

## When Brilliant Minds Are Morons

Thomas Brown February 13, 2012 asked a staunch Obamunist to compare himself to the prominent lawyers who've broadcast the fact of Obama's constitutional ineligibility to be President:

"Georgetown, you are the lawyer, not me. Leo Donofrio has a bio, laughable by many here, but its a bio, Mario has a bio, Van has a bio, Mark has a bio. What do you have? a blog degree? What? -you never gave your name in law school?"

Reply by the erudite Obamunist alpha-male:

"Listen up, Tubeworm: FACTS ARE NOT A POPULARITY CONTEST. Have you even studied the Informal Fallacies? I thought not. That would be an Ad Populum fallacy: "Dozens of people (lawyers) believe this, therefore it must be true." Not necessarily. "My lawyer is bigger and better than your lawyer"? That would be an Ad Verecundiam fallacy, or appeal to Authority. It means nothing to the proposition.

One day Albert Einstein was asked 'Are you aware that hundreds of other physicists dispute your theory?' His response: 'One.' In other words, if just ONE theorist can show an iron-clad PROOF that he is wrong, he is wrong. It isn't a popularity contest.

What are you wrong about? The fictional two-citizen-parent requirement being the current interpretation of Constitutional Law. It has been proven without question that the current status is Born On Soil = NBC ["natural born citizen"] = Eligible to Run for President, and every court will find it so, because it is."

my response: That is one of the most brilliantly deceptive statements ever written. He boldly takes the podium to refute an assertion that wasn't even made by anyone. The two-citizen parent requirement for natural citizenship is asserted by

"birthers" as being a constitutional fact, but he flips the subject from one of fact-or-error to "*the current interpretation*", -but that has never been a subject of dispute. Everyone knows that legal idiots hold a "*current interpretation*" that's a bastardization of the facts that are logically indisputable, but he can't dispute the truth so he attacks the fact that people don't accept the erroneous status quo view.

"...*proven without question that the current status...*" What? How can something that is "proven without question" be so vehemently questioned? It can only be if it has NOT been proven at all. Where is his brilliant logic in that statement?

As for a legal consensus view, there is no "*current status*" legal definition of NBC or there would be no controversy to discuss. The Supreme Court has never ruled, so all lower level authorities' opinions are not authoritative. The Fat Lady has never sung. Since no ruling has been handed down, all opinions are un-authoritative, but even when the constitutional traitors on the supreme court rule, there's a one-in-two chance that their ruling will be tails instead of heads, i.e., Wrong instead of Right. But whatever opinion they might one day offer (perhaps by a 5-4 split), -OPINIONS DON'T CHANGE THE FACTS! "FACTS ARE NOT A POPULARITY CONTEST"

"...*the current interpretation of Constitutional Law...*" Current *opinions* are like the wind, they change. Opinions in every field of human thought are never all correct and infallible. Many are erroneous, biased, flawed, and baseless. It matters not one bit what current opinions are, -anyone with a clear-thinking unbiased mind is immediately conscious of the fact that Born-On-Soil does *not*=NBC because of the true meaning of the words. No son of a foreigner is a natural member of a country foreign to his father (from whom he inherits citizenship). Soil has nothing to do with natural inheritance. One's birthright

natural citizenship is that which one inherits from their father as a right. There is no other definition of birthright.

Subjecthood/ citizenship has always historically been passed by patrilineal descent, -father to children, but some colonies/states bestowed citizenship on children of their un-naturalized immigrants. They were known as "sons of the soil" rather than sons of commonwealth subjects/ citizens (who comprised 98% +/- of the population). They [sons of foreigners] were not allowed to hold critical strategic offices in England or the colonies because they were born of foreigners with unknown motives and loyalty.

They are NvBCs, *Native-Born* Citizens but mere native birth did not make them identical to natural citizens. They would hold dual citizenship because they would also be a citizen of their father's native land, usually Britain, but Englishmen were aliens in the several states and to become a citizen of a state one would have to be naturalized into citizenship. They were certainly not barred from running for public office after a prescribed number of years of residence and naturalization, but following independence, it didn't follow that they were to be trusted for appointment as head of a state militia if their father never became a citizen of the colony in which they were born.

In other states that had no "son of the soil" citizenship, such citizens were viewed as aliens even though their foreign mother gave birth to them within the borders of the state. In the eyes of the state and federal government, foreign fathers produced foreign children who possessed no dual citizenship, -only foreign subjecthood and allegiance to a foreign king.

That reflected the same policy followed in England where there were classes of subjects known as *natural* subjects and *alien* subjects. Alien subjects were not bound for life to a bond of allegiance to the King. They could leave the country and return to their own homeland and

allegiance to its king, but natural subjects had no other homeland or nationality and so were Englishmen by nature, -not by mere legal tradition or court ruling or royal edict.

But at some point, the Crown, its judiciary, or Parliament decreed that England-born children of foreigners belonged to the King and were his subjects regardless of the parents not even being English immigrants, but being mere visitors to the King's island realm.

That egregious breach of the Law of Nations was the inflated product of the self-serving philosophical doctrine of The Divine Right of Kings which viewed anyone born within the King's dominion as belonging to him, (jus soli subjecthood ~law of the soil).

That doctrine was applied in the colonies as well and that is how the idea originated of one's nationality being determined by national borders and not natural (inherited) membership in the group into which there were born, (jus sanguinis, ~the law of blood).

In the eyes of the American federal government, natural citizenship was not acquired by any but the children of American parents. Foreign parents could *not* produce American children. Foreigners had to become Americans in order to give birth to Americans. If they did not become Americans then their children did not possess United States citizenship even if born on state or federal land.

One must realize the truth about citizenship in America from its inception. Americans possessed two citizenships, (as mentioned in the 14th Amendment). The first was their state citizenship, and the second was federal citizenship. It was and is possible to be a citizen of the United States, -but not a citizen of any particular state, by being born in the District of Columbia or federal territory. What isn't clear is whether or not it was also possible to be a state citizen but not a federal citizen.

Any State that granted its citizenship to children of un-naturalized foreigners thereby created a State citizen who was not a natural citizen of the

United States because the federal government did not recognize any citizenship as being natural other than that produced by birth to American parents. Such a citizen had all the rights and privileges of fellow citizens in the state in which he was born, as well as the nation, but not in regard to the presidency. The states had their citizens and the federal government had its, and there was no requirement that they be fully overlapping.

So, along with slaves, Africans, and Asians not being allowed to be federal citizens, alien-born State citizens lacked the protection of any federal law that required that they be recognized as U.S. citizens, -until, that is, the U.S. Supreme Court in 1898 altered the meaning and intent of the 1868 14th Amendment citizenship clause in the case of a U.S.-born son of Chinese immigrants named Wong Kim Ark.

[He had been deemed to be an alien by the federal government when he returned home to the U.S. after a second visit to China.]

Only then did the federal government have to change the policy followed from the founding of the nation 110 years earlier. Then even U.S. born children of Asian immigrants had to be accepted as U.S. citizens, although Chinese immigrants were not allowed to become U.S. citizens until the 1950's.

After that ruling, everything went to hell when the Attorney General accepted the court's 14th Amendment opinion, but was oblivious to the true meaning of the amendment's requirement that U.S. birth be accompanied by full subjection to the authority of Washington. Without that requirement attached to the ascribing of citizenship to children of aliens, the children of *all* aliens would be viewed as U.S. citizens even though their parents, (-their father) was never subject to the full authority of Washington because he was a mere visitor/guest temporarily in the country for pleasure, business, study, or work, and remained subject only to his own government.

The error that that Attorney General made was in not understanding the meaning of the jurisdic-

tion required. It was not civil jurisdiction, which every foreigner is subject to automatically, including foreign diplomats (who are immune from prosecution for violations), but was instead political & military jurisdiction. That authority includes the most fundamental requirement of members of a national society, namely national defense. Visiting outsiders are not subject to that responsibility and so any child born to them while sojourning in the United States does not fall under federal jurisdiction since it is under the jurisdiction of its parents, and they are subject to a foreign power.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

continuing;

"Now, the position that the NBC requirement ought to be stricter... -two citizen parents, -no dual citizenship, -no dark skin, -no funny names, whatever... YOU CANNOT BE WRONG ABOUT THAT. That is an opinion. You are welcome to try to change what NBC means for Article 2 purposes. It's a stupid idea in MY opinion, but at least it's not crazy. Have at it."

response: So his assertion is: "I HAVE THE FACTS AND YOU HAVE NOTHING, GIVE UP". His false characterization is that the subject now has become one regarding the *strictness* of the "natural born citizen" requirement when in fact that is not the case at all. It's not about the strictness of the requirement, it is solely about the **meaning** of the requirement.

Changing the focus is nothing more than a red herring to distract attention away from what the meaning actually is. "Don't examine that subject too closely!" -or else you will quickly discover the deliberate lying falsehood of his brain-dead unstated contention that the word *natural* in effect means nothing, -or else it means only *native*.

Understand this; Not every child born within U.S. borders is a "born citizen" because some are not legitimately citizens at all. Also, not every child born within U.S. borders who is truly a *native* "born citizen" is also a *natural* "born citizen" because some are not citizens by nature but

by law. They have no *natural right* to citizenship; (-they only have a *legal* right) because they are the off-spring of outsiders, foreigners, -who, like their parents, are citizens of a foreign nation and foreign government.

Natural citizens have no direct connection to any foreign government, -though they may have an indirect connection through their grandparents. Only the grandchildren of foreign immigrants are free of foreign alienage because they are born to American parents.

*continuing...*

"But arguing that's the way it is NOW, and the courts are wrong, is just plain batshit crazy. And no fallacy-ridden arguments, or out-of-context citations, or statements from long-dead Swiss political philosophers will make it so."

Truly nothing will "make it so". It is so because it actually *is* so. The courts are wrong because their concepts are ignorant and incorrect.

Throwing his own quotes back in his face; "Have you even studied the Informal Fallacies? I thought not. That would be an Ad Populum fallacy: 'Dozens of people (lawyers) believe this, therefore it must be true.' Not necessarily. 'My lawyer is bigger and better than your lawyer'? That would be an Ad Verecundiam fallacy, or appeal to Authority. It means nothing to the proposition."

He employs the Alyskeyite "*Rules For Radicals*" tactic of mocking-ridicule to silence any logical argument against his ingrained belief because he can't win the argument based on the facts, so the best way to try to win is by ending the argument on an authoritative, alpha-male, infallible preacher note. That may end the argument but it certainly doesn't win it.

continuing:

"And as to hiding behind internet handles: I post with my real name, I live in Baltimore, I have a degree in History; I am related to a Founder, so I am more than passingly familiar with Revolutionary and Federal history. I carry a copy of the Constitution with me everywhere."

response: He forgot to add his previous statement; "Ad Populum fallacy: 'Dozens of people (lawyers)/[historians] believe this, therefore it must be true.' " He could have added;

"Because of who I am, I therefore cannot possibly be in error about *anything*. I am an infallible authority because I know it all, my degree in History proves it! Don't you dare think to question the opinion of an expert such as myself. Everyone knows that experts are never wrong. Historians never disagree. Scientist never disagree. Researchers never disagree. Supreme Court Justices never disagree, including on fundamental things. Truly there is only one view that is correct and it is mine, so stop with the logic and facts because I am fully capable of spinning them to fit my own view."

concluding on a high note:

"I fear no Birther. In fact, I am **proud** to be defending the Constitution AGAINST attack by birthers. You got a problem with that? Bring it on. In fact, tell Orly where I live. I'm stocked up on Flying Monkey Repellent."

-in other words; "I'll huff and I'll puff and I'll blow your house down! I throw down the gauntlet, -who dares pick it up? Who dares question my sanity for declaring that I'm defending the Constitution even though it has absolutely nothing whatsoever to say about the meaning of natural born citizenship?"

concluding:

"Now go away, or I shall taunt you a second time." Aaaahhhh, such a satisfying little rant. It feels great to bloviate!

"Don't dare knock on my door again or I, Dracula, will open the door and once more sink my fangs into your neck."

Bluster and bravado. Witness the pride and arrogance of absolute certainty..."I may not be right but at least I'm certain" sums it up.]

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

the quoted post was located here:

<http://www.obamaconspiracy.org/2012/02/donofrios-dirty-little-secret/#comment-155081>