

Official State Error & a non-citizen President versus TRUTH, History & U.S. LAW

"Unknown" wrote: Blacks Law Dictionary, the preeminent reference on American legal terms, has for decades defined natural-born citizens as those born in the jurisdiction of a national government. The sixth edition goes farther; "Natural born citizen: Persons who are born within the jurisdiction of a national government, i.e. in its territorial limits, or those born of citizens temporarily residing abroad."

People make mistakes. Experts make mistakes. Lawyers and judges make mistakes. Presidents make mistakes. Doctors make mistakes. Surgeons remove the wrong kidney, or operate on the wrong side of the brain because they, like their understanding, are fallible. The Black's Law Dictionary "expert" was fallible and he, like Congress, like the Supreme Court, like Columbus, like Einstein, like theorists in every branch of science, were capable of error and being intellectually imprecise.

The description of "a natural born citizen" in the Law Dictionary was the result of only one thing; the incorrect conflation of those words with the words "a natural born subject". It was made in error because the author failed to grasp the distinguishing principle of natural citizenship and subjecthood, -the one needed for an understanding that would produce a precise and accurate meaning.

It's all too easy and natural for humans to unknowingly use ambiguous or imprecise language in everyday speech, and that tendency carries over into how one might write, -especially when writing in great volume. I once read that Greek has about a half dozen words for "love". while two-fingered English only has one. That is an example of lack of precision of meaning. That deficiency results in ambiguity. Ambiguity results in one mentally picking a meaning in a process akin to that of the toss of a coin, -or in the case of the word "love", several coins.

If a word or phrase has two meanings, then odds may be 50-50 that the listener or reader will make

an incorrect presumption as to what was meant. It would be a great travesty if a battle field message was sent to headquarters but it was ambiguous and the response was the incorrect one because its interpretation was the incorrect one. Battles, wars, and kingdoms could be lost due to simple everyday ambiguity.

The ambiguity at the heart of the citizenship issue is found in references to children, -of foreign fathers, born in England. No doubt, instances of discrimination had appeared against them when it came to rights or privileges, and so authorities had to defend them against such discrimination. As a result, authorities ruled that their national and social standing was identical to that of natural born subjects, and so they would have ruled and written that alien-born subjects are indistinguishable from natural born subjects, or shall be considered as though they are the same.

With the full weight of the crown and the government behind such judicial opinions, and magisterial edits, or parliamentary mandates, one would hence be viewed as farting in the face of the national policy if one pointedly and prejudicially made utterances about the difference between the two. And so it became accepted that the children of those foreigners made subject to the Crown by its own authority based on them living in the King's domain, were to be considered as being the King's natural born subjects also...(even though they technically weren't).

Warping the language alters perceptions, -as was ably demonstrated by the Nazis and the Soviets, as also in writings such as Animal Farm and 1984.

If the authorities call alien-born subjects natural born subjects then the foreign alienage of the father will be ignored and not imputed to his children. That was the goal and it was legally effective, but not socially effective. I read somewhere that in America, even after an immigrant naturalized, the natural natives of the colonies and states still re-

ferred to such a person as a foreigner because they were born and raised as such.

The children of foreigners (unnaturalized) were *never* referred to as natural subjects or natural citizens in any colony or state. Only in the rare colonies/states like Virginia, which granted subjecthood or citizenship to native-born "sons of the soil" (children of immigrants) were they even considered to be "born subjects" or "born citizens". None of the other colonies / states, nor the central government ever considered them to be fellow natives, -fellow blood-relatives (in a nationalistic sense), -fellow natural members of their state nor the American nation as an aggregate.

They were foreigner-born, -alien-born, -subjects of their father's homeland unless and until he became an American.

If he was unwilling to do so, then his children deserved no accommodation regarding the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of the male adult Caucasian freemen of America. His children would thus remain as domestic subjects of the state and central governments until, as adults, they themselves naturalized to become Americans.

They, thereby, were expected and required to swear before Almighty God that they renounced any and all allegiance to any foreign power, and would support and defend their "adopted" native-land, both state & nation, (by bearing arms if need be) as well as their laws and constitutions. If they were unwilling to take the oath, then they indeed were foreigners at heart and undeserving of the title and position of "citizen".

Recall what I wrote regarding experts and imprecise language which results in ambiguity. The Black's Law Dictionary definition is a glaring example of such flawed origin. Where is the flaw you ask? It is very subtle and hidden and easily overlooked, and that has resulted in an institutionalized error adopted by all those who are unaware of it. It's all connected to the wording of the 14th

Amendment citizenship clause, which reads: "All persons born in the United States, or naturalize, are citizens of thereof." If that is how it actually reads, then there would be no ambiguity. But I left out the second requirement for citizenship. It actually reads: "All persons born in the United States, or naturalize, *and subject* to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the state wherein they reside."

The flaw in Black's definition is in the use of the word "within" (the jurisdiction)". That word resulted in the greatest of errors possible. How? By conflating two different meanings of "jurisdiction". It can refer to a specific area but it can also mean authority. One can't be subject to an area, (a physical jurisdiction) nor can an area exercise jurisdiction (political authority). It is confusing but accurate to state that the government can exercise its jurisdiction within its jurisdiction. Clearly, the word has two different meanings, and as with the flip of a coin, the defining authority in 1898 choose the wrong one.

Consider the use of the words "reed" and "read", and also the words "red" and "read" (past tense). Those are four distinctly different words and yet when reading the two different versions of "read" one may read the word incorrectly and then be momentarily confused because of mentally pronouncing it incorrectly. A similar situation results when hearing the words and being asked to define "reed" or "red". One can't know that the words meaning "read" are not intended because of the ambiguous pronunciation. Only by using precise explanation can one distinguish the difference between two or more ambiguous possibilities. The logical error to be avoided, but unfortunately easily made, is the equivalent of conflating "reed" with "red" based on the similarity of "read" with "read" (past tense).

A legal error of that sort occurred related to "jurisdiction" due to failing to comprehend that citizenship is not connected to the meaning related to area but to the meaning related to authority.

The correct language to use to avoid the ambiguity is "*subject* to the jurisdiction", *not* "within the jurisdiction". Figure this out: "It is within the authority of authorities to make subjects of all born within the jurisdiction of the authority if their fathers are subject to the jurisdiction in authority within the area of jurisdiction."

Yeah, you might say that the term "jurisdiction" is rife with possibilities for confusion and error of interpretation. And error prevailed when it came to defining it as used in the 14th Amendment, which uses both meanings within the same paragraph. It first refers to authority, mentioning those born "subject to the jurisdiction" but later refers to area, mentioning being within state jurisdiction (state borders).

The erroneous conflation occurred in the minds of those who failed to distinguish the difference between area and authority. Hence the assumption that those "born within the jurisdiction" is equivalent to those "born subject to the jurisdiction", when in fact they are very much unrelated.

Native Americans were born within the jurisdiction but not subject to the jurisdiction, (as were Gypsies and slaves, and probably the French) but such persons had no connection to the duties and responsibilities of citizens, -the first and foremost of which is the requirement to help defend the nation. They had no stake in the American society that comprised the nation, and thus were not viewed as fellows in the responsible to be a part of national defense in time of emergency, -the most fundamental duty of citizens.

They were not "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States even though born "within the jurisdiction", except as is expected of all "subjects" living under the rule of moral and civil law.

Transient, visiting foreigners, and their pregnant wives and the children they might deliver within U.S. national borders, are not and have never been "subject to the jurisdiction" of the U.S. government even though they are "within the jurisdiction" of the government. They remain subject to the father's government because they are subject to him and he is subject to his own nation's authority.

That is the natural order of things and is how it has existed for thousands of years. Only the era of women's rights has altered that order, but it has not altered the past. It is still what it always was, but everyone fails to recognize what it was because the perception of reality has been distorted by the error of a presumption based on the incorrect definition derived from ambiguous concepts and language.

A coined was tossed into the air in the mind of Attorney General Griggs without him realizing it, and it came up tails. He choose the wrong possibility of the two that were before him because he was unaware of the other possibility. He choose the one that failed to distinguish between children of immigrants who are members of American society, and children of foreign transients who are not.

He choose the one that exalted the erroneous "within the jurisdiction" (related to civil law) instead of the correct one "subject to the jurisdiction" that had always been based on a man's national obligation to defend his homeland. Transient foreigners are not subject to that obligation nor the jurisdiction that stems from it.

What is the unimpeachable authority behind the Black's Dictionary author-definer's claim that those "persons who are born within the jurisdiction of a national government" are natural born citizens? There is none whatsoever.

He made an unfounded presumption based on the dishonest language adopted in Britain regarding its alien-born subjects. His mistake of adopting the English bastardization of language was compounded by the baseless presumption that it could be transmuted to directly apply to the American federal government and it's view regarding citizenship and its origin.

Just because Americans avoided calling children of immigrants "alien-born citizens" does not mean that they therefore are not precisely that. Just because we choose to call them "native-born citizens" as is still the practice of the CIS (formerly INS) today does not in any way make them indistinguishable from natural citizens.

It is sloppy and lazy thinking that fails to consider that just because nearly all natural citizens are born in the United States, that therefore all who are born in the U.S. must therefore be labelable as natural born citizens. The reality is that if a George Armstrong Custer Jr. entered this world on Sioux land, that would not make him Sioux, nor make him eligible to one day be the Chief of the Sioux nation.

Jus soli was never the policy of the central government, nor that of the most of the states, but the Black's Dictionary word-definer was so infused with the misunderstanding of the Wong opinion of the Supreme Court (1898), -a misunderstanding promulgated by Attorney General John Griggs in 1898 or '99 and universally adopted by the government ever since, that he simply assumed that the "common knowledge" origin of citizenship was correct, when in fact it is pure fiction.

The government, and "experts" such as Black's citizenship-definer, have been living in a fantasy ever since that erroneous interpretation of A.G. Griggs was disseminated. It is because of his error and it alone that Barack Obama is considered to possess U.S. citizenship. But there is nothing in the Constitution, nor any Congressional statute, nor any SCOTUS opinion that provides citizenship to native-born children of transient aliens. It exists solely are an aberration of law resulting from the Justice Department's erroneous policy, which is based on a misconstrued interpretation of the Supreme Court's misconstrued interpretation of the 14th Amendment.

That policy could, like Barack Obama's "recess appointments" to the NLRB, go down in utter dismissal by federal courts or by an honest Attorney General. Same with Obama's supposed American citizenship. He, like Hamdi the terrorist, was born of a transient foreigner and was never a legitimate citizen of the United States. His citizenship is supported solely by the powerful weight of the executive branch strongly enforcing erroneous precedence. It is his Achilles heal, and any reasonable

examination of the truth, like any reasonable examination of his Certificate of Live Birth, will reveal him to be a fraud and a criminal forger. The forgery was necessary not because he would be considered to not be a *natural* American if born abroad (as John McCain is considered), but because of the bastardized, erroneous and confusing view that by not being born in the U.S. he would not be a *native-born* citizen and therefore wouldn't be eligible to be President.

All "common knowledge" concepts about Obama's citizenship are wrong. His birth certificates are counterfeits. No one can demonstrate that he was born in Hawaii or anywhere else. All possible evidence is under lock & key or has been destroyed, and all witnesses to that campaign are either on his side and part of it or are silenced by fear. The facts regarding the cover-up are multitudinous but are hidden from and by the members of the government and press corps in order to preserve the status quo and individual's standing within it.

Furthermore:

His birth *outside* of the U.S. would not disqualify him nor any American from serving as President.

His birth *inside* the U.S. would *not* qualify him to serve as President.

His birth inside the U.S. does not qualify him to even be a U.S. citizen via actual U.S. law and court opinion.

If he had been born in Panama like John McCain, everyone would assume that he is ineligible to be President, yet all assume that John McCain was eligible, including the legal investigators for the Congressional Research Office. What's the difference? A father who not only was not an American, but was not even an immigrant. The consequence of that fact is that Obama was not born as an American citizen and has never become a naturalized citizen either.

America is Obama's home and country, but only because he has chosen to adopt it as such. And half

of it has adopted him as one of them. The other half have not because they see the ambiguity surrounding him. He, by provisional law, would or could be a citizen of the Islamic nation of Indonesia. He, by provisional law could have been a citizen of the nation of Kenya, not because he was born in either country but because he had fathers from both of them.

Just as Indonesia adopted Obama as a citizen through his step-father, so Obama adopted America as his country, a possibility solely because of 20th century law regarding his connection through his mother. But natural citizens have no such choice. They have no other alternate nationality that can replace or co-exist with their American political nature because it is the only nature that they have. They are Americans by nature, and don't have a choice to be so or not. Just as children of Jews or Arabs or Chinese are inescapably the same as their parents.

Natural citizenship is citizenship without any choice involved, whereas every other form of citizenship involves choice and/ or law; -choice by parents, choice upon adulthood, or force of law regarding persons born to a father from a foreign nation, with the exception of someone like Obama. He isn't covered by nature nor law since no American law exists which provides him citizenship if he was born in the U.S. with a non-immigrant foreign father.

He would have had to have been born outside of the U.S. to have obtained U.S. citizenship through his mother. So his supposed citizenship is not the result of natural inheritance, Congressional statute, constitutional amendment, Supreme Court opinion, nor international treaty. It's a vague, intangible, revocable thing that is, like petrified rock or pearl, a solid "legal" accretion based on a century old erroneous opinion regarding an erroneous opinion rendered by the personal will of six Supreme Court justices who choose to ignore all of the court precedence that preceded them, -and not based on legal, state nor national common law and tradition.

So if you want to say that Obama is an American citizen, you'd be right if referring to the stupid official Policy of the United State government for over a century.

And if you want to say that he is *not* an American citizen, you'd also be right if referring to the actual Law of the United State government.

But if you want to say that he is constitutionally eligible to be the Commander-in-Chief of all of the federal, and military forces, and all of the nuclear bombs of the United States, and the office of the President as well, well....you'd be wrong.

He is not eligible. He was born ineligible. He is President by fraud and treason against the Constitution. His oath of allegiance to the Constitution was a total farce since by taking it he was breaking it.

He is the greatest fraud in American history regardless of whether or not the powers-that-be are willing to acknowledge that fact. They can't be expected to because it would put their whole world in jeopardy.

Obama sits as the supreme lord of the realm, -the Emperor of the Land of Oz, impervious to almost everything, possessing citizenship that is legitimized by nothing but his own illegitimate and unconstitutional executive authority.

It can't be said to be legitimized by the Attorney General who is his brother-in-the-cause and beholden to him since if he declared the President to not be a true, legal American citizen, then he would also be rendering himself illegitimate by being the appointee of an unconstitutional President.

America, like Nazi Germany, has suffered a perfectly legal coup, -in both cases by ignoring their constitutions to legitimize ineligible leaders, -Hitler not being a natural born German as required by the German constitution, but a natural born Austrian, and in our case by Obama not being a constitutionally-required natural born citizen of any state, (nor of the federal government, nor any other nation).

The Democrat powers that accomplished his election are not the worst enemy that the founders feared because he owes no overt allegiance to any foreign power, (although he seems to place a high priority on the world-wide opinion of Muslims, possibly because he is still a closet Muslim - something that may have come about and been revived during his guided tour of Pakistan in 1980 by his well-off Muslim room-mate at Occidental College), -but that doesn't mean that the founders didn't fear exactly what Obama has pulled off.

Their fear was of a very possible form of disloyalty, -one fostered by someone, -and his party, that "only wants what's best for the country" (meaning what in his mind is fair and equitable from a warped philosophical historical perspective) and is willing to do anything to bring it about, including destroying the solvency of the future by limitless spending for "the General Welfare" (meaning those who will be inspired to vote for him and his party) and endless regulation based on no constitutional authority whatsoever, and in clear violation of the 9th & 10th Amendments.

Just imagine the magnitude of fear across the land in the early 19th century regarding the untrustworthy tendency of those with ultimate power using it illegitimately. That fear inspired the powerful impetus behind the authoring and ratification of the 9th and 10th Amendments.

IX. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others **retained** by the People.

X. 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.

That fear was regarding the very kind of over-reaching, all-powerful central government that Obama and his ilk are determined to force on all of the states if possible, and all of the citizens of a once free, lawful, and courageous land. That

land now exists as only a shadow of its former self, having become the nightmare reality of one of the founder's worst fears.

How dare I risk "exposing" such things? -because I live far from any population center, and the federal government is merely an abstraction to me. Similarly, Obama's citizenship is also an abstraction based on nothing but entrenched institutionalized error. The only thing semi-solid about it is the fact that it depends entirely on his own presidential authority and nothing else. But Hell would freeze over before he would use his authority to declare the fact that national policy and citizens' assumptions are based on error, and that he, in fact, is not an American citizen due to the devil in the details of American law and jurisprudence.

by a.r. nash February 2013 obama--nation.com