

FACT VERSUS CERTAINTY

Truth vs. Constitutional error

~the Obamanization of citizenship reality

It's quite common to erroneously conflate facts with what are not facts but merely certainties. Facts are things we know and have proven to be true or seen are true, but some things are so certain that we consider them to be facts when in fact they are not. Example; it is not a fact that the sun will rise tomorrow in the East. But it is a certainty. Facts relate to things known to be true in the past and the present, while certainties relate to things that have not yet happened, -things that will or could become facts in the future.

People don't usually speak of facts as being certainties, though language lends itself to doing just that. One could say; "the stove is hot, that's a fact, and it's certain that it will burn you if you touch it." but one could also say; "it's for certain that the stove is hot, and it's a fact that it will burn you." but that lacks the ring of accuracy that the first example has.

So usually people don't call facts certainties, but people commonly confuse that which is a certainty with that which is factual. That happens because certainties always involve a component of deduction rather than mere observation, and deductions are based on common sense, and common sense can often be wrong.

So sometimes one can be certain of something and think that what they think is factual, even though in fact what they think is false. An example is the pronunciation of the word culinary. Everyone you've ever heard pronounce that word has pronounced it incorrectly. Language is very vulnerable to error because words are not always pronounced the way that one might think, and if you never hear a word pronounced correctly, then you just go with your assumption.

The actual correct pronunciation of culinary has the first syllable pronounced like the "u" in peculiar. One does not say pee-kul-ee-r, but says pee-qu-lee-r. Same with culinary; qu-lin-air-ee, -not kul-in-air-ee.

Everyone assumes that what they "know" is a fact because everyone else mispronounces it also, reinforcing their certainty. So they are certain of that which is in fact false.

Certainty does not equal fact. Not in language, & pronunciation, nor in the realm of original law principles.

One can say it's a fact that this car crashed into that other car, but one can't say that it's a fact that that car speeding down the road is going to hit that car stalled in the middle of the road ahead of it. That is not a fact because it has not yet happened. Until it does it is merely a possibility, a probability, or a certainty.

This difference needs pointing out in order to show that the mind of man commonly fails to distinguish between subtle differences, and the result is the holding of assumptions that are invisibly false.

That produces false certainty in views and ideas that we assume are accurate, but in fact may be totally incorrect. One example, the biggest one ever on planet Earth, was the assumption that the Atlantic Ocean and the Indian Ocean were the only oceans on Earth. In other words, no one had any idea that there was another ocean, and that it was exceedingly vaster than the two that were known. The discovery of the Pacific Ocean blew away everything that everyone thought they knew about the Earth. Their certainty was proven in time to be not based on fact, but on fiction and false presumption. Everyone was wrong.

I came across a false assumption of my own today which I've held as long as I can remember. It popped up as a misspelling flagged by the word-checker routine in my word processor. I typed the word "ephisode" and couldn't under-

stand why it was flagged since it was spelled just the way it's pronounced. Or so I thought. But I discovered to my surprise that both were wrong. It's actually "episode" -no "h". No "f" sound.

In today's America everyone is wrong about the meaning of the 14th Amendment citizenship clause (which was written four generations after the Constitution) and everyone is ignorant about the basis of American citizenship -which predated the Constitution by a thousand generations.

Inside and outside of government, people go about their lives thinking that they understand some things that they completely misunderstand, and that misunderstanding will eventually lead to the ruination of our republic, unless patriotic Americans who learn the truth rise up in great enough numbers to counter the ever growing throng of government dependents who will only vote for candidates who will keep the gravy coming.

~ President by The Right of Kings

At the time of the founding of the United States the concept of citizenship was muddled and confused by a century and a half of colonial imperial domination. The Monarch and the aristocracy viewed the colonies as the foreign property of the Empire, along with its inhabitants, with the result that they were not seen as having the rights of British subjects since they were separate and apart from Great Britain and essentially lacking any right to have representation to protect their interests.

In the new nation created in that world, the framers knew that the system of nationality assignment was aberrant and bastardized by the *jus soli* principle of ownership which governed the status of indebted peasants and their children. They were aware that natural citizenship, i.e., state and national membership, was an unalienable right of freemen, -passed from parents to children by right of descent, rather than something declared and enforced by the Lord of the

Shire, (-the master of the Manor estate) on debt-inheriting children of his perennially indebted vassals, nor, on a grander scale, imposed in accordance with the Divine Right of Kings by the Sovereign Monarch on all souls born within his dominion.

Because of the bastardized origins of citizenship in the colonies of empires in the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere across the globe, the principle of natural citizenship remains misunderstood by the United States government to this day. In the minds of legislators and Supreme Court judges, citizenship concepts are based on impressions which follow the colonial model, not the model followed by those who were freemen in most of the nations that were once part of the Roman world.

Rome followed natural law, by which only Romans gave birth to Romans. Foreign parents could not produce Roman citizens.

During the 18th & 19th centuries, the United States federal government held to the principle that inheritance of the citizenship of ones father was an unalienable right, and opposed any and all lower court rulings that based citizenship solely on location of birth. But the government lost at the turn of the 19th Century in the case of a native-born son of Chinese immigrants, Wong Kim Ark. The court ruled that the 14th Amendment was the law of the land, even in the case of children born to those from very alien cultures (who were assumed to still be loyal to their sovereign, -the Emperor of China, and were barred by law from becoming U.S. citizens).

That ruling, and the subsequent opinion of the U.S. Attorney General based on an over-simplified and distorted interpretation of the court's ruling on the meaning of the 14th Amendment resulted in the common misconception that American citizenship is a right automatically granted by the United States to any child born within our borders to any foreign parents, -with only the rare

exception of those born to foreigners with diplomatic immunity. That impression in the minds of the American citizenry led to the mistaken belief that any person born within the borders of the U.S. is eligible to be the President.

That is a subtle, but huge logic error based on the erroneous conflation of being a native-born citizen with being a natural born citizen.

Not all natural born citizens are native born, and not all native born citizens are natural born. Consider the nature of this logic error:

Citizen: a person who can be native born, and/or natural born. Native born, as well as Natural born makes a Citizen, therefore native-born equals natural born.

Gray: A color containing two components. Black is a part of gray, and white is a part of Gray, -they both have gray in common, thus they're closely related, and things and terms that are closely related are often interchangeable, therefore Black is essentially indistinguishable from White.

Barack Obama is believed to be born in the U.S., but that does not make him a natural American because he did not obtain American citizenship from an American father, -by blood connection, by patrilineal inheritance, by right of descent, which is a required qualification to be a natural born citizen. Since he is not a natural American citizen he cannot be made eligible for the office of the President.

The Constitution's first statement regarding the eligibility of citizens to be President states, in a purely exclusionary manner, not who *can* be President, but who can *not* be President.

It states plainly that "**No person except a natural born citizen...shall be eligible to the office of the President;**"

Does the American public take their Constitution seriously? Do they care that they elected a person who is not eligible to serve? Well, they can't care about something that they don't even know about, something that is the most misunderstood open se-

cret in the nation. Those who know won't discuss it because the implications of a requisite response by Congress is very ugly, messy, and extremely complicated. In effect, the medicine is worse than the disease. That's the Republicans' excuse, but the Democrats have an additional one, which is obvious.

by a.r. nash obama--nation.com

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Sunshine49 replied:

Statements from the Framers who WROTE the 14th Amendment:

1st Session, 39th Congress, pt. 4, p. 2893. Senator Reverdy Johnson said in the debate: "Now, all this amendment provides is, that all persons born in the United States and NOT subject to some foreign Power--for that, no doubt, is the meaning of the committee who have brought the matter before us--shall be considered as citizens of the United States...If there are to be citizens of the United States entitled everywhere to the character of citizens of the United States, there should be some certain definition of what citizenship is, what has created the character of citizen as between himself and the United States, and the amendment says citizenship may depend upon birth, and I know of no better way to give rise to citizenship than the fact of birth within the territory of the United States, born of PARENTS who at the time were subject to the authority of the United States." [The ONLY way they could be SUBJECT TO THE AUTHORITY would be if they had already given their ALLEGIANCE to the US and were considered the same as citizens even if they were RESIDENT ALIENS!]

1st Session, 39th Congress, pt. 1, p. 572. During the debate on the 14th Amendment, Trumbull stated,

"The Senator from Missouri and myself desire to arrive at the same point precisely, and that is to make citizens of everybody born in the United States who owe ALLEGIANCE to the United States. We cannot make a citizen of a child of a foreign minister who is temporarily residing here.

There is a difficulty in framing the amendment [to the Act] so as to make citizens of all people born in the United States who owe allegiance to it. I thought that might perhaps be the best form in which to put the amendment at one time; That all persons born in the United States and owing allegiance thereto are hereby declared to be citizens;' but upon investigation it was found that a *sort of allegiance* was due to the country from persons temporarily resident in it whom we would have NO RIGHT to make citizens, and that that form would not answer."

[the investigation was into the principle of allegiance (in British Common Law) whereby foreign visitors owed temporary local obedience to the authority established by the national leadership (i.e. The King and the Parliament) and domiciled foreigners, (immigrants) owed allegiance to their responsibility to share in any efforts required for defense of the nation. Meaning that they owed allegiance to the King's authority and were required to obey his orders to serve in the military, if needed, to defend the homeland.]

1st Session, 39th Congress, pt. 4, pp. 2891-2. Cowan expressed concern over the prospect of the states not being able to determine their own citizens. In particular, he identified two groups that he felt were unsuitable for citizenship but would have such bestowed upon their children by the Amendment:

Chinese and Gypsies, the latter of which he described thus, "who owe to her [Pennsylvania] no allegiance; who pretend to owe none; who recognized no authority in her government; who have a distinct, independent government of their own...; who pay no taxes; who never perform military service; who, in fact, do nothing which becomes the citizen, and perform none of the duties which devolve upon him, but, on the other hand, have no homes, pretend to own no land, live nowhere, settle as trespassers where ever they go."

He subsequently cautioned against adopting the proposed Amendment, "Are these people, by a

constitutional amendment, to be put out of the reach of the State in which they live?...If the mere fact of being born in a country confers that right then they will have it...Therefore I think, before we assert broadly that everybody who shall be born in the United States shall be taken to be a citizen of the United States, we ought to exclude others besides Indians not taxed, because I look upon Indians not taxed as being much less pestiferous to society than I look upon Gypsies."

1st Session, 39th Congress, pt. 4, p. 2893. Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Lyman Trumbull, participating in the debate, stated the following: "What do we [the committee reporting the clause] mean by 'subject to the jurisdiction of the United States'? Not owing ALLEGIANCE to anybody else. That is what it means."

[He should not have made that statement because it is profoundly erroneous. A stateless person would owe no allegiance to "anybody else", but that fact alone would not make them subject to the full authority of the American government. They become subject by principles unrelated to foreign governments, -natural principles related to the responsibilities of group membership and the natural right of nations to require male members to help defend the nation, just as male members of a tribe are similarly responsible.]

1st Session, 39th Congress, pt. 4, p. 2895. Howard additionally stated the word jurisdiction meant "the same jurisdiction in extent and quality as applies to every citizen of the United States now" and that the United States possessed a "full and complete jurisdiction" over the person described in the amendment.

Congressional Globe 39.1 (1866) p. 1291.

John Bingham said: "Every human being born within the jurisdiction of the United States of parents *not* owing Allegiance to any foreign sovereignty is, in the language of your Constitution itself, a natural-born citizen; but, sir, may I be allowed to say further that I deny that the Congress of the United States ever had the power, or color of power to say that any man born within the jurisdiction of

the United States, NOT owing a foreign allegiance, is not and shall not be a citizen of the United States. Citizenship is his birthright and neither the Congress nor the States can justly or lawfully take it from him.”

[He made an erroneous conclusion based on a false assumption. Gypsies were not members of American society because they had no roots anywhere, and thus no allegiance to anything other than themselves. They therefore possessed no right to membership in a group to which they did not belong and did not wish to belong. That group being the American group. They had no American identity, nor interest in nor connection to America’s founding and history and Constitution and rule of law. Thus they had no “birthright” to American citizenship merely because they happened by happenstance to exit the womb within American borders.

That fact did not attach them, nor connect them to the American spirit, American dream, American pride, American loyalty, American values, or the American government. Mr. Bingham spoke without thinking through what he was saying. He missed the nuance differentiating between normal persons and gypsies. Native Americans were in a similar type of relationship to American society, and they were not viewed as having a right to be citizens.

He compounded his error by making the mistake of conflating birth “within the jurisdiction of the United States” with being born subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The former relates to geography and man-made borders, while the latter relates to inherited responsibility. The obedience of subjection is owed only by members of a society and not owed by outsiders such as “Indians”, gypsies, and foreigners, -even though they be born “within” the territory of the national group.

But he got one thing exactly right, and that was that Congress is imbued with no constitutional authority to grant citizenship to, nor withdraw citizen-

ship from those who are born of natives of the nation and not born of foreigners. They are born as organic natural members of the national group and are its natural citizens. Congress has no authority to legislate regarding their citizenship.

a.r. nash]

Sunshine49 continue:

If this statute merely reaffirmed the old common law rule of subjectship by domestic birth location then the condition of the parents would be entirely irrelevant.

It should be noted that the condition of the father is what determines whether someone is born an alien or not because under U.S. law citizenship of wives and children always followed that of the father. And of course the status of the father was what determined the citizenship of a child born under the law of nature.

In *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment* (1998) the court said “jurisdiction is a word of many, *too many*, meanings.” Therefore, it is important to discover the operational meaning behind “subject to the jurisdiction” as employed under the Fourteenth Amendment rather than assuming its meaning from other usages of the word jurisdiction alone. Both Sen. Trumbull and Sen. Howard provide the answer, with Trumbull declaring:

The provision is, that ‘all persons born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens.’ That means ‘subject to the complete jurisdiction thereof.’ What do we mean by ‘complete jurisdiction thereof?’ Not owing allegiance to anybody else. That is what it means.”

Now, what exactly don't you understand about the parents not owing allegiance to any foreign power or being under the full and complete jurisdiction of the United States? That ONLY leaves parents with allegiance to the US ONLY as able to pass on natural-born citizenship to their children.

Sorry if that doesn't conform to your far left ideology, but it's
OUR LAW!

[The Treason of Which Our Government Is Guilty]

The Parasitic Presidency of Barry Obama The Kingdom of
Reid -Dictator of the U.S. Senate

March 23, 2012

Feinstein's (D. Calif) reply to my inquiry:

"Thank you for writing regarding President Barack Obama's qualifications to be President. I appreciate this opportunity to respond.

Article II, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution specifies the qualifications for this executive office. It states that no person except for a natural born American citizen is eligible to run for President of the United States. Also, the candidate must be at least thirty-five years of age and have resided in the United States for at least fourteen years.

President Obama meets these constitutional requirements. If you were not already aware, on April 27, 2011 the White House released a copy of President Obama's long form birth certificate. He was born in Honolulu, Hawaii, on August 4, 1961. According to the Fourteenth Amendment, all persons born in the United States are considered citizens of the United States. Under these criteria, President Obama, a 47-year old U.S. citizen, who has resided in the United States for longer than fourteen years, is eligible to be President."

Notice that she just slid by the "natural born citizen" clause. Feinstein like most other senators must think we are all dumb!! She does not have my vote.

"It is the manners and spirit of a people which preserve a republic in vigor. A degeneracy in these is a canker which soon eats to the heart of its laws and constitution." –Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the Virginia Query 19, 1781