

## How The Ring of Power and a Traitor Shaped Presidential Eligibility

~ a new insight into presidential eligibility ~

The constitutional controversy raised by the election of Barack Obama has led both sides to consider the original view of what constituted a person born as a natural citizen, -or in the words of the Constitution; a “natural born citizen”.

Both sides sought hints in the discussions of the constitutional convention and the writings of the framers but to no avail since the matter was not discussed, leaving both sides to surmise one thing: there was nothing to discuss because there was no divergence of understanding of what the words meant which were chosen to describe those who would be allowed to be eligible.

The first designation chosen was: "No person" -shall be eligible, -but with two exceptions; one being any white male (Protestant) American citizen (meaning any citizen of any of the States regardless of their parentage or place of birth) as long as they became a citizen before the Constitution was ratified. Everyone understands and understood clearly what that meant, but a similar complete lack of discussion or dispute about what the second exception was reveals that it was equally understood by all.

The first and enduring requirement, being that one be a natural born citizen, was defined by a prohibition of either one, or both, of the two conditions allowed for all citizens born before ratification; they being either 1.) birth outside of the boundaries of the States and nation, (birth as a foreigner) or 2.) one not born of American parents.

One side argues the former while the other side argues both (with both sides in natural agreement that naturalized citizens are excluded) -while I argue that both sides are self-deluded because only the 2nd alone is determinative (American parents).

Here's where the new insight begins: either all of the members of the convention agreed that all sons of aliens could be President just as long as it is known that they entered the world within U.S. boundaries, and within a State that provided the gift of its citizenship to all such alien-born children who were thereby citizens from birth, -or... where they were born was irrelevant, with all that mattered being that they were born of an American father.

-As we easily comprehend, the difference between the two possible understandings was enormous and would have been evident in the minds of all those involved in determining the words to use to qualify one for the presidency.

Allowing all citizens who shared in the sacrifice of the war to partake in its victory on equal terms with natives would not have been very controversial, considering that their loyalty to America and Liberty and Equality were written in sweat, pain, and blood, so naturalized foreigners were included as equals and eligible. But in perpetuity, who would be excluded among the ones born after, -or gained citizenship after the Constitution was ratified?

Was it the alien-born (all sons of foreign immigrants) or was it the foreign-born only? -or both?

There was no disagreement possible that the native-born sons of Americans were born as natural citizens, but the matter about which there currently is great debate, is whether or not the citizenized-at-birth sons of foreigners can be, -and were, considered to be natural Americans by birth.

In other words; were *all* native-born persons considered to be natural Americans or were only the sons of Americans so considered.

The foreign-born sons of Americans were so few in number as to be invisible during the conven-

tion, and thus not included in a manifest way by the words chosen to qualify for eligibility.

The first Congress attempted to make up for that oversight in order that the foreign-born sons of American Ambassadors, and others, would not be excluded from their birthright.

They labeled all foreign-born American children not with the highly prized group appellation of CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES but instead chose to label them with the term reserved solely for men who could be President of the United States. The Congress directed that they be recognized as *natural born citizens*.

They had only one reason for invoking a term reserved solely for presidential eligibility, and that was to secure the foremost right for all natural American sons, regardless of whether or not they were delivered from the womb beyond the borders of their nation.

That right was secured for them in the first Congress about three years after the Constitution was written, -via the Naturalization Act of 1790.

Leaving that digression, focus needs to be returned to the fact that where there might have been a divergence of views (resulting in some measure of notable dispute) none were ever reported.

That makes it clear that they were all of one understanding as to who was *not* a natural born citizen, -whereas today, uncertainty exists (partly due to ignorance, but mostly due to bias and indoctrination).

The key to understanding the view of the Constitution's framers is uncovered by the suggestion offered by the former president of the Continental Congress, John Jay (Washington's first chief Justice of the Supreme Court).

And to whom did he make it? To the president of the Constitutional Convention. And who was that? The former Chief Commander of the entire American Army, General George Washington.

Everyone in the convention probably had no other choice for whom they would want to wield the power of Command in Chief of U.S. military forces under the constitution of a new nation.

They would have wanted General Washington, because he had followed the example of Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus (519 BC – 430 BC) who was a Roman aristocrat and statesman whose service as Consul in 460 BC, and dictator in 458 BC came about when while, "plowing his fields, a messengers arrived to tell him he had been named dictator to defend the city against the Aequi and the Volscians."

"He took up the Supreme Command, defeated Rome's enemies, freed the besieged consul Minucius, and returned to his farm, all within 16 days. Further, he refused the honors that came with his military victories."

"George Washington was sometimes called an American Cincinnatus because he too held his command only until the defeat of the British and, at a time when he could have chosen to exercise great political power, instead returned as soon as he could to cultivating his lands."

"After the end of the Revolutionary War, a group of former officers in the (now) American army formed The Society of the Cincinnati, taking the name from the Roman general. The city of Cincinnati was named after this organization, and a statue of Cincinnatus stands there today." <http://www.dl.ket.org/latin1/historia/people/cincinnatus01.htm>

Now let's zero in on exactly what the concerned John Jay wrote to General Washington. He felt so strongly about the issue of potential foreign influence that he wrote to him recommending that the qualifications for holding supreme military power should *not* be egalitarian but exclusionary instead. He wrote: 25 Jul 1787,

*"Permit me to hint, whether it would be wise and seasonable to provide a strong check to the admission of **foreigners** into the administration of our national Government; and to declare expressly that the **Command in Chief** of the American army shall not be given to nor devolve on, any but a natural born citizen. "*

From afar (New York) his thinking wasn't so much focused on the nature of a constitution of a new government as on who would wield the ultimate power of the nation, and whether or not he would be vulnerable to powerful and wealthy foreign sources of influence that might have designs on American sovereignty, resources, or the lands of the American West.

As far as anyone is aware, he did not know and could not know that the position of Command in Chief of the American Army would be placed under the authority of the President of the nation. All we see is that he feared that the authority of supreme military power might be exercised in a way that would be harmful to the peace, welfare, sovereignty, and unity of the Union.

A dictator, and a man with dictatorial authority, (as is the case with military leadership) could do significant damage to the nation, -either on his own selfish behalf or on behalf of a foreign sovereign power to whom he might secretly be loyal.

The odds of that were not significant, but then they were not determined by chance, but by greedy foreign minds who by the motive of greed could hatch plots to "place one of their own" into the position of supreme command; -someone who we today would call "a sleeper agent", -someone fully indoctrinated and motivated by a foreign allegiance, or by visions of great wealth & power, - but who kept his true motives hidden as long as necessary to secure national popularity and the highest office in the land.

The fact that John Jay was concerned about such a possibility reveals that he knew how selfish

the minds of the European aristocracy were regarding natives of foreign lands. We all know the history of how the selfish leaders of European nations violated the 10th Commandment by strongly coveting the wealth and power and sovereignty of other nations, whether across the globe or nearby, -frequently attacking and invading them.

After a long period of the British Parliament's totalitarian laws against the self-determination and income of the colonist, -after numerous humble but ignored and rejected petitions to respect their rights as fellow English subjects, the Americans knew full well that the aristocracy was thoroughly corrupt and dictatorial toward them.

There was little about them that could be trusted except that which was bound by the honor of official authority expressed in legally binding documents. And even those, as signed by the Kings of England, had been grossly violated with impunity over the ages until rebellion forced them to cede even more of their royal prerogative to Parliament, -which body was acting the same way toward the colonists. Ignoring their rights.

So in no American's mind, were dictatorial European aristocrats to be trusted with power in America.

The first line of defense against them was the abolition of all titles of nobility, and the requirement that any foreigner who sought to become an American must renounce all of his titles, -leaving them with no ability to secure followers by the appeal of authority and superiority.

John Jay would have assumed that no naturalized citizen would be entrusted by the electorate with the position of Command in Chief, -even though they were considered to be the equals of the natives in a civic sense.

But he was concerned that those who were born of foreigners, -and born with the gift of citizenship from birth (due to the allowance of some

States for all of their immigrant-born children) might be considered as eligible to wield the power of the American Army even though their allegiance could not be known for certain, -particularly if raised abroad in the father's homeland.

He knew that the framers were not going to consider allowing naturalized foreigners to rule the American Army other than those who fought in the revolution, but it was foreign-immigrant *sons* who did *not* serve in the revolution that concerned him.

He knew that not all States recognized only the children of citizens as being citizens since some allowed the alien-born to be citizens, -with the view that all native-born children were going to be native-raised as Americans.

And that was certainly the case in general, but he was concerned about the case in exception, -the out-of-the-ordinary, -a singular rare individual whose native-birth would not result in being native-raised but foreign-raised and indoctrinated. How could the new nation avoid that possibility, -and possible inevitability?

He had a suggestion which would avoid such a risk, and it was one that went further than allowing any and all native-born citizens to be the Commander in Chief.

No doubt he surmised, and feared correctly, that a proposal would be made (or knew that one had been made by Hamilton) that the only citizenship qualification be the possession of citizenship from birth, -regardless of whether that citizenship was *natural* citizenship via birth to Americans, or was merely *legal* citizenship bestowed by law to native-born sons of foreigners.

He wanted there to be no possibility of foreign loyalty in the man who would be the equivalent of an American king (Chief Commander of all military power), and so he made the recommendation that no citizen, -no born citizen, -except a natural born citizen, be allowed to hold that position.

I've explained his thinking many times previously regarding why he underlined the word "born", but wish to express a new insight into the history behind his thinking. It was of three aspects. Two were; the nature of man and the nature of the blood-line of the British monarchy. The other was the history of Roman power.

Rome began as a free Republic after finally demolishing the might of a centuries-long subjugation under the dictatorship of the Etruscans. Their mind-set after foreign domination for so long was that of hating kings and dictators. They were sick to death of foreign domination by autocratic rule, and resolved to never again be under the rule of a king, and so they formed the democratically elected the *Senate of Rome* to be their top government authority.

They would be governed by a civilian council of elected representatives, -as the Greeks had been before them. The council would create the laws of the nation and administer their execution through a bureaucracy of their own making and appointment.

That covered the nation within, but what of the security of the State in relationship to the powers without? That required a professional army, and it required a Commander in Chief, -a top General, -a potential dictator, but one who by Roman principles was subservient to the rule of Law and the Senate of Rome.

But in time, and with multiple foreign victories over the armies of coveted foreign lands, Julius Caesar appeared as the foremost power in the nation, and his "well-intentioned" ambition to be a "benevolent dictator" came to light when he had his army cross the Rubicon river, -all that separated it from Rome, as he had been ordered to not allow. That led to a realization by those in the Senate that he could and might seize absolute power since he had the army that could do it, and

it was loyal to him personally, and not to the laws and traditions of the nation and the authority of the Senate.

How did they respond to their admired hero? They knew they had only one choice. They could not arrest him for a crime of treason that he had not yet committed, nor could they securely put him on trial (because of the loyalty of his army) even if he had violated the law of civilian control.

They therefore had to take it upon themselves to go beyond the laws of Rome, beyond tradition and the rights of all Roman citizens, and join together to end the man's life before he anointed himself Emperor with there being no means to stop him.

Even a thoroughly proven hero and patriot had the human capacity of allowing his own presumption about his own wisdom and worth (superiority) rule his decisions about how to position himself in the hierarchy of national power.

Human ambition, when placed in a role of unquestioned authority and power, could never be trusted to do the right thing and remain subject to the law instead of superior to it. Power corrupts, and absolute power....

The satanic spirit of desiring to be an almighty God over everyone else is too powerful and irresistible when a man is placed in a position of such great control that he can become a god on Earth.

That fact has been well illustrated in many motion pictures involving a satanic villain. We've seen it is the Lord of the Rings, -influencing Sauro-man, -and in the end even Frodo, and everyone that came close to it.

It is an irresistible influence since the human psyche has nothing but a welcoming attitude toward it, -resisting only if, like Gandolf, one knows that they are highly susceptible to the crack cocaine of the human ego and thus avoids any contact with such power. (he would not even touch the Ring of Power) He knew that when it counted the most,

"the strength of men failed", and he was no less human than all others.

Another great example is that of Xerxes in "The 300", "a generous god" who was totally satanic, -a deity in his own mind, and those of others.

If they could not trust the very finest of their own people, how could they possibly trust the sons of their conquered lands of Spain, Africa, Palestine, Asia Minor and Greece to be Chief Commander of the Armies of Rome?

They couldn't and didn't. He had to be Roman born, not subject-born, -but not necessarily born *in* Rome although that was very preferable. Eventually, after centuries, the day came when the best person to be Emperor-Caesar (following the rise of the god-kings) was a man born of Romans but outside of Italy.

Lands outside of Italy were eventually highly romanized and so as an Empire, the Italians came to accept that the Roman Emperor need not be native-born, but *did* need to be born of Roman parents. (And that is exactly the view of the first Congress of the United States when they put it in writing that foreign-born Americans were citizens who were eligible to be President.)

The British learned, a millennia or less later, that the King cannot be put on trial in his own courts, -before his own judges, and so a strong check must be made against his exercise of unlimited power.

They had a long and sorry history of English kings being mad with power, disregarding fundamental fairness and charters of rights, and destroying the nobles and aristocrats that did not grease the royal palm with taxes and obeisance.

Just do a little internet research on "bills of attainder" and "corruption of blood" (barred specifically by the Constitution) and you'll feel sickened and depressed at just how much the innocent suffered under such dictators.

So abuse of power, in both English history and Roman history, made every educated man in America wary of any man who might not follow the Cincinnatus example set by General Washington.

The ambition of the man holding the scepter of all sovereign military power was a man who either could, or could not, be trusted. And they needed to decide who could *not* be trusted with such ultimate authority, and who could.

They choose, and all agreed, that he must be born of an American father. [all foreign wives of American men were American citizens via marriage]

The reason there was no debate about that was the fact that it was foremost in their minds. It was *not* the presidency that was in their minds.

Executing the laws of Congress was a purely administrative role and could pose little threat to the nation. So the focus was not on that role of the chief executive. Instead, it was purely and entirely on his also being given the position of Command in Chief of the American Army.

A traitorous Commander in Chief could wreck the nation and destroy freedom. A mere chief law administrator could do no such thing, and thus the office of President, -apart from the added military authority, was irrelevant to their consideration. It was all about: "Who will Command the Army?" -will it be another Cincinnatus? another General Washington? -or a Benedict Arnold? (-a Judas?)

General Benedict Arnold, an American war hero, became a traitor when his ambition for power was frustrated by Washington's slow-tracking his appointment as a co-chief commander of the American army.

So they must have asked themselves after being stabbed in the back by one of their own, "how can we not trust even less those born of foreigners?"

Clearly they couldn't, -and so they didn't. They required that the position of President, with its

added power of the chief of military authority, not be allowed to anyone who was not a natural born citizen; -barring all who were merely born as a citizen, i.e., born "with" citizenship, but *not* born as natural citizens.

The sons of foreigners might be raised with a foreign allegiance springing from their father's loyalty to the foreign monarch to whom he owed obedience as a subject (for life, -if British)

No son of a possible loyalist or British subject could conceivably be entrusted with the full authority of America's Armed Forces.

How could native-birth alone be considered a qualification to wield such power? That wasn't even thinkable, and that's why there was no discussion or debate. It was a "no-brainer".

One's exit from the womb was no more determinative of loyalty than a bowel movement. Only a man tied to the nation by blood, not dirt, -not borders, -not legal permission, -not English tradition and royal doctrine, could be placed in a position that required resisting all satanic, selfish, and foreign influence.

All they could do to avoid glib, facile, two-faced traitor was to vote for a humble and obedient servant of one's Deity who would reject all siren calls, -reject powerful "temptations of the Devil" to grasp the Ring of Power, and who would follow the example set by Cincinnatus and General Washington, -the kind of man who shared their vow of pledging their lives, fortunes and sacred honor to the cause of Liberty and the equality of Man.

Foreigners who had done so during the long arduous war were allowed the right to seek to lead them and command them because they were equals by vow and by deed.

Those who had not were not qualified since they were not Americans by either their own choice or by rejection based on poor moral character or foreign loyalty.

The window open for that generation of citizen-foreigners closed in spring of 1788 when the Constitution was ratified by the ninth State to do so.

After that, not only could citizen-foreigners not be President, but any son born to an alien was also ineligible regardless of native-birth and national loyalty because the whole class of the alien-born was barred, -whether State citizens or not.

Native-birth was irrelevant because all it could produce in some specific States was legal citizens, -not natural citizens. Legal citizens were those native-born to alien immigrants in States that recognized native-birth as a criterion for citizenship.

Being born as “foreign stock”, and not of citizens of the nation, they have no natural right to membership in it, thus an allowance is made by law to provide their fractional number with citizenship.

No citizenship provided by humans is natural citizenship. Natural membership, (which citizenship is at the national level) is a fundamental element of the composition of a society that organizing itself into a sovereign nation. Its natural members constitute the body of the nation’s natural citizens.

Foreigners are not a part of that body, and since they are a part of a foreign body, (their homeland to which they owe allegiance and obedience) any son born to them, even in America, is born under their father’s subjection, -born latently subject to his government, -born with his national character or nationality.

At adulthood, they’d have to choose which nation they wanted to be a part of if they wished to claim their foreign nationality. At that time, if they chose their father’s homeland as their own (he never having become an American) and emigrated to it, they’d lose their presumed (provisional) American citizenship received by extension of their possession of State citizenship based on native-birth.

In some States they had a legal right to citizenship, but in their father’s homeland they had a *natural* right to national membership. If they remained in the United States at adulthood, then they were presumed to have accepted the United States as their country, and that tacit acceptance of American citizenship was also viewed as a rejection of their natural foreign citizenship. That perspective is what avoided the detestable and unacceptable nationality bigamy of dual-nationality.

They were then Americans only, in effect, and continued through life as equals of all natural members of the nation, (and liable to a charge of treason for disloyalty) -except when it came to the one position of the presidency.

It was not a status that everyone had a right to. It was beyond that. Constitutions of the States read like this one from Pennsylvania, -which delineates some of the elements of the nature of citizenship: *All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and inalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness.*

*All power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their peace, safety and happiness.*

Such elucidation did not and does not include anything about any right to wield ultimate power over other human beings who are your equal. No such right exists. So the Constitution recognized none.

Its requirement was not a consideration of what one was in the present after reaching 35 years of age, -including being a proud and patriotic American citizen throughout one’s youth and adult life, -nor being native-born. It was only a consideration of what they were by birth, -by inheritance, by blood, -by patrilineal descent.

Where they had been born, or what they'd become was irrelevant. All that mattered was whether or not they were born of an American father and not an alien.

The framers, in the simplicity of the Constitution, did not split the hair of the alien-born who were U.S. raised, and those who were foreign-raised. Instead they simply barred all who were alien-born. Their father's later naturalization wasn't a factor.

That was a very small percentage of the population. In the founding era only about 2% of the population were foreigners (about one in fifty) while the bulk were natives. Children born to them were not American unless born in a State that gave its immigrants' children automatic legal citizenship as was the custom under British rule (anyone born in royal territory was a subject of the king) or until the father naturalized.

Being the recipient of free legal citizenship from birth did not alter the political character with which they were born since it was an inherited innate political character and not like clothing that one is given at birth.

The founding fathers and framers, in large part, understood all of this plain common sense without question, but some of them were from States that continued to follow British custom instead of the principles of the new republic (which principles they did not fully comprehend since their thinking about national belonging was thoroughly steeped in British legal tradition and the Rights of Kings).

They even continued to use the term "subject" instead of "citizen", revealing where their minds were at. They may have had in mind that a natural born citizen was anyone born (by law or tradition) with citizenship, -with no grasp nor consciousness of the meaning of the word "natural".

In their indoctrinate thinking "natural" may have meant "native". And yet that is not what it means and not what it meant to those who wrote it. To them it meant just what the word means; i.e., -a

citizen by nature, -by natural means, -not by *legal* means. And what is everything born by natural means? It is born in the image of, and with the nature of the parents. That fact, they understood, is true not just in the natural realm but in the political realm as well. Citizens produce newborn citizens, naturally without the need of legal permission. Foreign immigrants produce newborn citizens *legally*, -originally by British common law, later by State law (in some States), and even later still, by the Supreme Court's reinterpretation of the 14th Amendment citizenship clause in 1898.

Before that opinion was issued, the unsettled issue was not whether or not the alien-born in America were natural born citizens, but whether or not they were citizens at all from a national perspective, (-not a State perspective).

The issue, not being established in the Constitution nor addressed by Congress nor any amendment, was totally unsettled, and thus was under the purview of the Attorney General. It was within his authority, and the President's, -as top legal officers of the government, to decide what the policy would be that the executive branch would follow. State law? -or Washington D.C.'s chosen policy?

If the executive branch was ruled by men from native-birth-citizenship States, then native-birth alone might have been viewed as providing national citizenship, -and it did since State citizens were members of the nation, -but... what of those alien-born in States that did *not* granted native-birth citizenship, or those born not of *immigrants* but of mere guests? What the heck were they?

They were born subject to a foreign power, and thus, by the Civil Rights Act of 1866, were not recognized federally as citizens of the United States. The 14th Amendment, which immediately followed it, required subjection to the United States. And how did its authors define such subjection? By referring to the Civil Rights Act;

born *not* subject to any foreign power. But native-born children of visitors and guests absolutely *are* subject to the government of their foreign homeland where they live.

Cf. the Hausding and Greisser cases cited in Chief Justice Fuller's dissent in Wong Kim Ark, 1898.

*Hausding* was *born in the United States*, went to Europe, and, desiring to return, applied to the minister of the United States for a passport, which was refused on the ground that the applicant was born of Saxon subjects *temporarily* in the United States. Mr. Secretary Frelinghuysen wrote to Mr. Kasson, our minister:

You ask "Can one born a foreign subject, but *within* the United States, make the option after his majority, and while still living abroad, to adopt the citizenship of his birthplace?"

It seems not, and that he must change his allegiance by emigration and legal process of naturalization."

Sections 1992 and 1993 of the Revised Statutes clearly show the extent of existing legislation; that the fact of birth, under circumstances implying *alien subjection*, establishes, of itself, **no right of citizenship**, and that the citizenship of a person so born is to be acquired in some legitimate manner through the operation of statute. ~

*Greisser* was born in the State of Ohio in 1867, his father being a German subject and domiciled in Germany, to which country the child returned. After quoting the act of 1866 [Civil Rights] and the Fourteenth Amendment, Mr. Secretary Bayard said: Richard Greisser was no doubt *born in the United States*, but he was on his birth "**subject to a foreign power**," and "not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States." He was *not*, therefore, under the statute and the Constitution a citizen of the United States by birth, and it is not pretended that he has any other title to citizenship.

2 Whart.Int.Dig. 399.

Thus by established American law, the children of such non-immigrant foreigners are not citizens of the United States. That was national law & policy until the Supreme Court's 1898 opinion. Following it, the Attorney General went bananas and decided on his own to extend American citizenship to *everybody* born on U.S. soil, with the lone except of children of ambassadors & Indians.

And guess what? That A.G. opinion was never challenged nor over-turned. It today sits as a giant block of institutionalized legal cement even though it is purely a fiat policy that's non-constitutional, non-Supreme Court blessed, and not statutory via Congressional authority.

It remains what it was from its first day, -a bastardization of U.S. fundamental policy and a travesty against the rule of sane law; -both Natural Law, -and *actual* law as decided by the high court.

Now, as for the other half of the reason for the prohibitive presidential eligibility clause that's related to the British monarch. It was focused on the nature of the monarchy, -which involved its marriage alliances.

The British monarch, with command of British forces, showed to the Constitution's framers the dangers of an autocratic Commander-in-Chief, -one who might act arbitrarily and not be limited by the authority of Congress.

That was a home-grown danger of evil character, but the marriage tradition of the monarchy revealed the potential danger of foreign allegiance since monarchs had to be born of royalty.

There was not enough military might in Britain to provide full assurance of peace with ambitious and aggressive European neighbors, so to ensure peace & security, -and a sense of fraternity between nations, it was necessary for heirs to the throne to marry foreign royals. Thus, once that was established as the custom, the Queen, the woman that the King of England married, was

inevitably a foreigner. One hundred percent *not* British. That was worse than a case of a one or two term President's wife being say... Russian, -or Chinese.

Now far worse than that was the case in reverse, -where there was no male heir to the throne and so a daughter of the King had to be installed as the Queen of all England or all Britain.

According to royal custom, she must marry outside of England to maintain bloodline-ties to the royalty and aristocracy of Europe and Russia. Well! That was something highly conducive to producing great danger for the nation, since she would be married for life to a loyal royal from a foreign nation. And a woman by custom was viewed as subject to her head, -her husband who she swore to obey with a sacred marriage vow.

What possible status quo situation could be more fraught with more potential for foreign plots against the sovereignty of the nation?

Imagine a female President for life married to Vladimir Putin. *That* was the situation when a British Queen married a foreign royal.

Everyone in Britain who held a position of trust, -whether it be national security secrets or military power, was required by unwritten law, to be a natural born Englishman because they couldn't trust each and every native-born child of foreigners to be loyal to Britain and the Crown.

All that would be needed to successfully commit treason and overthrow the government would be one very trusted "sleeper agent" of a foreign power. They prevented that by not allowing a son of a foreigner to serve in any critical position.

That was an example that our founders and framers were well aware of. They did not want any foreign influence whatsoever lurking in the shadows of a President's background or psyche. They wanted him to be free of direct foreign influence.

For that to be possible would require not having a foreign father. Clearly, the simple approach was to require that the President be born of American parents, and they did that by requiring that no person except a natural born citizen be eligible for that office.

And if any ineligible candidate happened to run and be elected anyway, Congress had the constitutional authority to block him from taking the oath of office and taking power. That authority was more clearly spelled-out in the 25th Amendment. By its authority, if any elected President or Vice-President were found to be unqualified, they could be blocked. Disqualification could be due to an unqualified form of citizenship, - which in real terms, meant having a foreign father.

But in time, as the potential threat of foreign plots toward the power of the presidency of a vulnerable young nation evaporated due to our enormous growth in size and power, along with our closer alliances with foreign nations which one-by-one became democratic, concern about the President being born of a foreign father who had not yet become an American citizen waned.

In fact it waned to such a degree that it became invisible, and, along with it, the Constitution. But then the Constitution became semi-invisible generations ago. So why would anyone expect anyone in Washington to care today? Caring would require finding much of the legislation passed by Congress for several generations to be illegitimate by being in violation of the clear directives of the Constitution itself, along with the 9th and 10th Amendments. The sun will go dark before the elites in Washington will acknowledge the authority of the Constitution. As Nancy Pelosi asked in response to being asked where in the Constitution is Obamacare authorized: "Are you kidding?" Are you *kidding*?" No, we're not.

by Adrien Nash March 2014 [obama--nation.com](http://obama--nation.com)