

~After the Supreme Court granted itself supreme authority over the U.S. Constitution in its Marbury v Madison opinion, (contrary to the equal constitutional authority of Congress, the chief executive, and the Supreme Courts of the States), it has made gigantic strides in consolidating ultimate authority over every matter into its own purview. It has always done that illegitimately via perverting the meaning of words, common sense, and straight forward logic. It has in effect asserted its own authority based on its own authority, -and not the Constitution. It has done that either stealthily, in little steps, in larger steps, and, as with the health care monstrosity, in gigantic incomprehensible bounds the width of a continent.

There is no logic too solid for them to defy because some of them are spiritually corrupt, and outright betrayers of their oath of office. They have no God, no principles, and no law that they must adhere to. They are free and unchallengeable to impose their own personal feelings on all 300 million plus Americans who mistakenly think that they have the final say on everything, when the Constitution gave them no such authority.

What follows is another illustration of the bastardization of the meaning of the words of the 14th Amendment, namely "jurisdiction", which when bastardized, also perverts the meaning of the word connected to it, namely; "subject" as in subject to federal authority or jurisdiction. Since jurisdiction is an ambiguous word with two meanings, the majority on the court saw a means to justify its intended ruling by perverting the application of "jurisdiction" from referring to authority to referring instead to territoriality. A. Nash

TRAITORS IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT EXCERPTS FROM SUPREME COURT OPINIONS ON THE EDUCATION OF ILLEGAL ALIENS

Special to the New York Times Published: June 16, 1982

<http://www.nytimes.com/1982/06/16/us/excerpts-from-supreme-court-s-opinions-on-the-education-of-illegal-aliens.html>

WASHINGTON, June 15— Following are excerpts from the Supreme Court's ruling today in Plyler v. Doe, in which the Court held that children who are illegal aliens have a *constitutional right* to a free public education. The majority opinion by Associate Justice William J. Brennan Jr. was joined by Associate Justice John Paul Stevens and by three Associate Justices who also wrote separate concurring opinions, Lewis F. Powell, Thurgood Marshall, and Harry A. Blackmun.

The dissenting opinion by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger was joined by Associate Justices Byron R. White, William H. Rehnquist, and Sandra Day O'Connor.

From Majority Opinion By Justice Brennan....

10. Although we have not previously focused on the intended meaning of this phrase, we have had occasion to examine the first sentence of the Fourteenth Amendment, which provides that: "*All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States,...*" (Emphasis added.)

Justice Gray, writing for the Court in *United States v. Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U.S. 649 (1898), detailed at some length the history of the Citizenship Clause, and the predominantly geographic sense in which the term "jurisdiction" was used. He further noted that it was impossible to construe the words "subject to the jurisdiction thereof," in the opening sentence [of the Fourteenth Amendment], as less comprehensive than the words 'within its jurisdiction' in the concluding sentence of the same section; or to hold that persons "within the jurisdiction" of one of the States of the Union are not "subject to the jurisdiction of the United States." *Id.* at 687.

Justice Gray concluded that [e]very citizen or subject of another country, while domiciled here, is within the allegiance and the protection, and consequently subject to the jurisdiction, of the United States. *Id.* at 693.

As one early commentator noted, given the historical emphasis on geographic territoriality, bounded only, if at all, by principles of sovereignty and allegiance, *no plausible distinction* with respect to Fourteenth Amendment "jurisdiction" can be drawn between resident aliens whose entry into the United States was lawful, and resident aliens whose entry was *unlawful*.

See C. Bouve, *Exclusion and Expulsion of Aliens in the United States* 425-427 (1912).

~~~~~

### From Dissenting Opinion By Chief Justice Burger:

Were it our business to set the nation's social policy, I would agree without hesitation that it is senseless for an enlightened society to deprive any children, -including illegal aliens, of an elementary education. However, the Constitution does not constitute us as "**Platonic**

**Guardians"** nor does it vest in this Court the authority to strike down laws because they do not meet our standards of *desirable social policy*, "wisdom" or "common sense."

We **TRESPASS** on the assigned function of the political branches under our structure of **limited and separated powers** when we assume a policymaking role as the Court does today.

The Court's holding today manifests the justly criticized judicial tendency to attempt speedy and wholesale formulation of "remedies" for the failures -or simply the laggard pace -of the political processes of our system of government. The Court employs, and in my view, **abuses** the 14th Amendment in an effort to become an *omnipotent and omniscient* problem solver. That the motives for doing so are noble and compassionate does not alter the fact that the Court **DISTORTS** our constitutional function to make amends for the defaults of others.

In a sense, the Court's opinion rests on such a unique confluence of theories and rationales that it will likely stand for little beyond the results in these particular cases. Yet the extent to which the Court departs from *principled* constitutional adjudication is nonetheless disturbing.

The dispositive issue in these cases, simply put, is whether, for purposes of allocating its finite resources, a state has a legitimate reason to differentiate between persons who are lawfully within the state and those who are unlawfully there. The distinction the State of Texas has drawn - based not only upon its own legitimate interests but on classifications established by the Federal Government in its immigration laws and policies - is not unconstitutional.

The equal protection clause protects against arbitrary and irrational classifications, and against invidious discrimination stemming from prejudice and hostility; it is not an all-encompassing "equalizer" designed to *eradicate every distinction* for which persons are not "responsible".

### Fundamental Rights

Dissenting Opinion:

The importance of education is beyond dispute. Yet we have held repeatedly that the importance of a governmental service does not elevate it to the status of a

"fundamental right" for purposes of equal protection analysis. The Court points to no meaningful way to distinguish between education and other governmental benefits in this context. Is the Court suggesting that education is more "fundamental" than food, shelter or medical care?

Without laboring what will undoubtedly seem obvious to many, it simply is not "irrational" for a state to conclude that it does not have the same responsibility to provide benefits for persons (whose very presence in the State and this country is illegal) as it does to provide for persons lawfully present.

By definition, illegal aliens have no right whatever to be here, and the state may reasonably, and constitutionally, elect not to provide them with governmental services at the expense of those who are lawfully in the state.

Today's cases, I regret to say, present yet another example of unwarranted judicial action which in the long run tends to contribute to the weakening of our political processes.

18. As the District Court observed in No. 80-1538, the confluence of Government policies has resulted in the existence of a large number of employed illegal aliens, such as the parents of plaintiffs in this case, whose presence is tolerated, whose employment is perhaps even welcomed, but who are virtually defenseless against any abuse, exploitation, or callous neglect to which the state or the state's NATURAL CITIZENS and business organizations may wish to subject them.

19. ~With respect to the actions of the Federal Government, **alienage** classifications may be intimately related to the conduct of foreign policy, to the federal prerogative to control access to the United States, and to the plenary federal power to determine who has sufficiently manifested his allegiance to become a citizen of the Nation. No State may independently exercise a like power. (endquote) ~ ~ ~

An "advanced search" of the term "**natural citizen**" located this from the HARVARD LAW SCHOOL LIBRARY; -THE VEST POCKET LAWYER booklet c. 1919 418.

The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land.

419. The Constitution of the United States gives to every NATURAL CITIZEN, and guarantees to that citi-

zen, political, religious, and civil rights.

420. Every NATURAL CITIZEN of the United States, is first, a citizen of the United States. Then, this same citizen of the United States may be a citizen also of any individual state in the union. ~ ~ ~

The use of the adjective "natural" to describe citizen is evidence of a form of citizenship which is outside of the legal realm, -pre-dating it, existing as a natural extension of the natural realm which has as a fundamental element of all social groups, the Law of natural membership (off-spring are the same as their parents). In the realm of national membership we have the natural law of natural citizenship. By that law, all children of citizens are citizens also, just like their parents from whom they inherit their unconditional national membership.

If one parent is an alien, then the off-spring of such a couple will be a hybrid, cross-breed citizen with dual citizenship. Such citizens are not eligible to serve as President because their citizenship is not natural nor unconditional. Obama is not such a citizen because he did not inherit the citizenship of his mother since, for domestic births within marriage, citizenship is inherited from the head of the family, which is the father.

Neither did he inherit American citizenship from his father. Instead, he inherited only provisional Kenyan citizenship. By American law, Obama is still not an American citizen, although he is presumed to be one due to an institutionalized error established by the U.S. Attorney General in 1898. So Obama, instead of being a "natural born citizen" as the Constitution requires, is merely a presumptive political policy citizen whose presumption of citizenship could be nullified with the signature of the Attorney General or the President. Zero chance of that happening.

~~~~

Annual Report of the West Virginia Bar Association
~transcript of Annual Meeting held **1887**

West Virginia Bar Association Page 41

I would be glad to know how there can be any distinction without regard to the rights conferred on a corporation and the rights which the NATURAL CITIZEN possesses. No one will contend that a NATURAL CITIZEN may not engage in any sort of business transaction

of a pursuit which the law recognizes. How then can it be said that if the right be conveyed to and conferred upon a corporation to carry on business in its corporate name the business has any more public character than the ordinary pursuits of any NATURAL CITIZEN?

How can it be said that the rights given that corporation are other than similar rights of a NATURAL CITIZEN?

[<http://books.google.com/books?id=YMYvAQAAMAAJ&pg=RA1PA41&lpg=RA1PA41&dq=%22NATURAL+CITIZEN%22+born,+naturalized&source=bl&ots=u1QGaYhkLp&sig=4bEoylPAMzP10unBzXWBIO07QDs&hl=en&sa=X&ei=zus8UdTmD5LkqAG5rYCoDA&ved=0CFYQ6AEwCDgK#v=onepage&q=%22NATURAL%20CITIZEN%22%20-born%2C%20-naturalized&f=false>]

57th Congress, 2nd Session U.S. SENATE
DOCUMENT No. 46

JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL COURTS OVER CORPORATIONS

Corporation Is A Citizen

Purpose:

It is proposed herein, by invoking the aid and guidance of the fundamental rules of justice and equality, to urge upon Congress the necessity for enacting into law the form and substance (if not the exact words) of the bill hereinafter formulated, the design of which is to CORRECT a growing ABUSE and to advance a much-desired remedy.

The "CITIZEN" of the Constitution

For more than a half a century the judiciary of the United States, using as a basis a line of reasoning CONTRARY to the Spirit of our national Constitution, has, by a mere FICTION, construed the word "CITIZEN" as used in Article III, Section 2, to be extended to and include the word "corporation". From the foundation of the Government up to 1844 the United States Supreme Court naturally and justly held that "citizen" and "Corporation" had, for all purposes, two separate and distinct meanings. The word "citizen" in our American system of government was held to mean and include only a natural person who was endowed with the privileges and blessing of the qualifications which made him an American Freeman. That word in those days had as high and as noble a meaning as had the word "King" in the parlance of Europe.

The great Chief Justice Marshall, in the case of *Bank of the United States v. Deveaux*, gave this meaning and significance to the word "CITIZEN" thus:

"For the term CITIZEN ought to be understood as it is used in the Constitution and as it is used in other laws; that is, to describe the **real persons** who come into court, in this case in their corporate name." And again, in the same case, "A corporation aggregate can not, in its corporate capacity, be a citizen." (5 Cranch, 61.)

~Change Making a Corporation a Citizen...

Comparison of Corporation; ~Then and Now

~And all this time the powers and privileges of NATURAL CITIZENS have not increased a single iota, so that while it might have been fair to have a NATURAL CITIZEN and a corporate citizen on a par in 1844, at present it only makes an odious comparison. Hence a remedy is herein suggested to give greater recognition to the just demands of the NATURAL CITIZEN, without injuring or disturbing the rights of the honest and good-intentioned corporate citizen, the design and purpose being to bring back the equality of citizen before the law, be such citizens NATURAL or CORPORATE.

It is respectfully submitted that no honest opposition can be made nor will be made, by those truly representing the people -the **natural citizens** of the land, -to a proposition that has as its cardinal principle "equality before the law".

~~~~

The large corporations of today have members (stockholders) scattered all over the country, and even over several countries. In addition to this, the principle is too well founded and too universally recognized that the corporation, as such, has a separate and distinct IDENTITY, INDIVIDUALITY, and responsibility from its members. Hence the THEORY must be preceded upon that the corporation is itself the entity, the party, the CITIZEN.

### Injustice of Present System

~I also think that corporations chartered under the laws of the States should, for the purposes of jurisdiction in the Federal courts, be declared to be citizens in each and every State in which they have an office, or in which they carry on or conduct any part of their corporate business.

There are hundreds of corporations in this country today which never perform a single corporate act in

the State of their creation, except to pay the secretary of state the fees for a certified copy of their charter.

The sole object of the creation of such corporations is to *avoid the jurisdiction* of the State courts in the States where they do business.

To illustrate: There is the Southern Pacific Railroad;

it is a Kentucky corporation. It has not now and never had an inch of road or dime's worth of property in that State, and it never expected or intended to have. The object was to use its TECHNICAL CITIZENSHIP (under the decisions of the Supreme Court) in Kentucky to escape the jurisdiction in the State courts in the States in which it carried on its business.

If these FRAUDS (-I use the term advisedly) on the jurisdiction of the Federal courts had been **exposed**, and these corporations made to answer in the State courts of the States in which it they conduct their business, in all suits except those involving Federal questions, there never would have been any necessity to create the Circuit Court of Appeals.

### Previous Effort to Secure Relief

Judge Seymour D. Thompson (a gentleman without peer as an authority on the subject of corporation law) very frequently attacked the abuse of jurisdiction:

"That the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States assented reluctantly to the **doctrine** stated in the preceding section illustrates one of the most *pitiable* characteristics of the judicial administration, -the HABITUAL GREED of jurisdiction exhibited by courts and judges, and the *insincerity* manifested by them in interpreting constitutional provisions and statutes relating to their own jurisdiction."

The question was one of extreme simplicity. It related solely to the meaning with which the framers of the Constitution and of the judiciary act had used one of the plainest, simplest and best understood words in our language, -the word "citizen".

Never before had it been regarded as referring other than to a single person endowed with the ordinary political privileges and franchises of the country of which he was a resident. Never before had it been used to designate a body of persons, collected or organized in any manner, nor with any faculty whatever.

THE JUDGES KNEW THIS!

They knew that the men who used the word "CITIZEN" in those instruments had no idea that they were describing *an artificial collection* of persons.

~It is to be borne in mind that the question did not involve the mere question of the jurisdiction of the national courts; it involved something more.

All jurisdiction had been apportioned between the national and the State judicatories; and hence the Federal judicatories, in seizing upon a jurisdiction which had not been conferred upon them by the Constitution and judiciary act, seized a portion of the jurisdiction belonging to the States, and DEFRAUDED the State tribunals of a portion of their rightful jurisdiction. It was a plain case of THEFT of Jurisdiction.

It illustrated a charge which Mr. JEFFERSON, in one of his letters written some years before, had made against the tendencies of the Federal judiciary:

"working like gravity, -by night and by day, -gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a THIEF over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the government of all be consolidated into one."

Overruling their former decisions, and under a miserable pretext which involved the DISTORTION of a PLAIN WORD from its **natural** meaning to a meaning which had NEVER BEFORE been assigned to it, the court now announced the following rule:

"A corporation created by and doing business in a particular state is to be deemed to all intents and purposes as a person, although an ARTIFICIAL PERSON, an inhabitant of the same State, for the purposes of its incorporation, capable of being treated as a citizen of the State, as much as a NATURAL PERSON.

Like a citizen it makes contracts, and though in regard to what it may do in some particulars it differs from a natural person, and in this especially, the manner in which it can sue and be sued, it is substantially, within the meaning of the law, a CITIZEN of the State which created it, and where its business is done, for all the purposes of suing and being sued."

That statement of the law was probably EXTRA-JUDICIAL, but its authority was established by later decisions against the vigorous dissent of a minority of the court.

## JEFFERSON'S WARNING

The jurisdiction thus seized upon, to continue in the language of Mr. Jefferson, continued to "advance its noiseless step like a thief" until the court had reached the DOCTRINE that, for the purposes of the Federal jurisdiction, a corporation is conclusively presumed to be a CITIZEN of a State under whose laws it is created, and, conversely, that it can not be a citizen of a State other than the State under whose laws it has been created.

Stated in another way, this doctrine is that although a corporation is not itself a citizen, yet of ALL THE PURPOSES of federal jurisdiction founded on *diverse citizenship*, the stockholders who compose the corporate body by and under the name given them by the statutes of a State are to BE TREATED AS CITIZENS of that State, and are stopped from denying that they are such.

And this is so although all of its business may be prosecuted elsewhere, and all of its offices and places of business may be outside of the State by whose laws it has been created, and all its stockholders may be residents of the State in which it is impleaded in the Federal court as a citizen of such other State. The most striking commentary which can be made upon the IMPROPRIETY, if not the CRIMINALITY, involved in the seizure of this jurisdiction, is found in the manner in which it operates in respect of what is now known as the "TRAMP CORPORATION".

Under the rule thus established, a number of citizens of one State can organize themselves into a corporation under the laws of another State, through the mere aid of an attorney employed there, without acquiring a residence or even temporarily coming within such State, for the purpose of engaging in business in their own State, and can thus succeed in bringing all actions by and against them within their jurisdiction of the Federal courts, ousting the jurisdiction of their own State courts over such actions. (29 Am. Law Rev., 864)

### 10. JURISDICTION of FEDERAL COURTS OVER CORPORATIONS

~Flagrant Abuse of Existing Law

The injustice in the present construction of the word "citizen" for the purpose of jurisdiction, is not so very

VICIOUS per se, but becomes so by the ABUSE which is thereby permitted. ~

It requires very little argument to show the great INJUSTICE, inconvenience, and unnecessary expense suffered by one class of persons by reason of the opening of a JUDICIAL SIDE DOOR which permits another class (of citizens, i.e., corporations) a means of retreat not enjoyed by both.

### Futility of State Legislation

This kind of EVIL was undertaken to be remedied by the State of Wisconsin by an enactment which...

Here it will be seen that not only did the legislature do all it could to prevent "foreign" corporations (out-of-state) from invoking Federal jurisdiction, but the corporation itself voluntarily waived its right to invoke that jurisdiction.

~ ~ ~

Here too, the DOCTRINE now in vogue that "Corporation" and "Citizen" means the same for the purposes mentioned was REAFFIRMED by Mr. Justice Hunt in this direct language: "A corporation has the same right to the protection of the laws as a NATURAL CITIZEN and the same right to appeal to all the courts of the country." Hence it is positively apparent that any relief to be granted to CORRECT THIS EVIL must come from the national Congress.

### Voluntary Entrance into Foreign State.

It is a fact that all the States of the Union have laws relating to foreign corporations. ~ It is wholly optional with a corporation whether or not it desires to operate outside the State of its creation. ~ When it goes into that FOREIGN STATE it should be in all respects with the idea that the citizens of that State are entitled to every single privilege to which it (the foreign corporation) is entitled.

It should not ever be with the idea that it is entitled to any advantage over other citizens; and under The DOCTRINE of the EQUALITY OF CITIZENSHIP it should not be permitted to have any advantage; and if it has such, under just legislation should not be permitted to retain it. [criminal "foreign citizens" require EXTRADITION to home jurisdiction for prosecution.] ~Continuing, Mr. Russell, says:

This ground of jurisdiction (diversity of citizenship) with its PERVERSION, presently referred to, steadily

furnishes about one-third of the cases in the Federal court, nearly all of which one-third are naturally and properly justiciable in the State courts. Unfortunate conflicts of decision have resulted. Citizens have been drawn away from their homes and local courts, and have smarted under the impression that the General Government has a HOSTILE and UNFRIENDLY government, not having THE GOOD OF THE PEOPLE at heart."

And again, as pointed out by this eminent jurist, continuance of the present construction of the word "CITIZEN" as the law of the land is a prolific source of annoyance and hindrance to the Federal courts themselves, and should for that reason be ABOLISHED by Congress. ~Congress should *abolish this jurisdiction completely*; and with it would go, of course, the PERVERSION of this jurisdiction which is exercised over corporations. That PERVERSION and its enormous effect in creating delay in the Federal courts we will now consider.

~Private corporations aggregate are nothing but partnerships with superadded qualities; and the Rights of ARTIFICIAL PERSONS composed. ~ Now, to give the association of citizens (a corporation) a greater right of suit in the courts of the United States than is possessed by each and all of the individual citizens composing the association, by means of a PURE FICTION that all have that right, when none in fact may have it, is believed to be an ABUSE more far-reaching in its consequences than *any now existing* in our courts.

But the Supreme Court, in that regard, has refused to follow out the legitimate consequence of its own decisions... Those decisions, in the later history of the court, are believed to have been UNSOUND.

~ ~ ~

~ It is undoubted that corporations were not within the contemplation of the framers of the Constitution when they created the jurisdiction over controversies between citizens of different states.

~ How is it then that we see daily examples of a corporation suing or being sued in the Federal circuit courts as a citizen of the State incorporating it when, first, not one of the individuals composing it is, in fact, a citizen of that State; and when, (second) every one of the individuals composing it is a citizen of the same State with the opposite party to the suit, and when, (third) all the busi-

ness of the corporation is transacted outside the State which incorporated it, and all the actual business offices are outside that State, and when, (fourth) all these facts are well known to all concerned in the suit, including the court itself, which takes judicial knowledge of the statute of the incorporating State not requiring members or officers to be citizens, and when the court well knows that the suit *does not really* involve a controversy properly with the jurisdiction under the judiciary act (citizens of one jurisdiction versus citizens of another).

How is it, I repeat, that we see these suits occurring *daily*? It is because the Supreme Court has determined that in such cases the facts SHALL NOT COME OUT; and this for the reason expressly state, -that if the facts should come out the jurisdiction would be defeated. (Am. Law Rev., supra.)

### Protest of Federal Courts.

"One can not wink so hard as not to see that this so-called corporation was one of those elusive, evanescent, will-o'-the-wisp corporations existing only in name and a FRAUD upon the laws of the State where it was attempted to be formed, and equally a FRAUD on the States or Territories and their citizens in which it carried on its business...by a mere pretense of compliance with the law of a State in which they do not reside, and do not intend to carry on any business, in order that they may ESCAPE ALL LIABILITY for the hazards of the business in which they are engaged, and enjoy the privileges of litigating in the United States courts. These privileges are obtainable under existing...decisions of the courts.

(Owen v. Shepard, 59 Fed., 746.)

### The "Thief in the Night"

There is perhaps no better way to show the growth of this jurisdictional ABUSE than by quoting from the decisions which caused it. From these quotations it will be seen that Mr. Chief Justice Marshall denied the right of a corporation to be called a "citizen"; Mr. Justice Wayne allowed the presumption to be entertained, and Mr. Justice Grier completed the ILLUSION by making the PRESUMPTION of citizenship conclusive.

Chief Justice Marshall: The jurisdiction of this court

being limited... both parties must be citizens to come within the description. That invisible, intangible, and artificial being, -that mere legal entity, (a corporation aggregate) is certainly not a citizen, and consequently can not sue or be sued in the courts of the United States unless the rights of the members in this respect can be exercised in their corporate name.

Justice Wayne: A corporation created by and doing business in a particular State is to be deemed to all intents and purposes as a person, although an artificial person, -an inhabitant of the same State... -capable of being treated as a citizen of that state as much as a *natural person*.

Justice Grier: If the declaration sets forth facts [?]from which the citizenship of the parties may be presumed or legally inferred, it is sufficient. The presumption arising from the habitat of a corporation in the place of its creation being conclusive as to the residence of those who use the corporate name and exercise the faculties conferred by it, the allegation that the "defendants are a body corporate by the act of the general assembly of Maryland" is a sufficient averment that the real defendants are citizens of that State.

(Marshall v. B. & O. Railroad Company, 16 How., 328.)

Conclusion ~...Congress is urged to exert its power to give the country a legislative fact which will, in terms, transcend a judicial fiction, to the end that in the eye of the law, as in the spirit of the Constitution, all citizens are equal, be they natural or corporate.

~ ~ ~ ~

### Dual Nationality

[http://travel.state.gov/law/citizenship/citizenship\\_778.html](http://travel.state.gov/law/citizenship/citizenship_778.html)

Dual Nationality means that a person is a citizen of two countries. A person who is a dual national owes allegiance to both countries. Dual nationality can occur as the result of a variety of circumstances. The automatic acquisition or retention of a foreign nationality, acquired, for example, by birth in a foreign country or through an alien parent, does not affect U.S. citizenship. U.S. law does not require a person to choose one citizenship over the other. The U.S. Government does not encourage dual nationality. While recognizing the existence of dual nationality and permitting Americans to have

other nationalities, the U.S. Government also recognizes the problems which it may cause. Claims of other countries upon dual-national U.S. citizens often place them in situations where their obligations to one country are in conflict with the laws of the other. In addition, their dual nationality may hamper efforts to provide U.S. diplomatic and consular protection to them when they are abroad, especially when they are in the country of their second nationality.

~ ~ ~ ~

In the absolute absence of any facts regarding Obama's past, we have grounds to assume that the facts are kept secret because they are detrimental to Obama's narrative. So with that being the only logical possibility, we can legitimately speculate as to what it is that he is hiding.

First we must assume, since he has no future election ahead, that the hidden facts are major secrets rather than minor ones. So what sorts of major secrets could he have a need to hide? These:

1. He has no birth certificate from any American state.
2. He was adopted by Lolo Soetoro, and thus became an Indonesian citizen.
3. His Indonesian citizenship qualified him for an Indonesian passport, one which he acquired before traveling to Hawaii at age ten, -one needed for that travel because without an American birth certificate, he had no American passport and no American identification.
4. His parents were not divorced until 1980 when he was about 20 years old, so at that adult age he still had a renewed Indonesian passport, -one which he continued to renew into later adulthood because it was his sole source of identification.
5. There is no evidence that he ever used an American birth certificate to acquire any official form of identification.
6. His admission to American colleges was as a foreign student using a foreign passport as ID.
7. The reason he could not in 2008 release a scan of the Hawaiian birth certificate that he had used all of his life to acquire American forms of identification and admission is because he never had a Hawaiian birth certificate that he could scan and release.
8. Because he had no American birth certificate, he was forced to resort to producing a counterfeit, and when it was seen as being totally inadequate to vet him for the office of the President, he was forced to fabricate a long-form birth certificate counterfeit with the assistance of his senior staff and officials in Hawaii.