feelings matter, even more than safety and life & limb, right?

So don't force Obama to be a real natural born citizen to be President 'cause that's discriminatory, -unAmerican. And besides, what did those stuffy elite rich white men who wrote the Constitution know about the real world anyway?

Answer: "Everything."

by Adrien Nash July 2013  
<http://obama--nation.com>