from CERTAINTY to Confusion, to Ignorance, to ***TREASON***

There's an enemy within. There are traitors among us. They look just like us, they talk just like us, they live just like us, and in a sense they are us, but they are radically different in a fundamental way. They are traitors to the foundation of our nation. They are traitors to the United States Constitution.

Their treason is not like that of anarchists because instead of opposing the rule of law, and embracing disorder, they embrace the rule of law and want evermore greater degrees of order imposed by the federal government, aka *Big Brother*.

They use it to overthrow and contradict the *unalienable human rights* secured for us by our founding charter and its amendments. They use the implementation of laws abrogating individual liberties to herd us all into the same government controlled coral. Instead of using the power of government to protect and defend our liberties they use it to terminate those liberties.

The Constitution is akin to a sculptor's wire-figure skeleton on which he builds a shape out of paper mache. In time, as more and more layers are added and hardened, the figure can stand on its own without the support of the then hidden and forgotten skeleton upon which it was built.

That's what has happened to the skeleton that our founding fathers created for us. It's not only forgotten and ignored, but is deliberately violated without a single thought by the traitors in the Congress, the Courts, and the White House, -whether they be affiliated with the Democrat Party or the Republican Party. Their treason is nothing unusual. It's just more of the same that's been business-as-usual for a century.

To them, government is not the problem, it's the solution to problems. But those so-called solutions come at a very high price, -the loss of individual freedom (along with the fiscal solvency of present and future generations).

The biggest example of that is the Senate Health Care Act which the House deemed to have passed, and which the President signed into law in diametric opposition to the constitutional rights with which we are all born, -rights which can only rightfully be abandoned by the members of each individual State, since Congress possesses no authority to regulate such rights into oblivion.

But the traitors to the Constitution did not start their "what's best for the country" crusade with the health care act. It was essentially the culmination of a century of attempts to kick the Constitution aside, nearly all of them successful.

Now they've gone too far, but the traitors on the Supreme Court may once again violate their solemn oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and deem it to be within the authority of Congress to pass such a monstrosity. The future of our nation is in the balance, and it may be determined by just one man who holds all of our fates in his hands.

[Update: On June 28, 2012, America as we know it ended when Chief Judas Roberts ruled with the socialists on the bench, failing to strike down the individual mandate to involuntarily enter into a health insurance contract or be penalized ("taxed"), in violating of the boundary between state's rights and federal authority, between individual liberty and federal authority, and between the actual meaning of words and a capricious, arbitrary bastardized meaning.]

But just as that act was openly and notoriously in violation of the Constitution, a similar case of treason happened right under everyone's noses and few were willing or able to even recognize or acknowledge it. It took place in November of 2008 when those who knew something was horribly wrong allowed it to happen anyway because it involved the election of the first man of color to the office of President.

The fact that was ignored was that he was constitutionally ineligible to hold that office because his form of citizenship was expressly barred by the Constitution's prohibition that: "No person except a natural born citizen...shall be eligible to the office of the President,".

When that was written, the oldest natural born United States citizen was only 11 years old, -having been born in July of 1776. To resolve that problem they allowed one other exception to the prohibition that "No person shall be eligible..."; they also allowed "a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution," to serve as President.

The founding fathers were not born as citizens of the United States since it didn't exist when they were born, but they wrote the provision with the future in mind and placed all the generations of the future first in the order of the wording. And of the generations to come they required that a presidential candidate not only be born as a citizen, but that he be born as a natural citizen, -as opposed to only born as a legal citizen.

That meant that he must be born to an American father and obtain his citizenship organically, -not legally. Those who obtained their citizenship “at birth” were those born under the laws of certain sovereign States of the Union. Those laws were written to provide citizenship to children of immigrants who otherwise would have been born with only the citizenship of their foreign father. (Such an allowance existed in some states, but not in others.)

In other States the basis of citizenship was the opposite, -it wasn’t based on being born under the principle that birth location was everything, -that every person born within the King's domain belonged to him (**jus soli** -*the law of soil*), but instead was based on the unalienable right to belong to one’s own parents and inherit their place in the world as organic citizens by birth, by blood connection, (**jus sanguinis** -*the law of blood*).

Jus soli, instituted by the crown, was a policy justified as a derivative of **the Divine Right of Kings**, and adopted by the constitutions of certain colonies, whereas jus sanguinis was adopted by other colonies and was affirmative of the unalienable right of all parents to be the owners of their own children, -and not the King, and to pass to them their membership in the society to which they belonged. The resulting situation, on the continental level, was one of conflicting principles. That conflict has never been addressed by any Supreme Court ruling, and so it still exists to this day, but not in any clear way. Rather, it's in a confused and conflicting way tied to one important subject, and that is the presidency and the constitutionality of the election of Barack Obama.

His election has thrown the old dichotomy into focus once again, with his supporters arguing that "*native*-born" is the real meaning of "*natural* born" and that *jus soli* was the law of the land under common law when the Constitution was written.

Their arguments and facts are convincing when one only takes into account the words of particular members of particular States and the colonial law of such States, but they didn't in fact apply on the national level.

On the national level, the law of England and its King did not hold sway because the new government created by the design of the Constitution was not based on the monarchy-supporting laws of the

King's colonies in America, (-which lacked the rights of Englishmen since America wasn't a part of the nation of England) but it was based on principles derived from **natural law**, and as the Declaration of Independence put it; "the Laws of Nature and Nature's God". Those laws included certain unalienable rights which were totally in opposition to the supreme authority of the King as "God's representative on earth".

One of those unalienable rights was *the right of membership* based on **natural inheritance**, and springs from the membership of the parents. Based on that right, the children of a father inherited the same membership as the father. They belonged to his group (tribe/nation) by birth. That was the view of the founding fathers and that was the policy of the federal government for over 100 years.

One proof of that fact is found in something written by **Plubius**. That was the anonymous name under which Alexander Hamilton, Jon Jay (-leader of the Continental Congress and first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court), and James Madison (-"father of the Constitution" and U.S. President) wrote **the Federalist Papers**. Since Hamilton was no longer alive when the following quote was made, that only leaves the other two as possible authors. John Jay was in retirement, but Madison was President at the time the article was written, and it discusses the official position of his administration denying U.S. citizenship based upon simple birth in the country.

In the October 10, **1811** edition of newspaper *The Alexandria Herald* Publius wrote the following:

~ Mr. Rodman hints, that it would have been sufficient for James McClure to have been born in the United States. He is mistaken. The law of the United States recognizes no such claim. The law of Virginia of 1792 does, -for all free persons born within the territory of this commonwealth" is deemed a citizen. The law of Virginia considers him as a son of the soil. An alien, as well as a citizen, may beget a citizen, -but the United States act does not go so far. A man must be naturalized to make his children such.

[The act referred to was the Naturalization Act of 1802. *] The official position of the Madison administration was that persons born in the U.S. to alien parents were not U.S. Citizens.

This was the ruling concerning James McClure, despite the fact that his parents had been settled in the country for many years prior to his birth. This was the official decision despite McClure having been born in South Carolina in 1785 to a father who was naturalized months later in 1786. PUBLIUS makes clear that McClure was not a (native-born) citizen by virtue of his native birth in South Carolina.

There was no statute in South Carolina in 1785 which granted citizenship to persons born there similar to Virginia's statute mentioned in the article by Publius. Simply being a "son of the soil" was not enough, and this evidence repudiates the contention that the British common law had been adapted in all of the states after the revolution. Since there was no statute in place making those born in South Carolina citizens, McClure was not held to be a native-born South Carolina citizen. That argument [that he was a citizen at birth] was utterly rejected throughout the affair.

"The article makes clear that Madison's administration steadfastly denied that simple birth in the United States was enough to establish citizenship. This, of course, discredits the conclusions of Justice Horace Gray in **U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark**, [the case which established the "official" meaning of the citizenship clause of the 14th Amendment. Unfortunately, the court's opinion was then erroneously misinterpreted in the opinion explaining that opinion which was written by the Attorney General and made the "official" law (i.e., policy) of the land.

The court misconstrued the original meaning and intent of the amendment, and then the A.G. misconstrued their error even further.] as well as the infamous New York Chancery opinion of **Lynch v. Clark.** Both cases contain erroneous assumptions that the British common law rule of jus soli governed citizenship from the very genesis of the United States." *

It has been erroneously asserted that the reference to common law made in the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of **Minor v Happersett** (1875) establishes proof that English common law and the principle of jus soli supported by it was the law of the land from colonial times through to the establishment of the United States, but the words written in regard to common law are completely ambiguous regarding the fundamental principle that's the source of citizenship.

The court's opinion included the following; "At common-law, with the nomenclature of which the framers of the Constitution were familiar, it was never doubted that all children born in a country of parents who were its citizens became themselves, upon their birth, citizens also. These were natives, or natural-born citizens, as distinguished from aliens or foreigners."

The Chief Justice stated a fact that was never doubted but failed to elucidate which of the two facts involved in his natural law statement * were the actual determinants of citizenship. Was it birth within the country or birth to citizens? Birth location or parentage? Soil or blood? The right of Kings or the right of free men? He didn't bother to even broach the subject.

* [drawn from "**The Law of Nations -Principles of Natural Law**" by Emmerich de Vattel -1758]

But a thorough contemplation of the situation of the young country concludes with the realization that there was no such thing as a national common law, since all the colonies were separate nation-states unto themselves, -with their own governments and constitutions, and therefore no common law principle was governing them all as one uniform common law. Consequently, there was no such thing as a colonial, continental, national common law rule of jus soli-based national membership.

All citizenship questions were State government matters. The States were the entities that determined immigration and naturalization policy in their own territory. Being a United States citizen was a larger, abstract concept which had no bearing on the lives of most normal people since they weren't traveling abroad or engaging in inter-state or international commerce, or serving in the Army or Navy or Marines. As long as the nation wasn't at war, its national government was pretty much unseen and unheard, -invisible.

The federal policy was that children born to immigrants were foreigners since they were born to foreigners. To obtain U.S. citizenship the foreigner had to become an American via naturalization. If he refused to renounce his former allegiance to his home country by completing the naturalization process and taking the **Oath of Allegiance & Renunciation**, then he and his children would remain as foreigners, -devoid of membership in the political society of the United States.

That changed following the ratification of the 14th Amendment in 1868 and the Supreme Court ruling on its meaning in 1898 (Wong Kim Ark). After that, those born in the United States, and subject at birth to its jurisdiction (via birth to an immigrant father who was subject) were deemed to be citizens. But in time, the meaning of "jurisdiction"

became ignorantly perverted to refer to the jurisdiction of municipal, civil and criminal law, instead of its true meaning, which is the national political authority of the federal government.

Citizens and immigrants are subject to Washington's will, but foreigners (diplomats, visitors, tourists, students, etc.) who are not immigrants are *not* subject because they remain subject to the authority of their own nation. That means that non-citizen immigrants can be drafted for defense of the nation, while non-immigrant foreigners cannot.

That national form of jurisdiction came with an added complication, and it was related to women. Since they were viewed as subject to their husband or father, unless they were a divorcee, widow, or spinster, and they could not vote, serve in the law or government as elected or appointed officers, and could not be drafted into nor enlist in the military (unless nurses were an exception), it therefore could be argued that a child born out of wedlock to a foreign immigrant woman would not be granted U.S. citizenship because the parent was not an American father, and therefore not subject to the full responsibility of national membership which federal jurisdiction included.

Barry Obama, while not born to a foreign unwed mother, was born to a father who was a foreign national . He was not an immigrant, and therefore was not subject to the political jurisdiction of Washington. He could not be drafted unless it was by Great Britain or Kenya, which retained jurisdiction over him while he was attending college in the U.S.

Barry Obama, through his Kenyan, non-immigrant father, never fell under the jurisdiction of the federal government as envisioned by the 14th Amendment and therefore citizenship via birth in the U.S. was not granted to him by it.

But in time, U.S. law caught-up with changing U.S. social views towards women, and after they were granted the right to vote, the naturalization law eventually allowed their U.S. citizenship to be inherited by their children if they were fathered by "non-immigrant aliens".

That is the type of citizenship that Barry Obama was born with, -citizenship via modern era naturalization law. This author has been unable to find any mention of that form of citizenship via naturalization law, but not everything written has been put on the internet, or located on the internet.

[since writing that it has become evident that no such law exists, -was never written because of the erroneous belief that all U.S. births are covered by the language of the 14th Amendment, even though some are not.]

All that appears in the code on U.S. Citizenship is the simple statement of the 14th Amendment: "All persons born in the United States, and subject to its jurisdiction, are citizens of the United States" but no explanation is given as to what the legal meaning is to the terms "All persons", nor "jurisdiction". Does "all persons" now include females even though they can't be drafted and therefore aren't fully subject to federal jurisdiction and the national responsibilities of men? It has become evident that the authors of the citizenship section of the amendment had no clear understanding of the meaning of the term "jurisdiction" since they lived in a bubble of elite privilege.

The answer is that the answer is whatever the administration in power chooses it to mean. It's all fog and ambiguity and therefore is totally malleable to the will of those who control the administration of naturalization law. It could be completely changed overnight by an administration that views only citizens and legal immigrants as being subject to the will of Washington. That change would be viewed as a political position, rather than what it

actually would be, -which is an accurate legal position.

To understand the magnitude of the insanity of the present position of the federal government, one needs to resort to an extreme hypothetical case. It involves three pregnant women who are a couple weeks shy of nine months. They're pregnant with twins. One is a Canadian, one an American, and one a Mexican national. They're flying in three planes from Canada to Mexico City. Once in the air, and still within Canadian airspace, the American and Mexican women prematurely deliver one twin each. Flying on and into U.S. airspace, the Mexican woman delivers her second twin, and the Canadian woman her first. Finally, while within Mexican airspace the American woman and the Canadian woman deliver their second twin. What determines the nationality of their children? Blood? -or soil?

Did the Canadian woman give birth to American and Mexican children since they were born within the territorial jurisdiction of those nations? Did the American woman give birth to Canadian and Mexican children since they were born within the territorial jurisdiction of those nations? Did the Mexican woman give birth to American and Canadian children since they were born within the territorial jurisdiction of those nations? Or is the nationality of the children simply inherited from the parents?

Which one makes sense and which one makes no sense? The answer is simple, but the complications are great. Why? Because of the issue of official identification. It's entirely ascertained via the only method that is practical, and that's via examination of a certified copy of a hospital birth record. Without that record, how does one "prove" their nationality? That record names the parents and their nation, but is the nationality of their child determined by that of the parents or by the borders within which one was born?

Since serious philosophical questions of principle are involved, (requiring serious contemplation and knowledge of history and the roots of membership and civilization) the easy way to resolve the conundrum was resorted to.

It didn't require any thinking or knowledge of such things. All it needed was to know the birth location of a child and from it one could tell if they were or were not born within the country. From there it's just one very short step to the determination that one was a citizen or not based merely on location of their birth, -in complete disregard of the nationality of the parents to whom one was born, -to whom one belongs.

It's that type of thinking that assumes that the place where Obama was born determines his citizenship. But even if jus soli citizenship applied to anyone born to any type of foreigner, whether immigrant or tourist, what remains unfixed for Obama is the fact that no foreign father can father a natural born citizen of a country other than his own. A Kenyan father cannot beget a natural citizen of the United States because he does not belong to the United States and has no membership in its society.

By the same principle, no American mother can deliver a child that is a natural citizen of a foreign country such as Kenya. That requires a Kenyan mother and a Kenyan father.

Just ask John McCain about the principle by which the U.S. Senate resolved that he was born as a natural born citizen of the United States even though born in Panama.

There are many people who are aware of the travesty that's been committed against the Constitution by the failure of the U.S. Senate to disqualify Obama, -as is their constitutional responsibility, but there's far more who are totally ignorant. You can't fix the constitutional treason of those who knew

and did nothing, or knew the truth and were determined to keep it buried, but it seems also that you can't fix the ignorance of those who don't realize the truth and don't want to accept it or even think about it.

Among the ignorati is one Bill O'Reilly. He's a former teacher, he's an academic of sorts, and writes history books, yet he stubbornly holds to the discredited belief that Obama must have been born in Hawaii (because Presidents don't lie and forge identity papers?) but making matters far worse is that he drinks the Kool-Aid that he's made famous by swallowing the assumption that that alone qualifies a citizen to be President.

Who knows when the government began serving that Kool-Aid, -when it chose to bastardize the real meaning of jurisdiction into something so common that even foreign ambassadors are subject to it (though immune from the consequences of violating it.) Also unknown is the why. Was it done deliberately while fully aware of the truth, or was it due to the ignorance of an age without knowledge of the past?

Either way, conservative news anchors, Congressmen, Senators, judges, and governors falsely assume that their uninformed simplistic view, -which also infects the minds of the American people, is definitely the principle governing presidential eligibility. It's like a "group think" has taken hold, -a mind-set that presumes; "Born in the USA? -then you can go all the way! Even to the White House!" But that is not what the words of the Constitution mean.

What they mean is that no one who is born in any state of the union to an Englishmen, an aristocrat, a nobleman, a die-hard defender of the monarchy, -begotten by a foreigner, fathered by an immigrant, sired by an alien visitor or diplomat can serve as the Commander in Chief of the United States military and nuclear forces.

The position of the President & Commander-in-Chief was the one and only office in the United States government placed off-limits to everyone who was not 100% American, -who was not a "natural born citizen" of the United States. A dual-citizen half-American could become Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, -even a naturalized foreigner, but no such citizen could sit as the Chief commander of the Armies and Navy and state militias of the nation.

Yet that which was expressly forbidden was allowed to transpire, and now we're governed by a clique of silent traitors to the Constitution. The question is: "would the remedy for the travesty be like a kind of medicine that's worse than the disease?" No one knows and no one can know. We only know that we've been had, -and the odds of anything being done about it are slim to none.

by a.r. nash april/oct. 2012
http://obama--nation.com

* Leo Donofrio, Esq.
https://naturalborncitizen.wordpress.com/2011/12/28/the-publius-enigma-newly-revealed-evidence-establishes-that-president-james-madisons-administration-required-citizen-parentage-to-qualify-native-born-persons-for-u-s-citizenship/