# Native-Born Aliens & the Wong Perversion

The U.S. Supreme Court has handed down many unconstitutional rulings and the legislative and executive branches have unnecessarily accepted them when they are not required to do so under the "separate but equal powers" basis of American federalism. They are not bound by unlawful (unconstitutional) acts of other branches of the government, nor are the Supreme Courts of the States, but sometimes the Supreme Court has made unconstitutional rulings for all the right reasons; -the common good. That is similar to President Jefferson going beyond the Constitution in making the Louisiana Purchase.

The unconstitutional ruling of the Supreme Court in 1898 regarding citizenship, made a change that was very significant since it made citizens of all of the native-born children of un-naturalized immigrants who were until then considered aliens just like their fathers.

The policy of the United States had been since the beginning that aliens give birth to aliens, and Americans give birth to Americans. Aliens did not give birth to Americans and Americans did not give birth to aliens. That was fine and good, and although some States gave their citizenship to the native-born children of their immigrants, the Federal government never employed such a policy or law for alien-born children. A problem with that position of the government arose when immigration surged in the last quarter of the 19th Century because of the large number of their native-born children who were viewed as perhaps foreigners just like their foreign parents and siblings.

The Supreme Court was tasked with deciding whether or not such children were Americans or were foreigners, and their deliberative process as well as the focus of the lawsuit was on the meaning of the citizenship clause of the 14th Amendment, which reads: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State in which they reside."

To arrive at the conclusion that six of the eight Justices intended as the opinion of the court, they had to resort to some pretty egregious and obvious verbal gymnastics regarding the meaning of certain words, chief of which was the word "jurisdiction", followed by "subject to". How one is subject and what one is subject to were the questions that the court failed to answer nor even to ask.

Most words mean one thing and one thing only. Some words mean more than one thing and their meaning has to be extrapolated from how they are used. That is the case with phrases also, including "the United States". That phrase has at least five different meanings, including reference to the union of the States, to the Federal Government alone, the combination of the States and federal government, and etc. While "the United States" is therefore an ambiguous term, if one uses "these united States" then ambiguity is avoided because it is referring to only one meaning.

The word that is ambiguous in the issue of the citizenship of the children of immigrants is the word "jurisdiction" since it has two very different meanings. The 14th Amendment, used both meanings within one paragraph, and thereby gave the dishonest interpreters on the Supreme Court an opening to distort and pervert what the citizenship clause means. I don't say they distorted what it *meant* as written, (past tense) because that meaning was not allowed to be open for consideration. It was decided that the original meaning and intent of those words was off-limits in effect because no mention of the history of the writing and discussion of that clause was permitted.

That way they were free to interpret the word as they might prefer and not as its authors intended. They preferred that "jurisdiction" not mean what it had always meant since a change would give them a basis for interpreting the 14th Amendment as they wished and not as it was written and adopted. The perversion of language they committed was based on applying one meaning to the part of the clause that used the other meaning. It was very cleverly done, using sophistical reasoning which equated the meaning that is connected to territoriality with the meaning connected to authority. Jurisdiction can be in reference to an area of authority or to the authority itself.

A Sheriff or Marshall can exercise his authority within the area of his authority. But one can also say that the Sheriff can exercise his jurisdiction within his lawful jurisdiction, and cannot exercise his jurisdiction outside of his jurisdiction. The first refers to the "what" (authority) while the second refers to the "where". Two different meanings. But the court choose to contort that reality by conflating the two.

Under the first meaning (authority) people either are or are not subject to the government. Criminals, outlaws and insurrectionists are not subject to civil authority, just as, for much of American history, foreigners, Native Americans and Gypsies were not subject to U.S. *political* authority even though they all were **within** the jurisdiction of the government (the second meaning).

What the court did in effect was to rewrite the Constitution by changing the meaning and usage of the word "jurisdiction" to refer to territoriality instead of authority. By that misinterpretation, the 14th Amendment meant: "All persons born or naturalized ***within*** the jurisdiction of the United States are citizen of the United States…"

See what's missing? Subjection. The requirement that one be subject to the authority is missing because the history of what that meant was very clear and it would have prevented them from ruling as they wanted to rule "for the greater good" which would make alien-born native children Americans.

That history was written into law just four years before the writing of the 14th Amendment when Congress passed a statute which declared that foreigners and their native-born children were *Aliens* and therefore not **subject** to the **jurisdictio**n of the United States and its authority to mandate involuntary military conscription for the expanding Civil War.

Citizens were subject; aliens were not, and that included their native-born adult sons. That was an intellectually feeble position of the government since such sons were Americans also and should have borne the burden of defending their nation also, but it was in perfect conformity with Natural Law by which they were what their father was: -a foreigner and thus subject to a foreign power.

The U.S. Government rejected dual citizenship and competing citizen obligations, including military obligations. It's unnatural for two nations to have claim on the military service of single individuals, and yet with dual-citizenship it is unavoidable if it is the result of dual citizenship by blood, by two parents of different nationality. That was once impossible because families only had one nationality, that of the head of the family (the father). But Women's Liberation changed the laws of Western nations regarding women and their children and their nationality.

Let's look at an analogous situation regarding jurisdiction since it reveals the truth of the matter in a stark manner. From the viewpoint of law & logic (and cavemen), all children born within a man's estate or home who are fully and naturally subject to him can be assumed to be his natural children, while those *not* born subject to him can be assumed to be children of visitors, guests or tenants. A perfectly logical observation, but the Supreme Court took that original logic of the 14th Amendment and rewrote it to argue that all children born within the estate to its adult residents, including tenants, were subject to his authority and were thus also his children.

I don't say they ruled that such children were his *natural* children because they absolutely did not issue such a ruling, although the supporters of Barack Obama (and his right to be President) cling to the falsehood and faith that they did. What they actually did was to make such children *adopted* children and thus no longer alien children. The estate owner / father was now their father was well, albeit not their natural father.

The Law of the Estate is that only *natural* sons have the birth right to inherit the position of head of the estate. Thus, adopted children are not in line for consideration, just as native-born children of aliens are not in line to be President because "No person except a natural born citizens…shall be eligible to the office of the President. Art. II, Sec. I

By Adrien Nash Oct. 2013