

060225 - Eric Williams Show – Excerpt

Who R U ???

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/whoru>

Saturdays

6 p.m. to 8 p.m., Eastern Time

5 p.m. to 7 p.m., Central Time

4 p.m. to 6 p.m., Mountain Time

3 p.m. to 5 p.m., Pacific Time

02/25/06

<http://mp3.rbnlive.com/Williams06.html>

Listen while you read.

[41min., 34 sec.]

[Eric] We're back on the air with the Who RU show; I'm Eric Williams, your host and I was talking about my federal case and I'll go ahead with that and I say, Richard from Alaska, I'll be with you in just a minute. But when I was in federal court in Los Angeles the US attorney—the case was called, the US attorney started his opening remarks, he said, 'your honor, citizens of the United States have an obligation to blah, blah, blah,' he started listing things. I said, 'I object.' The judge said, 'why are you objecting for, he hasn't said anything, yet?' And I said, 'well, your honor, he said citizens of the United States have an obligation to do all those things and he doesn't have anything in his file to put me in that class.' The judge then said, asking me, 'are you renouncing your citizenship?' And I replied, 'how can I renounce that which I never applied for?' He then asked, 'where were you born?' And I replied, 'at the time that I was born I'd just gone through a terrible ordeal and I was gasping for breath, I didn't know where I was nor even what I was.' He then asked me what my mother told me. And I said, 'your honor, at the time that I was born I did not understand the concept of child-mother relationship so I could not have picked my mother out of a line-up of one. He then asked what did it say on my birth certificate. And I said, 'your honor, the time that I was born I had not prior thereto been explained the importance of a birth certificate and to my knowledge none was created regarding my birth and I deny that any was and he can't prove it,' gesturing toward the prosecutor. The judge then said that he would take it under advisement and that I would be notified and that was thirty-six years ago and I'm still waiting. Subsequent to that I started and operated my own very profitable manufacturing company for 22 years during which time I never filed a personal income tax return nor did I ever file any personal income tax or pay any of it. So what I learned from that; it took quite a while to figure that out because I didn't really know what had happened. I don't know why I did what I did in that federal court. I was guided there by my spirit. I had no plan when I went there; I just acted spontaneously and it came out that way and when I got out of there I was wondering what happened. I thought we were going to be there for several hours going over all this stuff that they had written down in the tax return but we never, ever got to that. And it took me a long time talking with other learned people to figure out what it was. One of those people that I talked to—or not that I personally talked to but.....—was a former US attorney who said that if you are not a citizen of the United States they don't have any jurisdiction over you. That was a turning point in our research when we were given that piece of information. After that I then went back doing my own homework, my own research, clear back to the beginning on July 4, 1776 where I finally realized that the most important thing that happened regarding our individual sovereignty over our individual personal entity was that on July 4, 1776 all political authority that had been established in the thirteen colonies prior to that date then ceased to exist and no one here, George Washington, Alexander Hamilton or anyone else had any authority whatsoever to create a government—now, pay attention to this—to create a government wherein that government that they created would have any authority over anyone who did not freely volunteer to

subject themselves to that government and that was codified in the Thirteenth Amendment in 1866 when the Thirteenth Amendment was written to state involuntary servitude shall not exist. The long and the short of that is that all those who did not volunteer on July 4th, 1776 or thereafter to submit themselves to the government of the United States have no obligation whatsoever to follow any of the rules. And, Richard, after this break, you'll be up next.

{break}

[Eric] We're back on the air with the Who R U Show, this is Eric Williams and, Richard from Alaska, what can we do for you?

[Richard] Good afternoon.

[Eric] Good afternoon, Richard.

[Richard] I was recently drafted into the den of inequity through a little citation and with a very learned friend of mine we put together a significant amount of documents and basically exploded their whole day. But when I went in there, I went in with a transcript or a dialogue or a writing and basically when the judge called my name, I said, 'let the record so show that I am Richard Lee, an American, sovereign man, one of the preamble people living on the land evidenced by the annexed documents in the contract record. Let the record so show that I have accepted the judge's oath of office as a private binding contract between you and me. This is a private binding contract by me to you to uphold my rights under the common law separated from the statutory law.' And he just kind of drove right on forward from there and I had about six or eight of these little paragraphs all put together and every time he asked me a question I just went right into the next one and right into the next one. And on the court notes all he wrote on there was 'defendant led [read?] contract law rights,' that's all he said.

[Eric] And then he dismissed it?

[Richard] It took him about three months to grind back and forth, but I had significant other documents to back up this whole thing, here. I put in the original recorded copy of the Thirteenth Amendment. I put in a document, some sovereignty information; I put in a document that I had deemed somewhere in my gatherings regarding the driver's license. It originally was titled several years ago called the Washington driver's license brief.

[Eric] Richard, there are a lot of ways of dealing with this and what you're describing is one of those ways and it will often work. And because of that if you would like to e-mail me copies of those I will post them on my Who R U website for others to use, if you would care to do that.

[Richard] I would be glad to give you an e-mail of this little essay or this paragraph, here, because...

[Eric] If you would write up—if you would—write up the questions as you recall them that the judge asked you and your responses and I'll post all of that on my Who R U group for people who would be interested in doing that because I have to acknowledge that what I do, I would never file any of those papers. Don't take my statement that I just made as any kind of a castigation of what you did. I don't mean it that way, at all. I'm glad that you did those things because there are those listeners, a lot of them,

who need—I mean, they just have a need to file a bunch of papers, they just can't go in there without having filed something—it's ingrained in them. And so that's fine and it will work.

[Richard] But basically the whole jest of it was status and standing.

[Eric] That's exactly right. But my problem with that is that unless you're very well versed in it and that's one of the reasons why I'm asking you to send the documents just so that people can study them over. They'll be able to download them off the website and they'll be able to print them out and study them over, talk about them and I'm sure everybody who's listening who does this, please pay attention to what I'm saying, right now because you need to be able to stand there on your feet and respond to the questions. And guess what? The judge is not going to give them to you in the same order that they gave them to Richard. They're not going to be phrased the same way; they'll be different words. But the questions will be inherent in them and you've got to be able to pounce on those and respond to them on your feet. And, Richard, hang on; we'll be back after this break.

{break}

[Eric] And we're back after the break, Who R U Show and I am Eric Williams, your host, and, Richard from Alaska, I want to make sure, Richard, that are you a member of my yahoo group?

[Richard] Yes, I am.

[Eric] Ok, good, then you know how to go about sending me all that stuff.

[Richard] Ok, I went in there and I couldn't post anything.

[Eric] So, you can't post anything; e-mail it to me and I'll post it.

[Richard] Ok, where do I find your e-mail address on the group, here, because I didn't find it...

[Eric] Ok, its whoru-owner@yahoogroups.com

[Richard] Ok, I got it—dash owner at yahoo group dot com.

[Eric] yahoo groups there's an 's' on the 'group'.

[Richard] And sent that and that will get to you?

[Eric] That will get to me and I'll post it up there.

[Richard] You got it.

[Eric] Ok, thank you very much, Richard.

[Richard] Thank you.

[Eric] Jeff, from Vermont.

[Jeff] Hi.

[Eric] Hi, Jeff.

[Jeff] Ok, how you doing tonight?

[Eric] Just fine, how are you?

[Jeff] Good. I heard you guys mention a couple of times about oaths and oaths of office and we have a problem in our state. The oath of office according to Chapter 2, Section 9, they're supposed to file in the Secretary of State's office, all the judges, legislators, representatives—there's none there. I mean, they don't file them, they don't care about when we go to court we'll ask. They don't care and it's kind of a joke. We've been at this issue since 1993.... It seems like we're beating a dead horse, here.

[Eric] Jeff.

[Jeff] Yeah.

[Eric] Who is it that is castigating these judges? Now, let me re-phrase that. What is the political status of you guys who are calling upon these judges to produce their oath of office? What is your political status?

[Jeff] It's We the People from the preamble.

[Eric] Have you made it clear to the court that you are not under their jurisdiction?

[Jeff] Yes, we could make it clear but I don't think they care.

[Eric] The reason why I'm approaching it this way is because if the court perceives those who are purporting to call the court on the carpet as citizens of the United States then the court would perceive that you have no standing to ask them anything because you are subject to the jurisdiction of, in every respect of your life and you have no standing to ask a question about anything except 'what do I do next, Master?'

[Jeff] Yeah, but they're not even judges, they haven't taken their oath; they're not....

[Eric] No, no, don't go there. Stay on my point. If they perceive you as not having the political status to ask them then it doesn't make any dif—if that is indeed your political status—if you are a citizen of the United States then you don't have any right to complain or even investigate as to whether or not they have an oath of office because you're nothing but a slave.

[Jeff] I understand that completely. I understand that aspect.

[Eric] So, then, the next thing to do; I would never, ever ask them about their oath of office because I don't care one way of the other whether they have an oath of office or not because they don't have any jurisdiction over me and I'm not a member of their club so it's none of my business or my concern whether or not those who are operating their club are conforming to the rules of their club or not. So I don't care if they have an oath of office or not because if I'm going into their court the first thing I'm going to say is, 'just a minute, we have an issue, here, of jurisdiction; show where I volunteered.' Until they can show where I volunteered it doesn't make any difference if the guy on the bench has an oath of office or not because, no matter, he still has to show that he has jurisdiction over me. In order for me to question him regarding his oath of office I first have to establish to him that I have the political status position to make such an inquiry and once I establish that I do indeed have that political status it becomes a moot issue because I don't care. They no longer have any jurisdiction over me. Once they acknowledge that I am of the posterity of the people of the preamble then it doesn't make any difference if they have an oath of office or not. It's kind of a catch 22 in reverse, if you follow me.

[Jeff] Yeah, I follow you 100% but I kind of believe in honesty in government and I don't believe—if you have no oath you have no office.

[Eric] Well, wait a minute; are you a member of the Elk's club?

[Jeff] No.

[Eric] You're not, ok, I presume you're not. So do you really care what goes on in the Elks club? If the Elks club is dishonest or....does it any way concern you? Why are you sticking your nose in the Elks Club business? If the members of the Elks Club don't clean up their own act then how does it concern you? You see what I'm getting at.

[Jeff] It does in the aspect...holding a representative to be accountable for honest government like you said at the beginning of your show; how can you have an honest government if they don't even have an oath and they haven't pledged themselves to a constitution and they haven't pledged themselves to anything so...

[Eric] But you see I was talking to a different class of people when I was making those remarks. I was talking to citizens of the United States because as you recall I said all of my listeners and I presume that the vast majority of my listeners will classify themselves as citizens of the United States. There will be some who will go to the next step and say, 'no way, Jose, I own myself,' but the vast majority are citizens of the United States and although they don't have any political clout they do have power. Now, understand the difference, again, because they can by numbers, they can go to the office of their

representative or the homes of their representative and they can make the representative's wife, children, siblings, parents miserable in the community even though they're citizens of the United States. And so, therefore, they can put pressure on them to do something to make their sibling who is holding government office do something to clean up their act which would include getting their oath of office. But say that the most important thing that we're dealing with, here now, isn't whether some judge has an oath of office in a local court and don't misunderstand, I'm not saying that that's not important, but here, we're in a situation where our actual national federal sovereignty is being given away and we need to be attacking this at the federal level to stop the federal government from giving away our country and getting us involved in a third world war with China and Russia. So that's a little bit more on the front burner than worrying about judge's oath of office.

[Jeff] I know, but I can't affect that in the aspect of my political status; I only try to do what's good for myself, my family and my community. I got this in me to try to do the right thing.

[Eric] I can't fault you for that, at all, Jeff. That's an honorable position to be taking and you know that. You know you're an honorable man; you don't need me to tell you that but I don't have any problem telling you that and what you've just expressed is what everybody who's listening and everybody who's not listening all ought to be doing. But what I would ask you to do is to kind of reevaluate your priorities a little bit and use that integrity that you have in a way that would go to the problem that is most important for us to resolve at this time which is the existence, the continued existence of our entire federation. That has to be done at the federal level, not at the local level. And the only way we could do that is by putting pressure on our representatives and our senators by going to their homes, going to the homes of their family members, their parents, their brothers, whoever may be their children and say, 'hey, clean up your act; make your family member who has taken on the responsibility of a public servant to keep his oath of office in Washington, D.C. or guess what?' 'He may not have a home to come back to.'

[Jeff] I don't have, personally, the...

[1 hr., 00 min., 34.944 sec..]

{break}

[1 hr., 3 min., 33.088 sec.]

[Eric] We're back on the air with the WhoRU Show, this is Eric Williams, your host, and Chris in California.

[Chris] Hi, great show.

[Eric] Thank you, Chris.

[Chris] A burden of proof is on the court.

[Eric] You got it.

[Chris] The court cannot establish jurisdiction over me unless I let them. The question is, the judge in the kangaroo court decides, 'well, you will answer the question or be found in contempt, off with their heads.'

[Eric] You know what my response to that is?

[Chris] Yes—what?

[Eric] Stick it up your - you-know-where, your honor. Where in the world do you think that you have any jurisdiction over me to threaten me with contempt of court? I have raised, here, an issue of jurisdiction. As soon as I raise that issue you no longer have any jurisdiction over me to order me to do anything whatsoever so stuff it.

[Chris] Unless they can prove the jurisdiction which you can't because you're not going to stupidly admit that you signed your social security card because you can't prove that.

[Eric] You don't have to admit or deny. Any time they start asking you questions they have already acknowledged that they've lost.

[Chris] Are they cognizant of that, because they haven't seen this very much, before?

[Eric] Well, they've seen it more than you might think; they just don't want you to know that they do. What they're trying to do is con you into tripping yourself up.

[Chris] Exactly.

[Eric] It doesn't make any difference what they say; as soon as they start asking me a question my next response is going to be, 'just a minute, I'm sorry, your honor, but just in the fact that you've asked me a question that constitutes an acknowledgement that you don't have jurisdiction over me because jurisdiction isn't something that you need to establish as of this minute. This cop ...or whatever it might have been, this cop gave me a ticket six weeks ago or two weeks ago or whenever and you need to establish jurisdiction over me as of the time the cop gave me the ticket. So where is your proof going back to that day? And additionally, your honor, you are of the judicial branch. If the executive branch, the police officer and the prosecutor—they're both in the executive branch—they are the ones who are claiming that the state has jurisdiction over me or the government has jurisdiction over me—you are supposedly a neutral party although you state receiving a paycheck from the same treasury so I don't know how you can possibly purport to be neutral and whenever you start asking me questions any purported neutrality is totally destroyed because now you are acting on behalf of the executive branch. So you have violated your own separation of powers doctrine and as soon as you start asking me questions you have acknowledged that you don't have jurisdiction. I don't have to answer to any of your questions. You've got to already have the answers to those questions in the file of the District Attorney or the prosecutor. And how is it that you're asking me questions? You're the wrong guy. It should be the prosecutor who's asking me these questions but, obviously, you don't think the prosecutor is competent or you'd allow him to ask the questions instead of you. I would never answer their questions. You're going to hold me in contempt of court? Where's your authority to do that? Besides, understand something, your honor, I want to apologize because I consider myself to be a respectable and a courteous man and I would never, ever say anything to anyone where I would be intentionally offensive and if I've said anything that personally

offended you I sincerely apologize and I want you to understand something, I have no contempt whatsoever for this court. I have a great deal of respect. It takes a man with a lot of character to sit on that bench up there—I didn't say good or bad—a lot of character to sit on that bench up there and do the job that you're doing and I commend you for that. I wouldn't want to have your job. You're going to stand up every day and take money from people who you know can't afford to pay it. So I don't have any contempt for this court, but that doesn't mean that you have any jurisdiction over me. You've got to prove that I volunteered into your jurisdiction which you can't do and for you to claim that I'm being in contempt of you because I am calling you on that issue is absolutely asinine and you know it. That's what I would tell him.

[Chris] That's excellent. Where can I buy your book or where can I find these techniques posted?

[Eric] Well, on my website in the yahoo group I have about 25 or 30 essays up there where I go into some of this stuff and you can download these shows from www.rbnlive.com at no cost if you just go into the archives on the www.rbnlive.com website. You could download these and you can play them back and you can copy them down, what I just said, and you can memorize that and you could reword it a little bit, put in your own words, I don't have any problem with that. Pass it around and talk it up.

[Chris] Very good. Thank you, Eric.

[Eric] You're quite welcome.

[Chris] God bless.

[Eric] Thank you for your call and, Don, from New York.

[Don] Hi, Eric.

[Eric] Hi, Don.

[Don] Hi. I guess you got my e-mail, ok?

[Eric] Which one was that?

[Don] Well, the one where I told you I was going to call in, tonight.

[Eric] Are you the one that had the couple with the wife and husband who were pulled over?

[Don] That's right.

[Eric] Ok, tell us about it.

[Don] Well, my wife and I were traveling in our car which is registered and owned by one of our sons. It has plates on it. But neither my wife nor myself have a driver's license and haven't for quite a few years.

[Eric] Oh, you terrible people.

[Don] Yeah, I know, it's terrible, isn't it? She was behind the wheel and a state trouper saw that she was not wearing her seatbelt and neither was I and he pulled us over and he came up to the window of the car and he said, 'I pulled you over because I...'

[Eric] Don, hold that thought; we'll be right back after the break and you can continue telling your story, thank you.

{break}

[Eric] Ok, we're back on the air with the WhoRU Show; I'm Eric Williams, your host, and we have Don from New York [aka, the Vampire State] who's telling us about an incident where he and his wife were pulled over by one of these hard-nosed New York State troupers and, Don, continue, now, with your story.

[Don] Ok, the trouper came up to the window and my wife rolled it partially down and he said, 'I stopped you because I saw you weren't wearing a seatbelt.' By that time my wife had put on her seatbelt and she said to him, 'can you prove I wasn't wearing a seatbelt?' He didn't know what to say to that so he asked for the driver's license and registration and my wife said, 'I don't have a driver's license because I don't drive, I travel,' and he said, 'you don't have a driver's license, well,' he said, 'I'm going to have to have your car towed and you're going to have to come down town with me.' And I trusted that coming down town didn't mean to have a donut and a coffee. So, he asked me, he said, 'sir, do you have a driver's license?' And I said, 'no, sir, I don't drive.' My wife also said to him, 'I am not in commerce,' she said, 'I am traveling in my private conveyance and I am not in commerce.' So he said, 'just a minute,' and he went back to the car and I don't know what he did but he came back with a pad and pencil and he said, 'may I have your name, please,' and she said, 'I don't have a name.' She said, 'I am who I am and I will gladly cooperate with you and write down who I am, but that's not my name.' So she reached for his pad and pencil and he wouldn't give it up so at that point. He said, 'who owns this car?' And I piped up and said, 'the State,' and he said, 'just a minute,' and he walked back to his car and he was there quite a long time. I trust he was radioing in to headquarters and when he came back he simply said to my wife, 'carry on, ma'am.'

[Eric] Well, congratulations, Don, and congratulations to your wife. It takes a certain amount of confidence in yourself and really you have to be fearless. You have to be fearless.

[Don] Yeah, you do.

[Eric] I don't know if you realize, Don, maybe you do but do you realize what you have in that woman? You have a jewel, there.

[Don] Oh yes, I do.

[Eric] Because that is a wonderful thing to hear that she had the ability to do that and to carry it off the way that you described and to stand up to the notorious New York State police right there alongside the road and to give them back everything that he tried to give her and give it back to him in spades. That's absolutely wonderful and you have my sincere congratulations and everybody that's listening, I'm sure likewise, and very, very proud to have you as a listener of RBN Network and as a member of my group. Thank you very much, Don, and your wife, also.

[Don] Well, thank you very much; we've been studying these things for about ten years, now, and so she knew what to do and she's a pretty brave soul and when she kind of gets her dander up why you don't stop her. So she was very cordial to him and he was cordial to us and...

[Eric] That's very important, Don, that's very important. Courtesy is very important. Never make it personal by an arrogant tone or anything like that; you're absolutely right.

[Don] Yep, she was very cordial and so was he and he just said, 'carry on, ma'am,' and got in his car and turned around and drove off.

[Eric] Very, very good. Thank you very much, Don, for the call and I'm glad that you called in.

[1 hour, 14 min., 43.891 sec.]

From: "ewrbn" <ewrbn@...>

Date: Tue Dec 27, 2005 8:38 pm

Subject: The Fourteenth Amendment - Revisited ewrbn

The Fourteenth Amendment - Revisited

First - forget everything you ever knew about the Fourteenth Amendment - then carefully read the below expose:

Take the Amendment's opening clauses, "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside..."

Now, consider the same clauses with the central, explanatory clause removed, and it then reads: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside..."

Under the rules of English grammar and punctuation, the second clause, "and under the jurisdiction thereof," is an explanatory clause. Explanatory clauses do not add to nor in any way change or alter the meaning of the writing in which they are included; their purpose is to explain. As it is self evident that naturalized persons volunteer into the jurisdiction of the United States as an inherent aspect of their voluntary naturalization, the explanatory clause obviously was not relevant thereto. Therefore the inclusion of this explanatory clause is to clarify that persons born in the United States, in deference to the Thirteenth Amendment, do not become and are not, at the moment of their birth in the United States,

automatically citizens thereof because such newborn persons are incapable of personally volunteering themselves into servitude. I contend that the inclusion of "persons naturalized" was somewhat obfuscatory.

Please note that when the explanatory words ("and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, "), are omitted, the entire impact and meaning changes, or rather (and more correctly), the true meaning become obfuscated. The explanatory clause, ("and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, "), clearly adds a second criteria necessary to establishing citizenship and clearly indicates that there are two distinctly separate criteria both of which must be met in order for persons born in the United States to be classified or designated as citizens thereof.

The words, "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, " clearly provide, recognize and acknowledge that there are persons born in the United States who are not thereby automatically subject to the jurisdiction thereof, and that such persons, by such birth, are not automatically classified or designated to be citizens of the United States.

(I strongly content that this includes all persons born in the United States of parents when the parents themselves are citizens of the United States. That is, no one becomes a citizen of the United States just because the person is born in the United States. "Born in the

United States" and "born under the jurisdiction thereof" are not one and the same as is commonly misunderstood. If the two statements meant the same thing then only one would have been needed. Moreover, the Thirteenth Amendment's prohibition of involuntary servitude prevents anyone from being designated to be a citizen of the United

States based merely on the location of the person's birth in the United States).

In regard to persons born in the United States there are two criteria which must be met and complied with in order for persons born in the United States to be designated as citizens of the United States, and the second of the two preclude such citizenship from

being "automatic" or based on the mere "accident" (or contrivance, as in the case of so called "anchor babies"), of the persons birth in the United States. The two required criteria are (1), that the persons be born in the United States (obvious), and, (2) that the

person born in the United States must also be subject to the jurisdiction thereof (this criteria is universally, incorrectly and erroneously presumed - read on:).

This second criteria is not and cannot be met merely by the location of the persons birth, because, as set forth in the Fourth Article of the Fourteenth Amendment, there is a requirement that citizens of the United States not question the validity of the national debt. This mandated provision clearly constitutes a condition of servitude, therefore, in deference to and in recognition of the prohibition of involuntary servitude of the Thirteenth Amendment, it becomes abundantly clear that a person's birth in the United States, by itself, does NOT and cannot establish U.S. citizenship. Please read on:

An examination of the two subject amendments will expose a diabolical plot; understand that the same legislators who wrote the Fourteenth Amendment had, two years earlier, also written the Thirteenth Amendment, wherein these same legislators prohibited involuntary servitude - I am not aware of any claim by anyone or any court that the Fourteenth Amendment in any way revoked or abolished any of the provisions of the Thirteenth Amendment.

Bearing in mind that the Thirteenth Amendment prohibits involuntary servitude; and while keeping this thought in mind, then consider this wording contained in the Fourth Article of the Fourteenth Amendment, (in reference to citizens of the United States):

"The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned.",

Or, to paraphrase the relevant part, "Citizens of the United States shall not complain about being required to pay the public debt of the United States, authorized by law...".

Or, to cut to the chase, "Citizens of the United States - SHUT UP and PAY UP!!"

As paraphrased (but NOT wrongly interpreted), it becomes abundantly clear and indisputable that this mandate in the Fourth Article of the Fourteenth Amendment constitutes a condition of servitude - that is, U.S. citizenship constitutes a condition of servitude - and, because of the prohibition of involuntary servitude in the Thirteenth

Amendment, US citizenship must be voluntarily entered into and cannot be acquired merely by birth.

So, with the foregoing examination and understanding in mind, it then becomes clear why the citizenship clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment are phrased in the manner they are (implying U.S. citizenship by birth but clearly unable to state such to be the case). If those legislators who created the wording of these two amendments had been honest, they would have written the Fourteenth Amendment somewhat as follows:

"All persons born in the United States, who thereafter, upon attaining the age of reason, then voluntarily elect to place themselves under the jurisdiction thereof, such persons, by such voluntary act, thereby voluntarily become citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside and in so volunteering, such citizens agree to subject themselves to the jurisdiction of the United States in every respect and agree to pay the national debt

thereof, without complaint."

The opening clause of the Fourteenth Amendment provides, "All persons born or naturalized, ". Bear in mind that those who were held in slavery had been kidnapped in their homeland and drug to the United States against their will, in chains, and then forced into slavery for many generations. Such acts as these, perpetrated on these innocent kidnapped Africans, could not in any way be expected to engender an attitude of gratitude and loyalty to the Government of the United States - what would be your attitude if you were among those who were freed at the end of Lincoln's unconstitutional and undeclared war (just in case you thought Bush was the first to ignore the applicable Constitutional provisions)??

Due to the conditions the African slaves had been subjected to preceding their emancipation, the former slaves had every reason to despise the United States. Additionally, naturalization (also included in the citizenship clause of the Fourteenth Amendment), requires a renunciation of the candidates former foreign sovereign and a willingness to take an oath swearing an allegiance to the United States. Naturalization requires a study of and a knowledge of the Constitution. The vast majority of the former slaves were totally illiterate, so, for the most part, none of them were in any way desirable as candidates for naturalization and it would have been ludicrous to expect that any of them would seek naturalization, and I am not aware of even one instance where such occurred. And none of this has even the slightest bearing on the fact that the former slaves were black.

In response to the foregoing there are those who claim that the former slaves gained U.S. citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment because, during the so called reconstruction period, imposed upon the Southern States after the end of Lincoln's illegal war, the former slaves were then under the jurisdiction of the United States and that is what made them U.S. citizens. This claim is spurious at best as the purported applicable clause of the Fourteenth Amendment addressing "those persons subject to the jurisdiction thereof [of the United States]", is specifically limited to and is only applicable to those persons BORN in the United States - and is not applicable those who found themselves under the jurisdiction thereof due to the result of an unconstitutional and illegal war. (All of the adult former slaves had been

born (albeit - as a result of kidnapping), under the jurisdiction of the (southern) state wherein they were born. Some may have even been born in a foreign country where from they were kidnapped).

As to those babies actually born of freed slaves during the so called reconstruction period, such children could still not be classified as citizens of the United States (due to their birth) because of the servitude mandated in the Fourth Article of the Fourteenth Amendment as a specific condition of U.S. citizenship; all this in deference to the prohibition of involuntary servitude of the Thirteenth Amendment. Before such children could become U.S. citizens they would have to wait until they reached the age of reason and then they would have to volunteer themselves into such status. I contend that none ever did so, certainly not knowingly.

I cannot imagine that any sane former slave who fully understood the provisions of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth amendments would freely volunteer into a condition of servitude which is part and parcel of United States citizenship. For that matter, neither can I imagine such would be the freewill choice of any sane white person born in the United States (this disparagement is not in any way applicable to foreign nationals who immigrate to the U.S. and apply for naturalization).

Having unraveled the insidious intent hidden in the Fourteenth Amendment it becomes abundantly clear that the purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment was/is to con persons of all races into volunteering themselves into a condition of servitude under the jurisdiction of the United States

There is widespread belief that the purpose and intent of the Fourteenth Amendment was to provide a citizenship status for the freed slaves and at the time of the promulgation of the Fourteenth Amendment such purpose was even publicly claimed by those who drafted the citizenship clauses - but if such was the case then why is any suggestion or implication thereof totally absent from the said clauses?? Why did the framers thereof not write:

"All persons born in the United States or any territory thereof, or born in any of the several states, being of African extraction, who desire to become citizens hereof, shall be accorded every opportunity to meet and comply with the rules of naturalization on the same basis of any white immigrant, without any restriction due to their former condition of involuntary servitude or slavery, nor shall such applicants be subject to any naturalization quotas."

And, just to make sure that it is clearly understood, there is no such thing as an "anchor baby" (babies born in the United States of illegal alien mothers).

So, if persons born in the United States do not volunteer into U.S. citizen servitude status - what then is their political status??

Well, as for me, I am of the Posterity of the People of the United States. "People of the United States" and "citizen of the United States" are not in any way the same!!! This begs an examination as to what it is that constitutes a republican form of government – and that will be the subject of a future discussion.

I suggest skeptics read Chief Justice John Jay's dicta in *Chisholm vs. Georgia*, the Preamble to the Constitution, and the First and Second amendments, paying particular attention to the use of the words "joint tenants in the sovereignty", "people", "ourselves and our posterity", and, the absence of the word "citizen".

Cheers,

Eric Williams

U.S. Supreme Court

CHISHOLM v. STATE OF GA., 2 U.S. 419 (1793)

2 U.S. 419 (Dall.)

Chisholm, Ex'r.

v.

Georgia

February Term, 1793

<http://laws.findlaw.com/us/2/419.html>

<http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=case&court=us&vol=2&invol=419#471>

http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/printer_friendly.pl?page=us/2/419.html

United States Constitution: Preamble

<http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/constitution/preamble/>

United States Constitution: Amendments

<http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/constitution/amendments.html>