

Yes, He Can and No, He Can't



By Anna Von Reitz

There is a big flap this morning because President Trump is trying to end the "Anchor Baby" provisions that immigrants and the INS have been abusing, by ending birthright citizenship claims related to "U.S. Citizenship".

Many people have reacted in alarm and thought that this means that he has power to end their birthright claims of nationality and State Citizenship.

The real answer is: yes, he can, and no, he can't.

As President of a corporation, already empowered by over 350 "emergency powers" granted to his Office by the British Territorial United States Congress back in the 1930's and continued by their Successors, Donald J. Trump can do darn near anything in the wide world he wants to do with respect to the day to day operations of that corporation, its subsidiaries, its subcontractors, its employees, its policies, and its statutory "laws".

It was, after all, their policy to allow "Anchor Babies" to provide their families with instant access to our country in the first place, and many would argue an irresponsible policy, too. It is Mr. Trump's job as President to alter corporate policies as necessary to deal with emergencies. The "National Emergency" status as already been declared. He is already in position to move. God bless him. Being born on American soil makes the baby an American, but doesn't (necessarily) make him a "U.S. Citizen".

I have been trying to get exactly this point across for many months.

That said, as President of a foreign corporation, Donald J. Trump has no ability or authorization to tamper with any aspect of American nationality or American State Citizenship. As above, it is entirely possible for a baby born on the soil of California to be a Californian, but there is nothing that makes his Mother or Father a Californian, too. They have already been born on the soil of Honduras or Mexico or wherever else, which establishes their nationality and citizenship obligations, if any.

This idea that they could busload hundreds of women in late pregnancy to the border, offload them like cattle, and then simply wait for them to give birth on American soil and thereby get a free pass for everyone in the family all the way back to the grandparents to become "U.S. citizens" was always crackpot and a means to end run around the Public Law.

It is also a cruelly deceptive means to entrap these people who are seeking freedom in the corporate enslavement racket instead.

Mexicans and Hondurans are not worth as much as slaves in the international slave market, but when they cross our border they magically gain in value astronomically, simply by having the label "U.S. citizen" attached to them. This sets up a situation where both the corporations serving "as" governments can profit by their migration.

All the U.S. Government has to do is provide a cut of the resulting profit to the Honduran or Mexican or other "government" corporation, and they will be happy to send an unending supply of new "U.S. citizens" to our borders. This is profitable for both corporations, because the value of an average "U.S. citizen" is far and away above any welfare costs or benefits the people ever receive, and the "U.S." Inc. can borrow against the value of its "citizenry" in the world slave market, thus providing extra income for the vermin in DC.

That is the dirty reason for all the dirty Democrats supporting mass immigration.

It's also the reason for all the forced immigration of Muslims -- quite apart from the wars in the Middle East -- into Europe.

A German "citizen" is worth a lot more than a Yemen "citizen" and the guilty governments are profiting themselves without regard for the people they are supposed to serve.

I gave a citation yesterday regarding "U.S. citizenship" and got back a response that someone went online and couldn't find it.

First, be aware that if you want to read law you have to go to a Law Library and read the hard copy, and if you want to know what really happened you have to go into the case files. What appears online is often heavily redacted, simplified, and annotated in various ways. Second, it has been profitable to the knaves to hide key citations and they have done so, just as they have burned books and suppressed treaties throughout their history. Third, that's far, far from the only citation giving you the same facts (and more) about the issue of "citizenship".

Here's a few more to cut your teeth on, for all of you who aren't sure that there is a difference between being an American and being a "U.S. citizen":

"We have in our political system a government of the United States and a government of each of the several States. Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of its own..." United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)

"...he was not a citizen of the United States, he was a citizen and voter of the State,..." "One may be a citizen of a State and yet not a citizen of the United States". McDonel v. The State, 90 Ind. 320 (1883)

"That there is a citizenship of the United States and citizenship of a state,..." Tashiro v. Jordan, 201 Cal. 236 (1927)

"A citizen of the United States is a citizen of the federal government ..." Kitchens v. Steele, 112 F.Supp 383

"On the other hand, there is a significant historical fact in all of this. Clearly, one of the purposes of the 13th and 14th Amendments and of the 1866 act and of section 1982 was to give the Negro citizenship. Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co. (1967), 379 F.2d 33, 43.

"The object of the 14th Amendment, as is well known, was to confer upon the colored race the right of citizenship. " United States v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U. S. 649, 692.

"The governments of the United States and of each state of the several states are distinct from one another. The rights of a citizen under one may be quite different from those which he has under the other". Colgate v. Harvey, 296 U.S. 404; 56 S.Ct. 252 (1935)

"There is a difference between privileges and immunities belonging to the citizens of the United States as such, and those belonging to the citizens of each state as such". Ruhstrat v. People, 57 N.E. 41 (1900)

"The rights and privileges, and immunities which the fourteenth constitutional amendment and

Rev. St. section 1979 [U.S. Comp. St. 1901, p. 1262], for its enforcement, were designated to protect, are such as belonging to citizens of the United States as such, and not as citizens of a state". Wadleigh v. Newhall 136 F. 941 (1905)

"...rights of national citizenship as distinct from the fundamental or natural rights inherent in state citizenship". Madden v. Kentucky, 309 U.S. 83: 84 L.Ed. 590 (1940)

---And, always note, that the so-called "Revised Statutes" were never actually enrolled on the Federal Register, that is, never actually "Revised" except for internal corporate use, because those making the revisions never had the power or authority to make them apply generally.

See this article and over 1300 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.