

THE GREATEST FRAUD IN HUMAN HISTORY

I have a simple question for you, one whose answer will fracture your mind. You will have absolute certainty as to its answer, but you will not know the reality behind your answer because you do not understand the subject asked about. The question is this:

"Are you an American Citizen?"

That seems like a very straight forward simple question, and yet it is a very complex question at heart because it is a cross-species type of question that is inherently unnatural since it combines the oil of national membership with the water of national citizenship. Huh?

Being a member of American society (our country) is not the same thing as being a citizen of our nation. In various ways you can be one without being the other because nations are something other than countries.

Nations are legal political entities created by the natural members of a country, -or by those who conquer them. The natural members of the country, the natives, then become the citizens of the nation.

When Saddam Hussein's army invaded Kuwait, the Kuwaitis had to flee their country, yet their nation continued to exist in absentia. Saddam planned to create a new nation of Kuwait with new citizens who were Iraqi but none of them would have been natives nor natural members of the country. [fyi, actually, he simply annexed Kuwait into Iraq.]

The question of nationality is multi-fold since it involves not only the nature of being a native but also of being a citizen. Those don't seem like anything but simple subjects, but reality is not as simple as it seems.

There are different ways to be both, and those differences are enormous. One can be an American and yet not be a United States citizen. And conversely, one can be a citizen of the United States and yet not be an American. Those facts are due to abnormal origins or abnormal environments.

One can be brought into the United States as a toddler by parents who are illegal immigrants, raised in America and acculturated as an American, -knowing no other homeland, possessing American values, -and yet not be a citizen of the United States nor possess any right to become one.

~TAMPA, Fla., Oct 2 (Reuters) - Florida's Supreme Court on Tuesday grilled attorneys on the implications of issuing a law license to an undocumented immigrant and law school graduate who passed the Florida Bar exam after disclosing he was in the United States illegally.

As 26-year-old Jose Manuel Godinez-Samperio of Mexico watched the proceedings from the gallery, one judge accused the Florida Board of Bar Examiners of putting the state in an awkward situation.

Godinez-Samperio legally entered the country with his parents when he was 9, but the family overstayed its tourist visas. His father and mother, both professionals in Mexico, took farming and factory jobs while Godinez-Samperio became an Eagle Scout, High School Valedictorian and a graduate of Florida State University's law school.

~ ~ ~

Americans like Jose are loyal only to the United States since it is their only home and only preferred nation, yet they may be raised in an environment where there are many native-born citizens with no loyalty whatsoever to the United States, its laws, its other citizens, nor its Constitution. They being the criminal class of citizens, -the gang class of citizens, and the welfare class of citizens.

But there's another type of citizen that is equally non-American. It is naturalized citizens who did not mean a word of the oath of Allegiance and Renunciation that they swore. They, like the younger of the Boston bombers, may have been socialized as Americans, (or as members of Western civilization) but were never philosophically American in their view of human rights, constitutional governance, individual worth, and national allegiance.

If their Dagestanian parents had become naturalized, then they would have become derivative citizens through them. They would have then been United States citizens, but they would still not have been Americans.

To be an American is an undefined thing except in the general political sense of being a member of the nation. We have a President who is politically and socially an American, but he is not an American in the most important sense, -that of being an American philosophically.

That involves having a significant sense of respect for the founders of the nation and the values they honored as the fundamental political principles of human governance, -values which they based our revolution on, as well as the government that they later created, -a one of a kind in human history.

Those values, and that charter of government are not honored and respected by tens of millions of people that we have to call Americans because they were born in the U.S. even though their values could be as alien as those of Nazis, Communists, narco-terrorists, and mass-murdering Islamic supremacists.

But those aren't the extremes we generally face. Rather, we face those with values, kept under the vest, that are subtle, incrementally progressive promotions of "social justice", "General Welfare", "common good", benevolent authoritarianism, intrusive nannyism, unrestrained and redistributive spending, and all executed as perversions and violations of constitutional limited government that respects the constitutional rights of the States and the citizens that comprise the nation.

Similarly, being a citizen is not the same as being a native of a country. The government cannot create new natives but it *can* create new citizens. Nevertheless, it cannot create new *natural* citizens, yet it can deem all citizens to *be* natural citizens by fundamentally embracing the fiction of law that all citizens are equal to natural citizens and therefore are viewed as being nothing other than natural citizens.

That is the fundamental philosophy of citizenship in the United States, and by it all naturalized citizens become not just legal citizens but also natural citizens because they have been "made natural" by the natural-ization process. They are not said to be citizen-ized because their citizenship goes beyond simply being legal members of the nation. By that fiction of law, they are identical to natural citizens in every way except for employment in critical positions involving national security, including the presidency.

Natural citizens cannot be "unmade" because they were never "made citizens" in the first place. They were born as citizens, just as a lion is born as a lion. Its lion-ness cannot be rescinded because it isn't something that it possesses. It is what it is by nature. So also, natural citizens are members of their country and nation by nature, -political nature, -not by law.

That truth is so fundamental, so origin-al, so "a priori" that law was never needed to declare such an automatic self-evident truth, -and so there *is* no law by which you are an American nor a citizen, unless...you are Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio, or Bobby Jindal. Then law is absolutely necessary for your citizenship because you were not the natural product of American parents.

The "Law" which grants the later two *legal* citizenship is the 14th Amendment (1868), or rather, the Supreme Court's re-interpretation of it in 1898 (US v Wong Kim Ark). It makes the native-born children of immigrants into American citizens by automatic naturalization at birth, -by the authority of law. But law cannot make one a *natural* citizen. It only makes one a *legal* citizen. All naturalized citizens are legal citizens and vice versa but not all naturalized citizens are born with citizenship since not all were born in the United States.

But for those who were, there are two distinct and surprising facts. The 14th Amendment ["All persons born in the United States, or naturalized, and *subject to the jurisdiction thereof*, are citizens..."] does not declare them in plain language to be U.S. citizens [the Supreme Court took it upon itself to do that, and

not by a unanimous vote] and they have no proof that they are American citizens.

That puts them into the same category as natural citizens born of American parents in that they also have no plainly written and understood law by which they are citizens, nor any proof that they are. *

Those foreigners who are naturalized by process and oath have proof of citizenship in the form of their naturalization papers or citizenship certificate from the federal government, but you, a child of American parents, have no such papers or certificate to prove your nationality. All you and 14th Amendment native-born Americans have is birth documentation that is accepted as evidence of citizenship even though such documents were not meant to serve that purpose. They were created as a record of birth registration for things such as inheritance, and proof of ownership or guardianship of one's own children, -not proof of nationality.

If all nations were equal, there would exist no motivation to do everything that one could do to secure citizenship in another nation. But nations are not equal, and so there is a very strong reason to seek admission into superior nations, especially when one can find work or go on welfare.

How is admission obtained for legal entry? By the production of evidence of native birth, even if that evidence is fabricated. Why isn't native birth synonymous with citizenship? Because for 97% of the population, citizenship is something that is inherited.

For the others it's obtained legally by process or by domestic-birth naturalization which only requires that the parents be immigrants and not citizens. For such citizenship one does not have to present evidence of being the off-spring of American citizens, -only evidence of a U.S. birth location. That evidence is always in the form of a birth certificate. But that certificate can't prove the thing that it is used for.

Its proof of native birth is not proof of citizenship. Citizenship must be inferred from it, -as a presumption, -a presumption that one was not the child of a foreign diplomat or a foreign tourist. Their children

are born to people who are subject to a foreign power and not to the United States government. As such, they are, by the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the 14th Amendment, not citizens of the United States. And besides them, there were the Native Americans also, who were not citizens of the United States until well into the 20th century.

So native birth is not "proof" of citizenship; it's only evidence of a very high probability. That probability is so high (following Native Americans being declared citizens) that native birth is accepted as de facto proof of citizenship. And for that reason, birth certificate counterfeiting became a cottage industry for official but fraudulent citizenship. A counterfeit birth certificate can be used to obtain legitimate secondary documents which can then be used to obtain a real birth certificate. Presto! Citizenship that is legal while being at the same time criminal.

That perfunctory presumption of citizenship is applied to all native-born persons without distinction; -whether they be children of Americans, children of immigrants, children of non-immigrant Visa-card aliens, and illegal aliens. The presumption of citizenship covers them all. But the law itself does not.

Alien-born children birthed within U.S. borders to foreign parents lacking a Green Card and its permanent residency permission do not qualify *by law* for citizenship, and yet the presumption is extended to them anyway. That is the way it's been done for seemingly forever, -so long that it predates everyone living, -unless born in 1898. It was in that year that a new form of citizenship was created which had never before existed in America.

It was as radical as declaring the children of foreign diplomats to be Americans since it declared U.S. birthed children of foreign visitors to be Americans as well as those of Consular Officers hired as civil service employees (not appointed by their government and given diplomatic immunity).

Why on earth would their children be viewed by any sane person as being Americans? Their parents may serve in a consular office for a number of years

and then return to their own country, perhaps even before a U.S. born child is old enough to enter school.

But the blanket presumption of citizenship is extended to children of all who don't have diplomatic immunity. Why? Because of ignorance of fundamental principles of citizenship. That ignorance became institutionalized in 1898 after the Attorney General (John Griggs) misinterpreted the Supreme Court's misinterpretation of the 14th Amendment when he assumed incorrectly that not only the children of immigrants (like Mr. Wong) are deemed to be citizens, but the children of all aliens of every sort are citizens including Visa Card visitors and illegal immigrants and migrants, (-excepting only those of diplomats). That error is what created the new form of citizenship; citizenship by a policy based on presumption rather than by the actual law of the land.

We can call them political citizens or national policy citizens because their citizenship was created by and is perpetuated by political appointees who occupy the office of the Attorney General of the United States. As the chief law enforcement officer of the federal government, his policy is in effect the law of the land even though it is not actual law. It can be overturned by the federal courts or by the President or by the A.G. himself.

But the 14th Amendment can't, nor can the unwritten citizenship of natural citizens.

So the confusion surrounding citizenship is becoming clearer. It's all pretty much based on presumption, usually correctly so, but sometimes incorrectly so because:

1. Native birth alone is not proof of citizenship.
2. A birth certificate is not proof of citizenship.
3. A birth certificate may be proof of nothing since it may be counterfeit.
4. Natural citizens cannot point to any law by which their citizenship exists.
5. Native-born children of immigrants have no hard-copy proof of citizenship.
6. Native-born children of *non*-immigrants have no legal basis for citizenship
7. Only citizens born abroad, or naturalized, have citizenship certificates.
8. Citizenship by political policy is not the same as citizenship by actual law.
9. All citizens are lumped together as natural citizens by a fiction of law.
10. By that fiction, all citizenship is natural and can not be revoked.

How do these facts relate to the Presidency?

If John McCain had lived his whole life in Panama where he was born, he would not be eligible to be President unless he moved to the U.S. and lived here for 14 years (and was 35 years old). If he never did move to the U.S., then his children would not only not be eligible to be President, they would not even be Americans.

Marco Rubio, born in the U.S. to Cuban exiles, was a 14th Amendment citizen, a legal citizen, a born citizen, but not a natural citizen since his parents were not Americans.

Ted Cruz, born in Canada to an American mother and a Cuban father was both an American and a Cuban by birth, and a Canadian by place of birth, -a hybrid citizen with dual or triple citizenship. He may have citizenship papers from an American consulate in Canada.

No dual or triple citizen with a foreign father is eligible to be President. He is not a natural citizen because his parents had different nationalities, being members of different nations, nor is he a constitutional 14th Amendment citizen since he was born outside of the United

States. He is a statutory citizen only, -and only that if his mother was 19 years old when he was born.

Barack Obama, birth place unknown and unproven by any hardcopy certified official paper document, or eye-witness, or natal photo, or released sworn statement by anyone, cannot point to any proof of citizenship via evidence of native birth, nor evidence from a non-forged birth certificate, nor proof via any law ever passed, or Supreme Court decision rendered, nor proof that his mother was single and he therefore inherited her citizenship instead of only that of his father, -which he would have if only she wasn't too young to legally convey her citizenship to him.

All he has as a basis to claim he is even a citizen of the United States is the presumptuous political policy put in place by Attorney General Griggs. It promoted the false assumption that everyone born in the U.S. is a citizen, instead of only immigrants' children (as was the finding of the Supreme Court that year).

Being the child of a woman too young to be eligible to provide him citizenship, and the child of a non-immigrant alien not subject to the full political authority of the American government, his citizenship is purely an American fiction of ignorance and presumption.

He is not a natural citizen, a naturalized citizen, a constitutional citizen, a statutory citizen, a derivative citizen, nor a provisional citizen, but he is a presumptive political policy citizen. Needless to say, none of those types of citizenship provide eligibility to be the President except the first.

So some clarity can be had as to just what kind of citizenship he actually has, and in a previous exposition (Obama; Fraud to the Core) I explored why he is not what we natural citizens would consider as one of our American brethren from the ideological perspective, making him neither a real citizen nor a true American by nature, by law, nor by attitude and philosophy.

But the purpose of this exposition is to expose a travesty of fraudulence equal to those two, and it concerns his secret and hidden background and story.

I'm not referring to his contrived "autobiography" "Dreams from my Father" which was concocted and cobbled together by Bill Ayers from recollections by Barry O., instead I'm referring to something that has received no scrutiny of any sort since there was no interest, -or no source of information to ascertain the truth. I'm referring to his professional accomplishments before elected office.

As everyone knows, he was a "community organizer" working for Leftist programs and foundations, including an Annenberg foundation which he co-chaired with former political bomber Bill Ayers, one of his neighbors and the owner of the home where Obama's political career was launched.

But even before political office he was something else, something professional, something accomplished and reputable. He was a Harvard Law School graduate, an Illinois lawyer and a Columbia U. law lecturer. But there was one problem with that history. There is nothing to support its foundation.

Its foundation is the acquisition of a degree from Columbia University, * a Law degree from Harvard, and the acquisition of a license to practice law in Illinois by taking and passing the State Bar Exam.

But is there any proof supporting those claims, or was there even a claim of being a licensed attorney ever made by Obama's own mouth? The truth of the matter is not determined by what someone wrote, or what he may have claimed. Instead it is either provable or it is a deliberate fiction. I contend that it is absolutely *not* provable and is in fact pure fiction.

I contend that Obama is worse than an Affirmative Action student given lots of passes but instead was a total fraud made possible by big money and influential backing. After all, if you are going to be a partial fraud, why would you be adamantly opposed to being a total fraud? Would honesty and integrity prevent that when you have neither one regarding academic & professional accomplishment and credentials? Who needs integrity when covert elite sponsors keep opening all the doors for you?

I contend that simple logic and a total absence of evidence to the contrary lead to the conclusion that

Barack Obama never *earned* a law degree from Harvard nor a license to practice law in Illinois, -which (along with Chicago) is home to endemic corruption. Being *awarded* a degree and *earning* one are two different things.

The logic behind that conclusion is based on a few facts, the first of which is general in nature. It is a fact that our whole corrupt public education system passes failing students on to the next higher grade in spite of failing grades.

In college there are similarly loose standards. They result in straight A students receiving the same degree as straight D students just as all High School graduates received the same diploma. Lack of merit is not punished by the system. All are equal. In such a system we see celebrity athletes who are semi-literate being given scholarships so they can bring in big bucks to the college or university via sports victories on the court or the field. Academic integrity does not exist when it is systematically eclipsed by big money. Think of Joe Paterno and Jerry Sandusky and how big money influenced that whole scandal.

But big money can come in not only via the public game tickets, but via benefactors who make huge donations to the endowment funds. Just ask yourself, -How many open doors would a \$100 million dollar donation buy? The answer is: All of them.

But they can be bought for far less in fact. \$10 million would probably buy a whole boat load of accommodation for one future-star student, as would \$1,000,000. By attending classes, or not, and earning all D grades via overly generous faculty grading which allows extra credit for whatever, one would eventually graduate with a degree in something or other, even if at the very bottom of the class, like the spoiled and lazy children of the elites (such as George W. Bush and John McCain -who finished 5th from last in his Annapolis class).

College, to many if not most American males, is a time to freely get drunk and do drugs, and one Barry Soetoro no doubt carried his Hawaiian laid-back dope-smoking attitude to Occidental college with

him, but those who smoke drugs aren't big users of booze so he wouldn't have had a problem of giving up alcohol when he was reacquainted with his Muslim background via his wealthy Pakistani Muslim room-mate who brought him to Pakistan with him in 1981.

He may have been the benefactor that provided Obama with the ring that he wears to this day. The inscription that circles it in Arabic is identified to say something translatable as "Only Allah" or "1 God, Allah". (see the WND expose)

"Finally, during the week of 14-18th of January 2010, just on the eve of my winter tour to the US, Rachel picked up a Nile TV broadcast in which Egyptian Foreign Minister Abul Gheit said on the "Round Table Show" that he had had a one-on-one meeting with Obama who swore to him that he was a Moslem, the son of a Moslem father and step-son of a Moslem step-father, that his half-brothers in Kenya were Moslems, and that he was loyal to the Moslem agenda. He asked that the Moslem world show patience." (attribution unnoted)

A recent world-wide Pew survey found that around 90% of Pakistanis believe in things like death for conversion to another religion, amputation and beatings for theft. So it's for certain that his visit to Pakistan was more than a mere sight-seeing excursion since the pervasive influence of Islam would have been everywhere, and he may have attended a mosque with his host and friend and his family, and might have bowed his head to the ground as they do en mass, and prayed with them. It's an expected behavior of such a society.

Via that trip and experience, which, like his time at Columbia University he has never discussed, reverence for Islam was deeply re-infused into his consciousness, -and his attitude and comments reflect just that, including bowing to the King of the land of "the Prophet", his numerous references to "the Holy Koran", which no Christian on earth would ever so describe, his many direct relatives who are active Muslims who promote, with Saudi backing, the spread of Islam and its influence, -the atmosphere in the U.S. military that made any criticism of anything

Islamic so unthinkable that the insane and radicalized Major Hassan was never confronted or challenged regarding his growing and open radicalization which ended with the slaughter of 13 unarmed Americans in the Fort Hood cafeteria, along with 32 wounded, -and the removal of all reference to Islamic terrorism and violent Muslim Jihad in government training manuals.

But Islam was only one of two influences on him. Indoctrination by "Frank" or "Pop" (as shared in his ghost-written "autobiography") inculcated Marxist ideology into him since he, the African-American Frank Marshall Davis, was his adult mentor in Hawaii throughout his years there from 10 to when he left Hawaii for California. As a Black adult "role-model", Barry's grandparents regularly drove him to Frank's home for Afro-American Marxist mentoring.

It's unknown if they were strong supporters of the American Communist Party as was he, along with being the publisher of a communist periodical [as well as being a photographer who shot nude photos of Barry's mom before he was born and sold them to Men's magazines].

Clearly, Barry was born and raised off in the far fringe of society's edges with no roots in the mainland of America, the history of America, the reverence for American heartland values, and the political philosophy on which our nation was founded and our Revolution inspired. His roots were somewhere altogether different, -in international third-world consciousness, [Indonesia, as with his anthropologist mother], in Kenyan ancestry, in drug culture, -in island laziness and idleness, -in Marxism, and Islam.

They are all anti-American and diametrically opposed to what made America the nation that it once was. Those are values to which he is obligated to give lip service, but which he has never personally embraced, just as he has never personally embraced salvation through Christ the redeemer and sacrificial Lamb of God all while pretending falsely to be a Christian convert since that, like American values, gets more votes and neutralizes inquiry into his true background and mind-set. As a consequence, nearly all Black Christians voted for him though he is known

to not hold their values in any esteem and even holds views diametrically opposed to their Bible-based beliefs.

There is reason to believe that Obama never passed the Illinois State Bar Exam and yet was allowed to pass himself off as a lawyer based solely on his Harvard law degree thanks to big money and big influence being behind him. But before explaining why, lets make plain the fact that facts are completely missing regarding everything about his professional accomplishments. Nothing is documented. No incontestable records are available, and I contend that that is because they would reveal academic inferiority, or because they simply do not exist because he didn't accomplish anything via the usual academic channels.

When you look for facts to substantiate his background and achievement, you find that there are none, -of any kind. He has seen to it that they are all kept secret by laws meant to protect the privacy of private individuals, or they are kept secret by his fellow progressive-socialist admirers in academia. Or both. And no one can even say that they still exist. His history is akin to a black hole. Nothing comes out and it is invisible because even light can't escape.

Where is evidence of his accomplishments at any of the colleges he attended? It's all secret. Where is the evidence that he attended them? Also kept secret. Where is the evidence of how he even got into them? Very, very secret. Where is the evidence that his entire academic career was not a financially and ideologically motivated fraud? There is none.

* Those children of immigrant parents, or a single foreign parent, are born with United States citizenship and have a law (the 14th Amendment) that they can point to as the source of their citizenship, but natural citizens have no such law. Their citizenship exists separate and apart from law and the Constitution. Like the primordial hydrogen gas that coalesces into a star, so also is the mass of native members of a country which coalesce into a nation. The star does not produce the gas, rather, the gas produces the star. Similarly, natural citizens are not created by government; government is created by natural citizens.

** No One at Columbia Remembers Obama by Wayne Allyn Root "I am a graduate of Columbia University, Class of 1983. That's the same class Barack Obama claims to have graduated from. We shared the same exact major- Political Science. We were both Pre Law. It was a small class- about 700 students. The Political Science department was even smaller and closer-knit (maybe 150 students). I thought I knew, or met at least once, (or certainly saw in classes) every fellow Poly Sci classmate in my four years at Columbia.

But not Obama. No one ever met him. Even worse, no one even remembers seeing that unique memorable face. Think about this for a minute. Our classmate is President of the United States. Shouldn't someone remember him? Or at least claim to remember him? <http://www.theblaze.com/contributions/barack-obama-the-ghost-of-columbia-university/>]

*** In a 2004 interview with Cathleen Falsani, Obama said, "I believe that there are **many paths** to the same place." Obama also said, "All people of faith—Christians, Jews, Muslims, animists, everyone knows the same God."

A Punahou Hawaiian classmate was interviewed by Jesse WATTERS: And, politically back then, did you see any trace of his democratic leanings or any sort of liberal leadership?

BOWERS: Well, you know, we had an incredible background at Punahou because we had an instructor who wove **global understandings** and perspectives of **all countries** throughout our entire curriculum. His name was Siegfried Ramler.

And, he had been an interpreter in the Nuremberg trials and so he wanted to make sure that everything we did whether it was in Christian ethics or history or literature really wove together all these perspectives of **different religions and different countries** and histories. And, I would say that we all really benefited in having a **global view** that way. And, I'd say when we first started to hear Barack's policies and the President's stance on different issues, it made

us so proud to hear a **global voice**. And that's what we saw growing up, we were very lucky to have that.

WATTERS: So, you're saying that the curriculum lent itself to more of a global view, a **world view** that you think Obama is encompassing in his policies today?

BOWERS: Well, I certainly think that he and his family really embodied that in the beginning.

Whether Punahou added a lot to it or not, but I can say that in particular the Punahou curriculum in the 1970s was extremely focused on building **GLOBAL CITIZENS**. That was the goal.

BOWERS: There were several memories I think that we all had that were very strong and one was when his father came to speak to the 5th grade class. Everybody was really in sort of in awe of him. He came in a suit. He came from the East/West center. He not only looked very professorial, but we all thought that he was, he seemed like an ambassador or a statesman, that made a big impression I think on all of us.

WATTERS: What do you remember that his father spoke about to the class?

BOWERS: It was actually about Kenya. And, you know, it imbued the sense of, again, this **world-view** that there is a world outside of the United States and a **different perspective** that started to resonate with what we were being taught.

~ ~ ~

Having a world view is not as wonderful a thing as it might seem -except for those in international relations. But for those who sit behind the Resolute desk in the Oval office, it is definitely not a good thing because it comes with a perspective that diminishes the respect that the President should have for the sacrifices that Americans have made for the sake of Freedom, -not only for Americans but for peoples all around the world. And, it undervalues American values by rejecting American exceptionalism in favor of a kind of universal equalism. But no other nation is the father of constitutional democracy in our world, and the proclaimer and defender of unalienable rights.

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