

When Experts Are Idiots & Authorities Are Fools

~none dare call it constitutional treason
by a.r. nash obama--nation.com

The Supreme Court ruling against the illegal migrant law of Arizona was misguided at best and a constitutional travesty at worst. The court had no basis to rule as it did against the State of Arizona. Says who?

Says the United States Constitution. And what makes yours-truly an expert on the Constitution? Simple, the ability to read. Anyone who can read can be quite expert on the Constitution because it is perfectly understandable in almost all regards.

If my audacious self-appointed expertness is true, and the Justices of the Supreme Court were wrong, then why were they wrong?

They were wrong because they violated their oath to follow the Constitution and instead followed an accepted conventional “common knowledge” attitudinal position. The conventional consensus attitude which they relied on is the same as that employed by respectable legal experts and former judges (“senior legal analyst”) who have shockingly declared in a most emphatic manner, that the right to control immigration is not given to the states but to the federal government by the Constitution!

Hearing that statement coming out of the mouth of a respected authority was like hearing that the Earth indeed, as every one can see, is in fact actually perfectly flat. I wondered in amazement, “if the ‘experts’ get something so simple flat-out wrong, what hope is there for our future?”

I have to assume that there is very little, -if something as simple as the enumerated powers delegated to Congress can be completely misconstrued in an imaginary manner by experts who are great defenders of the Constitution. That would mean that we’re in big trouble.

What did they all get wrong? Simple, they didn’t get anything “wrong”, -it’s worse than that.

Instead they simply invented something that doesn’t even exist!

Congress, in Article 1, Sections 8, 9 & 10 is given no authority over immigration! It’s impossible to misconstrue what the Constitution says about foreign immigration because the Constitution says absolutely nothing about it.

It does mention the slave trade though, -that it can’t be forbidden by Congress before 1808, but it can be taxed. It states in the Section 9: “The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress...”

So that leaves only the one single statement related to immigration, and yet even it isn’t. It’s the statement; “Congress shall have power...to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.”

So that’s it. There’s nothing more. Congress was only given the authority to write a naturalization rule that would make the rules of the states uniform. So Congress could decide the over-all nationwide policy for naturalization, period. But what you may have failed to grasp in that sentence, thanks to conventional thinking, is the part that reads, “the rules of the states”.

What that means is that the states were sovereign over immigration and naturalization, just as they were before the Constitution was finally ratified by all of them. As formerly sovereign governments, with their own legislatures, governors, courts, and constitutions, the central government had no sovereignty over who the states allowed into them, nor had a hand in their naturalization. It was strictly a state matter, except the Congress was given authority to ensure that all the states met a minimum standard, i.e., had a uniform rule. They remained free to set a higher standard as long as it didn’t conflict with the general nationwide rule written by Congress. End of story.

So, when you consider the words of the 10th Amendment; “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”, you’re left with on-

ly one conclusion. The states have been robbed. The federal government has stolen an authority it was prohibited from possessing.

Which leads us back to the authoritative dogmatic statement that immigration was a subject delegated by the Constitution to the federal government, about which one is left to ask oneself; "In what universe?" It sure isn't this one.

Any child reading what the Constitution says and what the 10th Amendment says can come to no other conclusion. So even in the subject of immigration and naturalization, the central government, as in most other areas of its jurisdiction, is operating totally outside of its legal bounds. It's not skirting the border between the granted and the prohibited, -it's squarely ensconced in the land of the prohibited.

One is left with no other understanding of the situation other than that "the law", the Congress, the courts, and the experts are all wrong. Conventional "wisdom", common "knowledge" and consensus "opinion" is guiding their misguided minds. It's bad enough hearing legal experts pontificate incorrectly on the Constitution, but how do you explain the justices of the Supreme Court?

Are they not supposed to know and follow the Constitution? There is no acceptable answer to that question, because they either know what its limits are on Congress, and the authorities it leaves to the states exclusively, but it doesn't care and simply does whatever its member want and feel should be the political policy of the nation, or indeed they are actually as ignorant as any child would suspect them of being. Both possibilities are horrible. As for operating as "a nation of laws and not of men", pardon my French but, we're screwed.

In fact, the inescapable fact is that we essentially are a nation of men and not of laws. That is born out by the terminology used in law; "the *opinion* of the court" (not "the facts determined by the court", or "the constitutional truth of the matter").

Opinions do not necessarily have to be factual or correct, after all, they are just opinions. And judges with no regard for our foundational charter nor for the wisdom of the men who labored over writing it, can and do simply substitute their opinion of what the law should be for what the law actually is.

How should one describe such behavior? Call it what it is; constitutional treason.

Again, that leaves only three explanations; -they either are too ignorant, intellectually lazy or stupid, and therefore are not even aware of what the constitutional law actually is, -or they know but misunderstand it, and choose the wrong side of two possible choices, -or they simply don't give a damn about fulfilling their oath to follow the constitution whether they like it or not, -as impartial judges. In most instances, it's the latter when it comes to the votes of the court's treasonous liberals.

Allow me one more example of conventional wisdom being totally wrong. Everyone, including yourself, think that slavery was abolished in the United States. It's banned. Gone forever and can't come back. Right? Wrong!

Slavery, and involuntary servitude are still perfectly legal in in all of the states under proper circumstances, and fully legal without restriction in well over half the territory of the United States. How can that be true when everyone knows that it isn't? Because everyone is wrong.

But, you argue, slavery and involuntary servitude were universally outlawed by the 13th Amendment, which reads: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

That's about as plain and simple as it could get, right? That *is* right, but what's wrong is that the quote left out its center section, which reads: "except as punishment for crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted,".

So, under proper legal circumstances, slavery and involuntary servitude are still legal in

“the United States and their jurisdiction”. That second-to-last word makes it even worse, because “their” jurisdiction only covers that of the states themselves, and does not include the jurisdiction of the federal government, -which includes all of Washington D.C., all federal territories and lands owned by the federal government. That includes perhaps 80% of the land west of the Mississippi river since the federal government owns more of the land of many western states than the states do.

If you follow the logic of state-property versus federal property to its inescapable conclusion, then slavery and involuntary servitude are not banned in perhaps more than half of the area comprising the nation, especially with the vastness of Alaska thrown in, -which one could assume is mostly owned by Washington since the federal government obtained it by buying it from Peter the Great of Russia.

In addition, anyone born on federal land is not a citizen of the state in which they were born because they were not born under its jurisdiction. States have no jurisdiction over federal lands, anymore than they do on Indian reservations. They are therefore, like those born in Washington DC, federal citizens only. They therefore should not be liable for state income taxes if they live and work on federal land, such as rangers for example, and if they are not citizens of the state in which they reside, they probably have no constitutional right to vote on state matters in state elections.

So much for conventional wisdom. Conventional wisdom declares that I must be off my freakin’ rocker to think that I’ve illuminated some obscure surprising facts that all of our nations great legal authorities, pundits, scholars, and judges are unaware of. Well, stating the obvious doesn’t necessarily come with the assumption that others aren’t aware of such elementary facts. But if they are aware, then where are their voices? Have you heard any? I sure haven’t. But then I’m nobody, with no legal connections whatsoever. Yet here I am writing about it. If the experts are experts, why aren’t they the ones writing about it instead of a nobody?

Is “group think” that powerful? Does no one question the status quo they were taught in law school, a status quo that no one is challenging? Why aren’t they? Are they cowards, clueless, or fellow traitors with the Congress, the White House, and the Supreme Court? I think we’ve all been conned in a manner too huge to grasp, and not by what the experts have said, but by what they haven’t said.

Part II; The 14th Amendment & Millions of Alien “Citizens”
(when opinions are revered, truth gets reviled)