

FROM CORRUPTED LANGUAGE TO CORRUPTED GOVERNMENT

The History & Meaning of "Natural Born Citizen"

In a time long ago, like the time of King Arthur, all the native inhabitants of the kingdom were subject to the king's authority. They were thus known as his subjects. They were all natives of Britain. They were her natural inhabitants. Children born to them were new natural inhabitants and new natural subjects, but were indirect subjects since they were directly subject to their fathers until adulthood. Then they would be free from their father's authority and become directly subject to the king and his government, both local and national. They then owed the king that same obedience as all other adult males who were his subjects.

With the passing of time, foreigners migrated into the kingdom. They were labeled denizens. Denizens were foreigners who willingly submitted to the king's authority and that of Britain's governments, thus being subject to his authority like his native subjects. Since they were likewise subject to him, they also were subjects of a sort.

Some term was needed to distinguish his native subjects from his alien subjects, and the natural choice was "natural". The native subjects were the king's *natural* subjects because generation after generation they grew up to become subjects by the natural means of being born in subjection to his rule -born under the obligation of obedience that their father was under, and his father before him, all having being born of a father who was subject.

They inherited their subjection by inheriting their fathers status or national position, standing, or nationality, -being born as Englishmen and not as aliens. All English-men were subject to the king as well as all of their off-spring, -natural subjects all. Like father, like son. An apple of the same tree. Fathered by a subject, and fathering new subjects.

But the foreign immigrants also had children. What term would accurately describe them? Since they were born of aliens they were accurately described as

alien-born, -and since their fathers were the king's willing subjects, they inherited his standing or position in the realm as well, thus being subject like him and being describable as the king's subjects as well. Hence they were alien-born subjects. They were born into subjection to the royal authority by being born under it because their father choose to continue residing in the king's domain during the period of their birth. If he and his wife had left the kingdom before their child's birth, then the king's authority would not have extended over them and their child would not be born in subjection to him.

If the couple moved back to Britain some time after their child's birth, their child could not be claimed by the Crown to be one of its subjects for life, bound by an unbreakable bond of obedience such as the royals imposed on those born under the dominion of the Crown. Those subjects, those natural subjects, could not become Americans except by the exception allowed in the Peace Treaty of Paris which ended the Revolutionary War. They, in the eyes of the British government & Crown, had no unalienable right to renounce and reject all bonds of allegiance & obedience to their native land with which they were born.

But the term "alien-born subject" invited thoughts of xenophobia and discrimination that would have resulted from their foreignness and contrasting differences with Englishmen, -especially language, -and religion (Catholicism). So as their numbers grew it was beholden on the royal ruler to stick-up for his alien-born subjects since they were not second class in any way to his natural born subjects, and so the position of the government was made crystal clear that they were in every way the equals to and equivalent to natural subjects of Britain.

That didn't do the job. So a further attempt was needed. A new logic and equivalency principle was promoted to end discrimination and that was to start calling the children of immigrant fathers natural subjects also. By what logic? By the logic that they were naturally subject to him, being born within his domin-

ion and subject to no other sovereign. They were therefore born subject to his authority just like the children of his native subjects. They were born as subjects and they could therefore be called *natural* subjects because they naturally were subject because of where they were born and to whom they were born (a willing subject of the King, albeit not a permanent subject (an Englishman) but instead a foreign or denizen subject.)

Thus began the bastardization of the meaning of the words "natural born" in describing "subject". Change the language and you change the thinking. Change the thinking and you change the behavior. Like changing the position of a rudder.

Where is the proof that such a history is accurate? In the meaning of the words themselves, as well as the status assigned to all involved in the issue of nationality and royal rule. I carry a few gallons of apples that have dropped from my apple trees out to the woods behind my property, and scatter them on the ground. The next day they are all gone and somewhere in the area is a pile of bear poop. Who would tell me that I can draw no conclusions without having photographs proving what *really* happened to the apples? I thought so. Same with the conclusions as to the history of what happened to the words used to describe the subjects of the king of England. Some conclusions are inescapable and obvious from the writings of ages past.

Our founding fathers were well aware of that bastardization and that is why the future Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Jay, when writing to George Washington (president of the Constitutional Convention) urged him to avoid allowing the power of the Commander-in-Chief from being held by any man who was not a "natural born citizen", underlining the word born. What did that indicate? It indicated that he was not adopting the equivalent of the bastardized British legal "term of art" known as "a natural born *subject*" because it had been bleached of the actual meaning of the words.

Rather, he was giving the words their actual meaning and by emphasis that fact is unmistakable. He was saying that the President and Commander-in-Chief

should be not just a natural citizen since that term had also been bastardized by the American fundamental philosophy that all citizens are equals. [None stand above their fellows as nobles and Royals and aristocrats do] That philosophy was **the doctrine of citizenship equivalency**, and by it all citizens are viewed as being of the same caliber as natural citizens.

Once an immigrant had renounced his prior Lord and King and the authority of his government, then and only then could he become an American, -becoming a new *natural* American equivalent by being "natural-ized".

There was no naturalization under a king because he owned the entire kingdom and you would be subject to his authority or you would be an outlaw. Being his subject was not a willful choice. It was automatic via one's compliance with the laws and policies of the government.

But in America, no king owned any kingdom. A foreigner who settled in America was still a foreigner unless he took the positive steps needed to become an American, and that in the end involved taking **the Oath of Allegiance and Renunciation**. He thereby was baptized into a *new citizenship*. Leaving behind his old subjectship with which we was born and being buried as by the water of symbolic baptism to his old nationality and raised as in baptismal resurrection as a new being, a new citizen, a new American. He then was a new natural American citizen, equal to all others.

So if John Jay had merely urged that the President be a natural citizen, then that would have been ambiguous since it would have included those who were naturalized as well. That would not have been a risk worth taking since the stakes were too high. So he urged that he be one *born* as a citizen also.

But that also came with a kind of bastardization of meaning because some of the States (four, I've read) allowed children of immigrants to be accepted, adopted, naturalized from birth as citizens of their State. They thus were "born as citizens" or "born citizens", but that appellation did not indicate whether they were born of aliens or born of Americans, -or both -(in the case of a foreign father and an American mother).

So the term "born citizen" also needed to be modified to indicate that the President's father must have been an American when he was born, hence the need to urge that he be an *actual* natural citizen *and* an American born citizen as well. How would one express that in words? In the briefest and most succinct term? The only good choice was the one that he made when he wrote that the President should not be any who was not a "*natural born* citizen" (italics added for emphasis which handwriting is incapable of).

Washington and the convention accepted the wisdom of that advice and wrote it into the Constitution where it has remained ever since. By that narrow exclusion, sons of foreign nobles, royals, aristocrats, bankers, politicians, generals, and etc. could not get their greedy power-seeking hands on the reins of the United States military by being eligible to serve a President merely due to the location of their mother when they exited the womb. So none of such power-envying foreigners who were born in America or whose wives gave birth in America would be able to (or have a son who one day could) control the United States Army and Navy and Marines by being elected as President.

Some foolishly think of that exclusion as a big carve-out that excluded a whole lot of people. Well the numbers were one thing but the percentages were another. The percentage of the children born in America to foreigners was between 2 and 3% in most times. Their exclusion percentage-wise was insignificant, since about 97% of American sons would be eligible to serve. Considering what was at stake, who would presumptuously assert that the framers of the Constitution, and its President George Washington made a big mistake that was just plain unfair?

Which comes first and has the highest priority: "fairness" or national survival? We were almost conquered in the War of 1812, but our sovereignty could have also been lost by a closet loyal royal-sycophant being elected President and re-aligning the country under British or other royal-family authority. Or attempting to do so. Treason was not something that the founders were unfamiliar with since they received a huge example of it in the betrayal of what

seemed like a totally loyal and heroic American general; Benedict Arnold.

“A nation can survive its fools, and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and carries his banner openly. But the traitor moves amongst those within the gate freely, his sly whispers rustling through all the alleys, heard in the very halls of government itself. For the traitor appears not a traitor; he speaks in accents familiar to his victims, and he wears their face and their arguments, he appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soul of a nation, he works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of the city, he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to fear. The traitor is the plague.”
Marcus Tullius Cicero

To prevent such a traitor from gaining power in the United States all that was needed was a simple requirement that he who wields that power be born and raised by an American father; -an educated, patriotic, independent, self-reliant, morally upright, liberty-loving father who was an American. That way his son would grow up to be like him and could be trusted with the awesome power of the Commander-in-Chief since he neither would, nor could, hold any secret loyalty to any other nation or government.

By electing only natural born citizens, America would be safe, as she was until the election of a closet traitor to the Constitution who currently goes by the name "barack obama". If he so willingly stabs the Constitution in the back at his preference and convenience, who knows just how reluctant he is to trample on it altogether. After all, he signed treasonous legislation that gives the military the power to indefinitely detain, (imprison) American citizens without charges, without a trial or a lawyer or the right of Habeas Corpus. How much more un-American and anti-Constitution could such a person be? It's like we've suffered a coup d'etat, - not by the military but by Statist oligarchs who treat the Constitution and our unalienable rights like bird cage paper.

The United States Constitution is now, as was proven by the anti-liberty health care monstrosity and subse-

quent ruling by the traitors on the Supreme Court, barely a speed bump on their march to ever-greater and unlimited federal power, -a speed bump composed of the bodies of all of the brave Americans who have died in the cause of obtaining and securing the liberty of the American people and other peoples as well.

Bob Livingston wrote at personalliberty.com

The 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against the people and Constitution Wednesday when it vacated a permanent injunction barring the enforcement of Section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act that allows for the indefinite detention of U.S. citizens.

District Court Judge Kathryn Forrest had issued the injunction in the case of journalist Chris Hedges who, along with Daniel Ellsberg, Noam Chomsky and other activists and journalists, sued the Barack Obama Administration over NDAA. In its decision, the 2nd Circuit ruled the plaintiffs did not have standing because the law does not apply to U.S. citizens.

However, because the law does not exempt U.S. citizens from detention and uses overly broad terms, that's exactly what it does. The act allows the military to indefinitely detain anyone the government determines has consorted with terrorists or those who committed "belligerent acts" against the United States. Hedges and his group argued that journalists often meet with people who fall into those categories and are, therefore, subject to detention under the law. ["belligerent" has nothing to do with treasonous, -protests are belligerent]

As the NDAA was passed by Congress, signed into law by the President and it was the President who appealed the injunction to the 2nd Circuit and the 2nd Circuit sided with the regime, it seems there is now no recourse to use to protect Americans against the lawless regime now inhabiting the Nation's capital.

Responding to the decision, Hedges wrote:

This is quite distressing. It means there is no recourse now either within the Executive, Legislative or Judicial branches of government to halt the steady assault on our civil liberties and most basic Constitutional rights. It means that the state can use the military, overturning over two centuries of domestic law, to use troops on the streets to seize U.S. citizens, strip them of due process and hold them indefinitely in military detention centers. States that accrue to themselves this kind of power, history has shown, will use it. We will appeal, but the Supreme Court is not required to hear our appeal. It is a black day for those who care about liberty.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

It has become increasingly clear that the government is no longer subject to the People but views us as subject to it. The great and wonderful socialist nanny-state, for supposedly all the right reasons and best intentions will smother liberty with the pillow of oppressive regulation of our lives, for which it only allows exemptions for those with inside influence and loyalty.

To paraphrase a famous quote: "There are people in every age who want to do the right thing and feel that they should have the power to implement their good intentions. They mean to rule well, but they mean to rule. They promise to be good masters but they mean to be masters."

And almost half of the population is okay with that as long as the freebies and benefits keep coming. "More bread & circuses!" is the unspoken message from the Big Government, Big Spending Statists. They present their fiscally treasonous programs as "an investment in the future" when it's more of a guarantee of the ruination of the future since the fiscal hole they're digging is in the bottom of the life-boat that we are all hoping to survive in.

by a.r. nash July 2013
<http://obama--nation.com>