

Jack Venrick

From: "Jack Venrick" <jacksranch@skynetbb.com>
To: "AJack R. Venrick" <jacksranch@skynetbb.com>
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2008 4:13 PM
Attach: p-18-mFEk4J448M.gif
Subject: Natural Born Citizen.html

Natural Born Citizen

“NATURAL BORN CITIZEN”: DEFINED BY 14TH AMENDMENT FRAMERS AND IN TREATISE RELIED ON BY SCALIA

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 11, 2008 by naturalborncitizen

[UPDATE]: 11:26 AM - Dec. 12 2008 : Rumors of a decision denying Cort's application are unequivocally false. A SCOTUS Spokesperson just told Cort Wrotnowski there has been no decision. She indicated there will be no decision until Monday. The conference is sealed, no clerks are allowed in.]

PREAMBLE

This week has been quite enlightening as to the blatantly obvious fact that our “Fourth Estate” press corps have been transmogrified into propaganda ponies polly wanna crackering whatever may be handed down to them from “*The One Corporation - your source for everything...*” (cue eery theme tune). They don't report the news anymore. No. Now they tell you what they want the news to be. There's a huge difference.

For the record, my law suit was brought to remove *three* candidates from the ballots - *three candidates* who have big Constitutional issues as to their eligibility.

At the time of his birth, Obama was a British/Kenyan citizen by descent of his father. Because I pointed out pesky international laws which governed his citizenship due to the fact that a father has every legal right in the world to have the laws of his nation apply to his son, I have been labeled a conspiracy freakoid of nature.

Never mind that I included demands for Panama John McCain and the Nicaraguan born Roger Calero to also be removed from our ballots. No, they don't want to talk about that do they - because it would blow the “*he's just another Obama hater*” mantra clear out of play.

A citizen (me) raised the Constitutional issue of first impression as to the meaning of “natural born Citizen” in Article 2, Section 1, of the United States Constitution - that ultimate pesky legal document for those who would rather “*be*” the law instead of *following* it.

What are the Fourth Estate propagandists worried about? Thou doth protest too much. Me thinks so. Why? Because the law is against their man - it indicates Barack Obama is not a natural born Citizen of the United States. And most of the media pundits have basically agreed by default. I say this because when yelling and mocking the issue, their main argument is not that the law is on their side (they know it isn't), but rather that *the law shouldn't be discussed at all*.

PRESIDENTIAL PRECEDENT

Other than the fraud perpetrated by Chester Arthur ([see prior stories](#)), every post grandfather clause President of this nation was born in the United States to parents who were US Citizens. In their wisdom, they recognized the danger in having people born under the jurisdiction of another country taking the role of commander in chief.

They did this recognizing that multitudes of loyal men wouldn't be eligible, but they also knew that they couldn't see into the soul of *all* possible candidates, so just to be safe, they put a restriction in the Document which is there to protect us from a sneak attack in the oval office by somebody who might have loyalty to another nation. The framers themselves were good men, loyal to this infant nation, but they recognized that people like them had to be excluded from future Presidential eligibility as an order of protection. McCain and Obama know that.

And in [my stay application](#), I never accused either man of disloyalty. Quite the opposite. Had any of these morose media maniacs actually read the papers I filed with the United States Supreme Court (before election day), this is what they would have found as to Barack Obama:

As regarding the issues surrounding Senator Obama's birth certificate, and if it may please this Honorable Court, I would point out that Senator Obama has not been presented with a genuine legal request from a party with proper standing to command him in any way, and therefore he has no legal responsibility to submit or to bend his integrity. And for that, he certainly deserves respect.

Appellant believes that if Senator Obama is presented with a legal request from a government authority sanctioned to make such request, that Senator Obama will respond accordingly and put this issue behind him forever.

That being said, petitioner regretfully submits that since candidate Obama was born to a Kenyan father, he also is not eligible to the office of President since he is not a "natural born citizen" by the Constitution.

As to John McCain they would have found this:

Senator John McCain is an American patriot who has valiantly suffered more for this country than most of us ever will. He has shown bravery beyond that which the country has any right to ask, and it is with very deep and sincere regret that I respectfully request that this Honorable Court order the Secretaries of the several States to remove John McCain's name from the ballots.

I couldn't have shown the candidates more respect. But both of them should have known that if either were to become President - despite the loyalty they have for this country - the dam would be broken and the waters of foreign influence would be forever capable of drowning our national sovereignty and

placing our military in the hands of enemies from within.

IT'S NOT ABOUT OBAMA OR McCAIN - IT'S ABOUT WHO COMES NEXT. THEY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN THAT AND FALLEN ON THEIR PRESIDENTIAL SWORDS TO PROTECT THIS COUNTRY.

The truly patriotic thing for both to do was pass the baton to another worthy candidate not burdened with eligibility issues. I understand the lure of being President and all the power, glory, responsibility and possibility for enlightening change that entails. But the precedent to be set is fraught with danger. And the candidates knew that.

I suppose they've taken a view that the good they might bring to our Country far outweighs any risk from who may come next. But knowing the slippery slope of history, only hubris could make such a call.

OBAMA'S ADMISSION

Like it or not, rich or poor, great or strong, Democrat or Republican, Obama was born under the jurisdiction of Great Britain via Kenya. There is nothing conspiratorial about saying that. [Obama has it posted on his own web site](#). It's this very definition which I included in Cort's Wrotnowski's brief. [Here's what it says at Obama's web portal, Fight The Smears](#):

*When Barack Obama Jr. was born on Aug. 4, 1961, in Honolulu, Kenya was a British colony, still part of the United Kingdom's dwindling empire. As a Kenyan native, Barack Obama Sr. was a British subject whose citizenship status was governed by The British Nationality Act of 1948. **That same act governed the status of Obama Sr.'s children.*** (Emphasis added.)

There it is. Obama is telling you his status was "governed" by a foreign jurisdiction. This is no theory. This is a fact.

I have always believed Obama was born in Hawaii. I told numerous reporters that there was no way in hell Obama would post a fraudulent birth certificate at his web site. I said that over and over, but they're still lying about my position. Why not tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth? Is the truth now part of a conspiracy?

Instead of recognizing that a legitimate legal nexus exists for Obama's eligibility to be questioned, the great bulk of main stream media outlets have pulled out all the stops to mock, attack, accuse, hate and discredit anybody willing to consider the law.

What have we come to?

The opposing media argument concerns the will of the people in the election and that the Supreme Court shouldn't overturn the intent of 65 million voters. It's an argument that fails - if the candidates were not Constitutionally eligible then the election was a fraud no matter how many voted for Obama.

My law suit was meant to *return* the election to the Constitution. It's the Republican and Democratic parties that *overturned* the election stuffing two ineligible candidates down our throats with no regard whatsoever to the future precedent it would set.

The people are subservient to the Document and if we don't keep it that way, we have plenty of historical examples throughout history detailing exactly what will happen to us if the Document is defeated.

Regardless, should the people demand that Constitutional restrictions in Article 2, Section 1, be removed from the Document, they can lobby their political representatives to introduce an amendment, and if such amendment were to be ratified by three-quarters of either the state legislatures, or of [constitutional conventions](#) specially elected in each of the states, then they can have any President they like.

But as long as Article 2, Section 1, is controlling law, it's those who are trying to attack all review of it who are the conspiracy theorists. All I did was ask the Supreme Court to rule on an issue which has caused multiple law review articles to be written and countless news reports and blogs to be published. It has generally confused legal scholars for over two centuries.

"Ooh, look at that crazy conspiracy nut Donofrio," they squawk. Me so crazy. Well, maybe I am a bit strange (Who the hell isn't?) but not for my understanding of the natural born Citizen issue. And that's the only issue before the Honorable Court.

That being said, let's now take a look at two established and respected legal sources which define the term "natural born Citizen" as a person who is born in the United States to parents both of whom are "citizens".

NATURAL BORN CITIZEN DEFINED THROUGH HISTORY

I could understand rabid attacks if the legal theory I was relying upon had been thoroughly discredited by a Supreme Court decision or by statute, or even by historical texts, but it's quite the opposite. Beside 200 years of Presidential precedent, the great weight of authority supports the argument that Obama is not a natural born Citizen.

I understand the countering argument and I've welcomed debate of both sides of the issue in comments to this blog. But most of the published arguments on the natural born Citizen issue are recently published law review articles which haven't done a very good job of presenting the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

THE FRAMERS OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT

Despite popular belief, the 14th Amendment does not convey the status of "natural born Citizen" in its text. It just conveys the status of "Citizen". And it's very clear that in the pre-amendment Constitution, the Framers made a distinction between a "Citizen" and a "natural born Citizen". The requirement to be a Senator or Representative is "Citizen", but the requirement to be President is "natural born Citizen".

From [the 14th Amendment](#):

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside."

But even as to this conveyance of citizenship, those who were responsible for drafting the 14th

Amendment made it clear that - to them - the meaning of “subject to the jurisdiction thereof” meant subject *only* to the jurisdiction thereof.

Dr. John Fonte, Senior Fellow of The Hudson Institute had this to say about the issue at [a Congressional hearing on dual citizenship from September 29, 2005](#):

The authors in the legislative history, the authors of that language, Senator Lyman Trumbull said, “When we talk about ‘subject to the jurisdiction of the United States,’ it means complete jurisdiction, not owing allegiance to anybody else.” Senator Jacob Howard said that it’s “a full and complete jurisdiction.”

This illustrates that Congress recently discussed the issue, and they can’t claim they were unaware. But we don’t have to take Dr. Fonte’s word for it. The following discussion by the various 14th Amendment Framers took place on the Senate floor. I took it from P.A. Madison’s research at <http://www.14thamendment.us> (use his link for footnotes):

It is clear the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment had no intention of freely giving away American citizenship to just anyone simply because they may have been born on American soil. Again, we are fortunate enough to have on the record the highest authority tell us, Sen. Lyman Trumbull, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee... and the one who inserted the phrase:

[T]he provision is, that ‘all persons born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens.’ That means ‘subject to the complete jurisdiction thereof.’ What do we mean by ‘complete jurisdiction thereof?’ Not owing allegiance to anybody else. That is what it means.

Then Madison quotes Sen. Howard, another Framer, concurring with Trumbull:

Sen. Howard concurs with Trumbull’s construction:

Mr. HOWARD: I concur entirely with the honorable Senator from Illinois [Trumbull], in holding that the word “jurisdiction,” as here employed, ought to be construed so as to imply a full and complete jurisdiction on the part of the United States, whether exercised by Congress, by the executive, or by the judicial department; that is to say, the same jurisdiction in extent and quality as applies to every citizen of the United States now.[3]

Mr. Madison continues with even more proof of what the 14th Amendment Framers meant:

Sen. Johnson, speaking on the Senate floor, offers his comments and understanding of the proposed new amendment to the constitution:

[Now], all this amendment [citizenship clause] provides is, that all persons born in the United States and not subject to some foreign Power—for that, no doubt, is the meaning of the committee who have brought the matter before us—shall be considered as citizens of the United States. That would seem to be not only a wise but a necessary provision. If there are to be citizens of the United States there should be some certain definition of what citizenship is, what has created the character of citizen as between himself and the United States, and the amendment says that citizenship may depend upon birth, and I know of no better way to give rise to citizenship than the

fact of birth within the territory of the United States, born to parents who at the time were subject to the authority of the United States.[4]

No doubt in the Senate as to what the citizenship clause means as further evidenced by Sen. W. Williams:

In one sense, all persons born within the geographical limits of the United States are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States...All persons living within a judicial district may be said, in one sense, to be subject to the jurisdiction of the court in that district, but they are not in every sense subject to the jurisdiction of the court until they are brought, by proper process, within the reach of the power of the court. I understand the words here, 'subject to the jurisdiction of the United States,' to mean fully and completely subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.[5]

Madison saves for last the greatest authority on the issue:

Rep. John Bingham of Ohio, considered the father of the Fourteenth Amendment, confirms the understanding and construction the framers used in regards to birthright and jurisdiction while speaking on civil rights of citizens in the House on March 9, 1866:

[I] find no fault with the introductory clause [S 61 Bill], which is simply declaratory of what is written in the Constitution, that every human being born within the jurisdiction of the United States of parents not owing allegiance to any foreign sovereignty is, in the language of your Constitution itself, a natural born citizen...[6]

It's important to note this statement was issued by Bingham only months before the 14th Amendment was proposed.

In conclusion, I would like to thank reader ["John Boy" for pointing to Justice Scalia's opinion in *District of Columbia Et Al. v. Heller*](#). In that case, Justice Scalia took into consideration a certain historical legal reference:

The common references to those "fit to bear arms" in congressional discussions about the militia are matched by use of the same phrase in the few nonmilitary federal contexts where the concept would be relevant... Other legal sources frequently used "bear arms" in nonmilitary contexts.¹⁰

Now look at "footnote 10":

*E. de Vattel, *The Law of Nations, or, Principles of the Law of Nature* 144 (1792) ("Since custom has allowed persons of rank and gentlemen of the army to bear arms in time of peace, strict care should be taken that none but these should be allowed to wear swords");*

Since Justice Scalia cited to this legal textbook in March of 2008, it's not outrageous to think he might also refer to ["The Laws of Nations"](#) on the natural born Citizen issue?

I'll leave you now with [the relevant textbook definition of natural born citizen](#). The following was published in 1758. This definition, added to all of the above, certainly establishes a rational legal basis to hold that Barack Obama is not a natural born Citizen. And more than that, it puts the burden on those

who deny it to don the tin foil hat of despair and bring forthwith to the table of honest debate their own bed of authority to lie in:

§ 212. Citizens and natives.

The citizens are the members of the civil society; bound to this society by certain duties, and subject to its authority, they equally participate in its advantages. The natives, or natural-born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens. As the society cannot exist and perpetuate itself otherwise than by the children of the citizens, those children naturally follow the condition of their fathers, and succeed to all their rights. The society is supposed to desire this, in consequence of what it owes to its own preservation; and it is presumed, as matter of course, that each citizen, on entering into society, reserves to his children the right of becoming members of it. The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children; and these become true citizens merely by their tacit consent. We shall soon see whether, on their coming to the years of discretion, they may renounce their right, and what they owe to the society in which they were born. I say, that, in order to be of the country, it is necessary that a person be born of a father who is a citizen; for, if he is born there of a foreigner, it will be only the place of his birth, and not his country.

[195 Comments »](#)

[A LITTLE MORE ON CHESTER ARTHUR FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS](#)

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 10, 2008 by naturalborncitizen

Yesterday, after Cort filed [the supplemental brief](#) at the Supreme Court, we dropped by the Library of Congress and took a look at the index of papers for Chester Arthur. ([Please see previous report.](#)) Compared to most of the other Presidents, there's barely anything on Chester. The index is a skinny little pamphlet, thirteen pages long. The introduction to the index begins with a letter from Chester A. Arthur III:

“You may be sure that I am as interested as you are in having the Arthur papers finally come to rest in the Library of Congress. The ones that I have in my possession have traveled a good deal — over to Europe, back to Colorado, California, and now here. During his lifetime, my father would never let anyone see them — not even me. When they finally came into my possession. I was amazed that there were so few...

Charles E. McElroy, the son of Mary Arthur McElroy who was my grandfather's First Lady, tells me that the day before he died, my grandfather caused to be burned three large garbage cans, each at least four feet high, full of papers which I am sure would have thrown much light on history.”

It's quite a dramatic start for a Library of Congress index document. The intrigue continues as follows:

“For many years President Arthur was represented in the Manuscript Division by a single document... Beginning in 1910 and continuing to the present, successive chiefs of the division have done what they could do to assemble surviving Arthur manuscripts. For the first of these chiefs,

Gaillard Hunt, who in that year initiated the search for the main body of Arthur Papers, there was little but discouragement as a result of his inquiries. However, his persistence and what he was able to learn were to encourage his successors.

He wrote first to Col. William G. Rice and learned the address of Mrs. John E. McElroy, Arthur's sister and official hostess during his administration. Mr. Hunt wrote to her and learned from her that Chester A. Arthur, Jr., controlled the papers. After several attempts, Mr. Hunt learned Mr. Arthur's address and wrote to him. The reply — written on March 13, 1915, five years after the search began — provided the first concrete but frustrating evidence:

'I beg you will excuse my tardiness in replying to your letter of November 4th [1914]. The question of my father's papers is a very sore subject with me.

'These papers were supposed to be in certain chests which were stored on their receipt from Washington, in the cellar of 123 Lexington Avenue. After my father's death, they were removed, I believe, by direction of the executors to a store house recommended by Mr. McElroy at Albany. Several years ago on making my residence in Colorado, I sent for these chests of papers and found in them nothing but custom house records of no particular value or importance. Where the papers they were supposed to contain have vanished, is a mystery.' “

The story just keeps getting stranger.

[59 Comments »](#)

[THE WASHINGTON TIMES COVERAGE OF DONOFRIO AND WROTNOWSKI SCOTUS CASES](#)

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 10, 2008 by naturalbornrcitizen

[Tom Ramstack of The Washington Times](#) has made consistent attempts to report accurately on the SCOTUS cases - Donofrio v. NJ Secretary of State and Wrotnowski v. Connecticut Secretary of State. Of all the main stream media coverage, Ramstack's has been the most accurate.

But there are a couple of things I need to clarify about his last two reports from a purely legal standpoint. The issues involved in these cases are not easy to report accurately. Most of the reporters are not lawyers and if not a lawyer they are truly at a disadvantage and must really strive to lock down understanding of each key phrase as whole worlds of meaning change on even tiny discrepancies.

This today on Cort's case:

On the same day the Supreme Court declined to hear one appeal challenging [Barack Obama](#)'s right to become president because of questions about his citizenship, Justice Antonin Scalia distributed another appeal on the same issue for the court to consider.

The new case, Cort Wrotnowski v. Susan Bysiewicz, Connecticut Secretary of State, is scheduled to be discussed by the justices at their Dec. 12 private conference. They plan to decide whether to give

the case a hearing - again on whether the British citizenship of Mr. Obama's father makes the president-elect ineligible to assume the office...

Mr. Donofrio helped Mr. Wrotnowski prepare his Supreme Court appeal.

"Cort's application before [the Supreme Court] incorporates all of the arguments and law in mine, but we improved on the arguments in Cort's quite a bit as we had more time to prepare it," Mr. Donofrio said on his blog.

The report should have stressed that, according to Obama, his birth status as a British citizen was "governed" ([Obama's Fight The Smears' choice of words](#)) by Great Britain in that Obama was a British citizen at the time of his birth, not just his father.

Ramstack also reports:

Eleanor Holmes Norton, the District's nonvoting Democratic delegate to Congress, speculated that the Supreme Court is considering appeals that challenge Mr. Obama's citizenship only long enough to reject them "and lay to rest manufactured doubts about the legitimacy of Obama's election before the inauguration."

That's a rather absurd statement. Frivolous cases aren't graced with any respect at all. If it deserves immediate denial, then they deny it. But on the same day the order came down rejecting my case, Justice Scalia referred [Wrotnowski v. Bysiewicz](#) to the full Court and it was distributed for the Dec. 12 conference.

If the Court wanted to send a message as Norton suggests, they could have denied Cort's case at the same time as mine. Now that would have sent the message she suggests.

For example, when a stay application is renewed to a second Justice, that Justice may deny it straight away rather than referring it to the full Court. Examine the following two SCOTUS dockets where stay applications were denied by the first Justice and then denied by the second Justice upon renewed application:

[No. 07A638](#)

Title: Ate Kays Company, Applicant
 v.
 Pennsylvania Department of General Services, et al.

Docketed:
Lower Ct: Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Eastern District
Case Nos.: (175 EM 2007)

| ~~~Date~~~ | ~~~~~Proceedings and Orders~~~~~ |
|------------|--|
| Feb 1 2008 | Application (07A638) for a stay pending appeal, submitted to Justice Souter. |
| Feb 2 2008 | Application (07A638) denied by Justice Souter. |
| Feb 6 2008 | Application (07A638) refiled and submitted to Justice Scalia. |
| Feb 7 2008 | Application (07A638) denied by Justice Scalia. |

[No. 7A421](#)

Michigan, Applicant

v.

Corey Ramone Frazier

Docketed:

Lower Ct: Supreme Court of Michigan
Case Nos.: (131041)

Nov 20 2007 Application (07A421) for stay pending disposition of the petition for a writ of certiorari, submitted to Justice Stevens.

Nov 20 2007 Application (07A421) denied by Justice Stevens.

Nov 28 2007 Application (07A421) refiled and submitted to Justice Alito.

Nov 28 2007 Application (07A421) denied by Justice Alito.

Now let's take a look at Ramstack's December 9, 2008 report:

Leo C. Donofrio, a New Jersey lawyer who filed the case, argued that Mr. Obama had British citizenship when he was born, thus disqualifying him from being president under the Constitution's requirement of being a "natural-born citizen."

"My case is done," he said. "I'm perfectly comfortable with their decision."

Preventing Mr. Obama from becoming president was less of a consideration for him than ensuring constitutional law is followed, he said.

"I'm not worried about Barack Obama, I'm worried about the precedent of law," Mr. Donofrio said. "This sets a precedent for someone who doesn't have a tie to this country" to become president...

Fair coverage again. But it appears as if I intended to imply that Obama had *no* tie to this country. I didn't mean that. And to Mr. Ramstack's credit, we did discuss this exact quote. I told him people might mis-understand. He was confident otherwise. And I let it go because I felt like I might be bullying him in that I parsed over multiple statements in his original draft of the story when he called me to verify the statements before going to print. I was deeply gratified that he took the time and effort to make sure the story was accurate.

But reading that statement in print has confirmed my fears. It is confusing.

I meant to convey that a person - born to a father who is an alien and who remains an alien not residing here - would probably have a tie to whatever country his father is from. For example, as to Obama, in 1963 his British citizenship transferred to Kenya, and while he may have dropped his dual national status

at the age of 21, the influence of that country and his tie thereto are self evident.

I take personal responsibility for any confusion on this issue. I should have been more vigilant.

This is why it's so difficult for news reports to accurately convey legal issues. Every word is so important. I cannot stress that enough.

[Watch for blog post #2 today regarding an update on the Chester Arthur story.]

[64 Comments »](#)

WROTNOWSKI APPLICATION REFERRED TO FULL COURT BY JUSTICE SCALIA - DISTRIBUTED FOR CONFERENCE ON DEC 12 - SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF TO BE SUBMITTED TOMORROW

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 8, 2008 by naturalborncitizen

PRESS RELEASE: 12.08.08 7:20 pm

Cort Wrotnowski's emergency application for a stay and/or injunction as to the Electoral College meeting on Dec. 15 was today referred to the full Court by the Honorable Associate Justice Antonin Scalia. It has been distributed for Conference of Friday December 12. The official case name is [WROTNOWSKI v. BYSIEWICZ](#), United States Supreme Court Docket No. 08A469.

The Wrotnowski Supreme Court application was prepared by Leo Donofrio, Esq. and is centered on the same issue from Donofrio's case which was discussed by the Supreme Court in its conference of December 5 - *whether Barack Obama is not eligible to the office of President due to the fact that he was a British citizen at the time of his birth.*

Tomorrow, Dec. 9 - Cort Wrotnowski will submit a supplemental brief concerning the newly discovered ineligibility of twenty-first President Chester Arthur due to his having been born as a British subject. This is relevant to the case at hand in that Justice Gray - who wrote the seminal opinion in [United States v. Wong Kim Ark](#) - was appointed by Chester Arthur.

The Wong Kim Ark case involves an important historical opinion that SCOTUS Justices will certainly consider as to the Obama natural born citizen issue.

The recent discovery calls into question the motivations of both Arthur and Gray since Arthur's father was a British subject not naturalized at the time of Chester's birth. In fact, [William Arthur was not naturalized until 1843](#), fourteen years after Chester was born. In the light of historical retrospection, Justice Gray's decision in Wong Kim Ark seems tailor made to the circumstances of Arthur's birth.

Chester Arthur was born in 1829. The 14th Amendment wasn't ratified until 1868, and Wong Kim Ark was decided in 1898. But under United States law in 1829 it's not clear that Arthur would have even

been considered a United States citizen at the time of his birth, let alone a “natural born citizen” eligible to be President. At best, he would have been a dual citizen of Great Britain and the United States.

[It was proved earlier this week](#), by various articles in [the Brooklyn Eagle](#) printed circa 1880, and other authorities, that when Arthur was on the campaign trail as Garfield’s running mate he lied many times about his father’s emigration record, his parents’ life in Canada before coming to the United States, and his father’s age. Chester also burned his papers and falsified his birth year. It appears now that he was doing so to conceal the POTUS eligibility issue.

Every other President (who didn’t become eligible under the Article 2, Section 1 grandfather clause) was born to American citizen parents in the United States. The fact that he was a British subject at birth was first [reported](#) on Friday Dec. 5.

It must now be questioned whether the relationship between Chester Arthur and Justice Gray was influenced by Arthur’s eligibility problems and whether those issues effected Gray’s opinion and vote in Wong Kim Ark.

It must also be considered that the integrity of Justice Gray’s SCOTUS appointment might have been called into question if Chester Arthur’s POTUS ineligibility issues had become known.

All of the above is relevant to the issue of whether Barack Obama is a natural born citizen in that the core Supreme Court opinion in Wong Kim Ark must now be re-evaluated in lieu of the fact that the Justice who wrote the opinion was appointed by Chester Arthur.

Leo Donofrio will accompany Cort Wrotnowski to Washington D.C. tomorrow and both will be available for comment at 11:00 AM on the steps of the Supreme Court. This is not a rally, protest or vigil. If the media would like to discuss this historical brief and the issues discussed above, Donofrio and Wrotnowski will be available to answer any questions thereto.

Leo C. Donofrio, Esq.

Cort Wrotnowski

[212 Comments »](#)

[**DONOFRIO APPLICATION DENIED - WROTNOWSKI APPLICATION STILL PENDING**](#)

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 8, 2008 by naturalborncitizen

[UPDATE 12:23 PM The main stream media should stop saying *SCOTUS refused to hear the case*. It was distributed for conference on Nov. 19. They had the issue before them for for sixteen days. Yes, they didn't take it to the next level of full briefs and oral argument. **But they certainly heard the case and read the issues.** The media is failing to acknowledge that. The case and issues *were* considered. Getting the case to the full Court for such consideration was my goal. I trust the Supreme Court had good reason to deny the application. Despite many attempts to stop their full review, my case was placed on

their desks and into their minds. Please remember that. It's important for history to record that.]

My application was denied. The Honorable Court chose not to state why.

Wrotnowski v. Connecticut Secretary of State is still pending as an emergency application resubmitted to the Honorable Associate Justice Antonin Scalia as of last Tuesday. I worked extensively on that application and it includes a more solid brief and a less treacherous lower Court procedural history.

After six days, it's interesting that Scalia neither denied it nor referred it to the full Court.

My case may have suffered from the NJ Appellate Division Judge having incorrectly characterized my original suit as a "motion for leave to appeal" rather than the "direct appeal" that it actually was. On Nov. 21 I filed official Judicial misconduct charges with the NJ Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct, and I updated SCOTUS about that by a letter which is part of SCOTUS Docket as of Nov. 22. The NJ Appellate Division official case file is fraudulent.

On the chance that SCOTUS was looking at both my case and Cort's case, I must stress that Cort's case does not have the same procedural hang up that mine does. It may be that without a decision on the Judicial misconduct allegation correcting the NJ Appellate Division case file, SCOTUS might have been in the position of not being able to hear my case as it would appear that my case was not before them on the proper procedural grounds.

I did file a direct appeal under the proper NJ Court rules, but the lower Court judge refused to acknowledge that and if his fraudulent docketing was used by SCOTUS they would have a solid procedural basis to throw mine out.

I don't know if it's significant that Cort's case was not denied at the same time as mine. His case argues the same exact theory - that Obama is not a natural born citizen because he was a British citizen at birth.

All eyes should now be closely watching [US Supreme Court Docket No. 08A469, Wrotnowski v. Bysiewicz.](#)

If Cort's application is also denied then the fat lady can sing. Until then, the same exact issue is before SCOTUS as was in my case. Cort's application before SCOTUS incorporates all of the arguments and law in mine, but we improved on the arguments in Cort's quite a bit as we had more time to prepare it.

I was in a rush to get mine to SCOTUS before election day, which I did do on Nov. 3.

Cort's case has a much cleaner lower court procedural history.

I'm not trying to play with people's minds here. SCOTUS has not updated Cort's docket and until they do there can be no closure. I was expecting, if they didn't grant certiorari, that they would deny both cases at the same time so as to provide closure to the underlying issue. I hate to read tea leaves, but Cort's application is still pending. That's all we can really say with any certainty.

[383 Comments »](#)

[HISTORICAL BREAKTHROUGH - PROOF: CHESTER ARTHUR CONCEALED HE WAS A BRITISH SUBJECT AT BIRTH](#)

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 6, 2008 by naturalborncitizen

December 6, 2008 6:36 PM

[I have collaborated on this with my sister and historian [Greg Dehler, author](#) of "Chester Allan Arthur", Published by Nova Science Publishers, Incorporated, 2006 ISBN 1600210791, 9781600210792 192 pages.]

I've been forwarded [the actual naturalization record for William Arthur](#) on microfiche, obtained from the Library of Congress. He was naturalized in New York State and became a United States citizen in August 1843.

Chester Arthur perpetrated a fraud as to his eligibility to be Vice President by spreading various lies about his parents' heritage. President Arthur's father, William Arthur, became a United States citizen in August 1843. But Chester Arthur was born in 1829. Therefore, he was [a British Citizen by descent](#), and a dual citizen at birth, if not his whole life.

He wasn't a "natural born citizen" and he knew it.

We've also uncovered many lies told by Chester Arthur to the press which kept this fact from public view when he ran for Vice President in 1880. Garfield won the election, became President in 1881, and was assassinated by a fanatical Chester Arthur supporter that same year.

How ironic that the allegations started by Arthur Hinman in his pamphlet entitled, "[How A British Subject Became President](#)", have turned out to be true...but not for the reason Hinman suggested.

Hinman alleged that Arthur was born in Ireland or Canada as a British subject. It was bunk. It's been definitively established that Chester Arthur was born in Vermont. But Hinman turns out to be correct anyway since Chester Arthur was a British citizen/subject by virtue of his father not having naturalized as a United States citizen until Chester Arthur was almost 14 years old.

That means Chester Arthur was a British subject at the time of his birth.

We've uncovered news clips exposing a thorough trail of lies, all of which served to obscure Chester Arthur's true history of having been born as a British citizen.

Chester Arthur's lies came during his Vice Presidential campaign in 1880. His fraudulent attempt to obfuscate family history provides context and evidence that in 1880 it was recognized that having been born as a British citizen would make one ineligible to be President or VP. His falsification of family history indicates he was aware of POTUS ineligibility.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Chester Arthur was in politics at the time of the 14th Amendment's ratification. He was a lawyer and a politician while the 14th Amendment was being debated. It was ratified in 1867. In that same year Chester Arthur rose to become chairperson of the Executive Committee of the State Republican Committee. He would have been fully cognizant of the natural born citizen issue and that should he ever run for POTUS or VP, problems could arise.

He would have known that if anybody found out his father naturalized after he was born, he could never be President or Vice President.

CHESTER'S LIES

The definitive biography on Chester Arthur is [“Gentleman Boss” by Thomas Reeves](#). It's an exhaustive reference. Many of the blanks in Chester Arthur's legend were filled in by this book which utilized interviews with family members and authentic documents like the Arthur family Bible. It was a necessary work since old Chester Arthur was a very wily protector of his strange history. [He burned all of his papers](#). (See page 2365.)

“Gentleman Boss” establishes, [on page 4](#), that Chester Arthur's father William was born in Ireland, 1796, and emigrated to Canada in 1818 or 1819. His mother Malvina was born in Vermont and his parents eloped in Canada in 1821. They had their first child, Regina, in Dunham, Canada on March 8, 1822.

By no later than 1824, the Arthur family had moved to Burlington, Vermont. Their second child Jane was born there on March 14, 1824. Chester Arthur was their fifth child, and he was born on October 5, 1829. Reeves established these facts (and the correct date of Chester Arthur's birth) from [the Arthur family Bible](#).

From [“Gentleman Boss”, page 202](#) and [203](#):

“...Hinman was hired, apparently by democrats, to explore rumors that Arthur had been born in a foreign country, was not a natural-born citizen of the United States, and was thus, by the Constitution, ineligible for the vice-presidency. By mid-August, Hinman was claiming that Arthur was born in Ireland and had been brought to the United States by his father when he was fourteen. Arthur denied the charge and said that his mother was a New Englander who had never left her native country — a statement every member of the Arthur family knew was untrue.”

Arthur's mother had lived in Canada with her husband and even had her first child there.

In the [Brooklyn Eagle](#) newspaper, an [article interviewing Chester Arthur about Hinman's](#) accusations was published on August 13, 1880. In that article, [Chester Arthur defended himself as follows](#):

“My father, the late Rev. William Arthur, D.D., was of Scotch blood, and was a native of the North of Ireland. He came to this country when he was eighteen years of age, and resided here several years before he was married.”

This was another blatant lie. His father emigrated from Ireland to Canada at the age of 22 or 23. William Arthur didn't come to the United States until sometime between March 1822 - when his first child was born in Dunham, Canada - and March 1824 - when his second child was born in Burlington,

Vermont. The youngest he could have been when he came to Vermont was 26.

On [August 16, 1880 Chester Arthur told the Brooklyn Eagle newspaper](#) that at the time of his birth, his father was *forty years old*. Another blatant lie. His father would have been only *thirty-three years old* when Chester was born.

In that same article he lied that his father settled in Vermont and reiterated the lie that William came here at the age of eighteen. This age discrepancy was exposed in the August 19, 1880 edition of the Brooklyn Eagle in [an article written by Hinman](#).

It was very convenient for Arthur that Hinman kept the focus on the extraordinary and false claim - that Arthur was born abroad - while the more subtle and true eligibility issue stayed hidden in plain site.

FATEFUL FACTS

I contacted Greg Dehler a few days ago after finding [a reference in his Chester Arthur biography](#) which said William Arthur became a citizen in 1843. I wrote to Greg and asked him about the reference. As fate would have it, Mr. Dehler, after checking his notes, wrote back to me to say that he got it from Thomas Reeves' book, "Gentleman Boss".

I went to the library the next day and devoured the Reeves book. But the reference to William's naturalization was not there. Greg also knew I was interested in the Hinman scandal and pointed me to [the Brooklyn Eagle search engine](#) from the Brooklyn public library.

I began poking around and discovered a few of the lies mentioned above.

Earlier today I was telling my sister that this matter of Chester Arthur having falsified his parents' personal history might lead to a very important revision of history. I suggested we put together an outline of a book as we might be able to prove that Chester Arthur was a fraudulent President and that would be quite a story. My sister thought I was jumping the gun a bit in that we really needed to define when William Arthur was naturalized before we could get excited.

About an hour later I received an email from Greg Dehler. I'll let you read it:

Leo,

Needless to say I was more than a little embarrassed that you could not locate the reference in Reeves. I thought that was odd because my note concerning William Arthur was with the Reeves notes. I conducted a more thorough search and found the source. It was in the Chester A. Arthur Papers (what is left of them at least) at the LOC. I own the microfilm reels and made a copy for you which is attached. The Washington County Clerk in NYS dates it August 31, 1843. How does this affect Chet?

Greg

I almost fell off my chair when I downloaded the [William Arthur naturalization PDF](#) and was staring at the shifting sands of history.

Chester Arthur had something to hide.

He had all of his papers burned which was very odd for a President.

Arthur lied about his mother's time in Canada. He lied about his father's time in Canada. He lied about his father's age plus where and when he got off the boat from Ireland. By obscuring his parents' personal history he curtailed the possibility that anybody might discover he was born many years before his father had naturalized.

When Chester runs for VP, Hinman comes along essentially demanding to see Chester's birth certificate to prove he was born in the United States. This causes a minor scandal easily thwarted by Chester, because Chester was born in Vermont...but at the same time, the fake scandal provides cover for the real scandal.

Is this the twilight zone?

William Arthur was not a naturalized citizen at the time of Chester Arthur's birth, and therefore Chester Arthur was a British subject at birth and not eligible to be Vice President or President.

Chester Arthur lied about his father's emigration to Canada and the time his mother spent there married to William. Some sixty years later, Chester lied about all of this and kept his candidacy on track. Back then it would have been virtually impossible to see through this, especially since Arthur's father had died in 1875 and had been a United States citizen for thirty-two years.

And without knowledge of his father's time in Canada, or the proper timeline of events, potential researchers in 1880 would have been hard pressed to even know where to start.

Reeves proved that Arthur changed his birth year from 1829 to 1830. I don't know if that would have protected recorded information. It's another lie. I just don't know what it means.

Because Chester Arthur covered up his British citizenship, any precedent he might have set that the country has had a President born of an alien father is nullified completely as Chester Arthur was a usurper to the Presidency. He wouldn't have been on the ticket if it was public knowledge. Nobody knew Arthur was a British subject because nobody looked in the right place for the truth.

And it's no precedent to follow.

Leo C. Donofrio COPYRIGHT 2008

[293 Comments »](#)

[DONOFRIO NOT INVOLVED WITH NATIONAL PRESS CLUB EVENT ON DEC. 8, 2008](#)

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 6, 2008 by naturalborncitizen

ALL REPORTS STATING I WILL BE AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB ON MON DECEMBER 8, 2008 ARE FALSE.

I will not be there and am not in any way associated with this event.

Please pass this information out to the blogosphere far and wide. The event has nothing to do with me.

[World Net Daily has their story wrong](#). I am not involved and nobody is representing my case at this event.

[117 Comments »](#)

DOCKET CONFUSION - WND LETTER CAMPAIGN - DEC. 5th RADIO INTERVIEWSs

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 5, 2008 by naturalborncitizen

[UPDATED Radio info at bottom of post. 6:38 AM, 12.6.08]

DOCKET CONFUSION

I must admit that past comments of mine regarding the [docket entries of Nov. 19](#), one for the Justice Thomas referral and one for the distribution for conference, might not signify any affirmative action. I cannot get a straight answer from the Supreme Court despite many attempts. Different press sources have also received various explanations as well.

I've examined other dockets for applications and I cannot say with any degree of certainty what the docket entries mean. I have requested an explanation from the Clerk numerous times and guidance from the Public Information Office. The PIO did try to help, moreso than the Clerk's office, but I am more confused than ever.

Muddying the waters is the [Reporter's Guide to Applications Pending Before the United States Supreme Court](#), specifically page 3.

I am removing from my blog, all references which indicate any knowledge of what the docket entries mean. And let me go on the record to apologize if it turns out that my analysis of the docket was erroneous. I did the best I could with the information I had.

I have not been given any information on the disposition of the application at the conference today. SCOTUS did issue [a miscellaneous order](#) granting certiorari in two other cases today.

The rest of their orders for today should come out on Monday. If I had to read into this, I would say it doesn't look good, but it's just a guess. The Public Information Office said they have no information other than what the Court published today. The full order list will be out on Monday.

I wish I could give better guidance, but I can't.

WORLD NET DAILY LETTER CAMPAIGN

I also want people to know that I appreciate all the letters sent, but I *never* supported a form letter. I was adamant about that and I was hoping people would formulate their own thoughts and not sign a kind of petition. People need to think and express themselves from their own personal heart and mind.

As I reported below, the letter didn't address the issues of my case, and the solicitation for participation in the campaign did unfortunately mix up the birth certificate issue, **something I've really tried to avoid**. I believe Barack Obama was born in Hawaii and that the only people with standing to certify that info are the various Secretaries of State.

But I do appreciate so much that people laid out money to support the Constitutional issues raised. And I know it was important for folks to be heard before the conference today. I just don't like the concept of bulk e mails. It's not like the Justices will read them over and over. Think about it.

I'm not into herding. I'm into individual expression. And I refuse to tell people what to say. I've been consistent about that.

The World Net Daily letter campaign had nothing to do with me and I did not endorse it. But I do appreciate the effort everybody made, including WND. It's just not my style and never will be.

Also, I will not be involved with any press conferences on Monday, Dec 8. If you see my name associated with that anything like that, please know it is not with my permission. If you don't read about something involving me on this blog, assume my name is being used without my permission.

UPCOMING RADIO INTERVIEWS FOR DEC. 5, 2008.

At 9:00 PM EST, I will be on [The Lion's Den](#), Plains Radio Network.

~~At 1:00 AM EST, I will be on [Coast To Coast](#) with George Noory. Their web site hasn't been updated yet, but I haven't emailed the release form back yet, so give it an hour or so.~~

Coast To Coast balked. They offered me "one minute". I passed.

I will be on [All Community Spin](#), Foxtalk1360.com tomorrow at 7:30AM Est-11:00 AM EST with Al Huey.

[153 Comments »](#)

[THE RELEVANT OBAMA ADMISSION](#)

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 5, 2008 by naturalborncitizen

THE RELEVANT OBAMA ADMISSION

At Barack Obama's web site, [the following admission](#):

[‘FactCheck.org Clarifies Barack’s Citizenship](#)



‘When Barack Obama Jr. was born on Aug. 4, 1961, in Honolulu, Kenya was a British colony, still part of the United Kingdom’s dwindling empire. As a Kenyan native, Barack Obama Sr. was a British subject whose citizenship status was governed by The British Nationality Act of 1948. That same act governed the status of Obama Sr.’s children...’ ‘

Read that last line again.

‘That same act governed the status of Obama Sr.’s children...’

That’s an admission that Great Britain “governed the status” of Barack Obama, Jr. Brack Obama has chosen to highlight this on his own volition.

And this leads to the relevant question:

HOW CAN A NATURAL BORN CITIZEN’S STATUS BE “GOVERNED” BY GREAT BRITAIN?

A natural born citizen’s status should only be governed by the United States. This is the core issue before the Supreme Court of the United States.



[216 Comments »](#)

‘PRESIDENT?’ CHESTER ARTHUR et al - WHY THEY AREN’T PRECEDENT FOR OBAMA’S ELIGIBILITY

Posted in [Uncategorized](#) on December 5, 2008 by naturalborncitizen

December 5, 2008 - 5:34 am

This essay will discuss the eligibility of every President who had parents born abroad. As long as the parents had the future President on US soil after they became citizens, then that person is a natural born citizen.

Every President born before the adoption of the Constitution was eligible because of the grandfather clause of Article 2, Section 1 :

*No person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, **at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution**, shall be eligible to the Office of President;*

JAMES BUCHANAN

The first President we must examine then was James Buchanan, 14th President of the United States. He was born on April 23, 1791 in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. He just missed out on the grandfather clause as the Constitution was adopted on September 17, 1787, by the [Constitutional Convention](#) in Philadelphia. Buchanan was also the only President from Pennsylvania and the only President never to marry.

His mother Elizabeth Speer was born in Pennsylvania. His father James Buchanan emigrated to the United States from Ireland in 1783. It was an interesting year for the United States as the Treaty of 1783 was signed between the US and Great Britain. Colonists chose to be United States citizens and by virtue of the Treaty, Great Britain recognized those former subjects as United States citizens.

Before the Constitution, United States citizenship was conferred on citizens by the States. When the Constitution was ratified, each citizen of a state became a citizen of the United States. No formal naturalization was needed.

On June 21, 1788 the Constitution was ratified. The Buchanans were **citizens** of Pennsylvania and therefore James Sr. was a **citizen of the United States**. When James Jr. was born in Pennsylvania he was therefore a natural born citizen, born on United States soil to two US citizen parents.

ANDREW JOHNSON

Johnson, our 17th President, was born in Raleigh, North Carolina on December 29, 1808. Wiki has [this on his father](#):

Jacob Johnson was born circa 1778. Some sources indicate that he was born in Newcastle, England and sailed to America around 1795, but other sources indicate that he was born in Raleigh, North Carolina, and that it was his grandfather (and possible namesake) who sailed to North America from England. Historian Rev. Nash A. Odom writes that “*In the year 1760, Peter Johnson, migrated from Kintyre, Scotland to North Carolina with his large family and settled in Cumberland County. The preaching instinct broke out again and a number of the Johnsons became ministers. One was the father of Jacob Johnson, who moved to Raleigh, North Carolina and was the father of President Andrew Johnson.*” Author Billy Kennedy writes that Jacob’s father, named Andrew, a Presbyterian, came to North Carolina about 1750 from Mounthill, Ireland.

The weight of authority is that Jacob was born in the US. But even if the other sources were correct, he

would have been in the US for 13 years before Andrew was born. The Naturalization act of 1795 called for a five year residence before Naturalization. The Act was modified in 1798 to a 14 year requirement, but then the Naturalization act of 1802 it was put back to five years.

Jacob Johnson also served as [a militia Captain](#) of Muster Division 20 and [was the city constable](#). I can find no allegations that Jacob wasn't a citizen when Andrew was born. (Jacob Johnson died from complications caused by his [heroic saving of a friend's life](#).)

[Andrew Johnson's mother](#) was born in North Carolina in 1782.

So, Andrew Johnson - born in North Carolina to two US citizen parents, hence - natural born citizen.

[Chester Arthur would be next, but I shall save him for last.]

WOODROW WILSON

Born December 28, 1856 - the 28th President, born in Staunton, Virginia.

Wilson's mother was from Carlisle, England. His father was a US citizen from Ohio. Wilson's mother gained US citizenship when she married his father according to a congressional [Act of February 1855](#), which stated,

“any woman who might lawfully be naturalized under existing laws, married, or shall be married to a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed and taken to be a citizen.” [Act of February 10, 1855, 10 Stat. 604, section 2]

This was called derivative citizenship. This act was enacted in 1855. Woodrow Wilson was born in December 1856. He was born in the US, both parents were US citizens - natural born citizen.

HERBERT HOOVER

Hoover was born in Iowa, 1874. He was the 31st President. His father Jesse was from Ohio, a US citizen. His mother Hulda Minthorn was from Ontario, Canada. [They were married in 1870](#). According to the 1855 act, which was in effect until 1922, Hoover's mother became a US citizen automatically when she married Jesse.

So, Hoover was born in the US, both parents were citizens - natural born citizen.

CHESTER ARTHUR ...or the strange lies of our 21st President

And here we have a very interesting story full of intrigue. Arthur became President when one of his supporters shot President Garfield with an exclamation of joy that Arthur would now be President.

More relevant to our discussion is that during his Vice-Presidential campaign, Chester Arthur was accused by an attorney named Arthur Hinman of having been born abroad. But there was absolutely no merit to the charge. Hinman first accused Chester of being born in Ireland, then he switched his claim to Canada. Hinman, a New York lawyer, wrote an accusatory pamphlet under the heading, “How A British Subject Became A President of the United States.”

The definitive biography on Chester Arthur is [“Gentleman Boss” by Thomas Reeves](#). It’s an exhaustive reference chock full of notes. Many of the blanks in Chester Arthur’s legend were filled in by this book which utilized interviews with family members and authentic documents like the Arthur family Bible. It was a necessary work since old Chester Arthur was a very wily protector of his strange history. Also, [Chester Arthur burned all of his papers](#). (See page 2365.)

“Gentleman Boss” establishes, [on page 4](#), that Chester Arthur’s father William was born in Ireland, 1796, and emigrated to Canada in 1818 or 1819. His mother Malvina was born in Vermont and his parents eloped to Canada in 1821. They had their first child, Regina in Dunham, Canada on March 8, 1822.

THE MYSTERY - When was William Arthur naturalized? I don’t know. The only reference historian I know who ventured a date said it was 1843, but that historian also said he got that from “Gentleman Boss” and I could not find such a reference in the book. I spent a few hours with the book today. I examined every reference to William in the index and also went over the early years with a microscope. No reference to the naturalization date.

FACTS

By no later than 1824, the Arthur family had moved to Burlington, Vermont. Their second child Jane was born there on March 14, 1824. Chester Arthur was their fifth child, and he was born on October 5, 1829. Reeves established these facts (and the correct date of Chester Arthur’s birth) from [the Arthur family Bible](#).

It gets interesting here because of the [Naturalization Act of 1802](#). That act set the requisite of five years residence in the United States for those who wanted to become naturalized citizens. Doing the math, we know that William Arthur had moved to Vermont no later than 1824. Chester was born in October 1829. So if William had taken action on being naturalized in his first year, then he very well could have been a US citizen when Arthur was born. William studied law and taught school before he became a preacher in 1827, so he should have been familiar with the process of acquiring citizenship.

CHESTER ARTHUR’S FIRST LIE

From [“Gentleman Boss”, page 5](#)... regarding Chester’s birthday:

“...on October 5, 1829, Malvina Arthur gave birth to her fifth child. (The traditional date 1830 is incorrect. Arthur made himself a year younger, no doubt out of simply vanity, some time between 1870 and 1880...)”

Perhaps it was out of vanity, but perhaps he had a more sinister motive. Reeves establishes Chester changed his date in the decade of his most serious political career, 1770-1780. Chester was also a very skilled New York lawyer. If he had a problem with his father’s naturalization date, then moving back his birthday by a year might have fixed it. We will revisit this later. Suspend judgment for now.

CHESTER ARTHUR’S SECOND LIE

And this is where our villain Hinman returns. But was he a villain to Arthur? Hinman made a big stink in various New York publications alleging that Chester Arthur was born abroad as a British subject, much

like those who are trying to say Obama is not a US citizen. It wasn't true. Chester was born in Vermont. But this scandal had the effect of keeping public attention off of the issue of whether Chester Arthur's father William was a British subject which would have made Chester a British subject "at birth" even though he was born in Vermont.

Does any of this sound familiar?

From "[Gentleman Boss](#)", [page 202](#) and [203](#):

"...Hinman was hired, apparently by democrats, to explore rumors that Arthur had been born in a foreign country, was not a natural-born citizen of the United States, and was thus, by the Constitution, ineligible for the vice-presidency. By mid-August, Hinman was claiming that Arthur was born in Ireland and had been brought to the United States by his father when he was fourteen. Arthur denied the charge and said that his mother was a New Englander who had never left her native country — a statement every member of the Arthur family knew was untrue."

His mother had lived in Canada with her husband and had her first child there. This was a blatant lie.

CHESTER ARTHUR'S THIRD LIE

In the the [Brooklyn Eagle](#) newspaper, an [article interviewing Chester Arthur about Hinman's](#) accusations was published on August 13, 1880. In that article, [Chester Arthur defended himself as follows](#):

"My father, the late Rev. William Arthur, D.D., was of Scotch blood, and was a native of the North of Ireland. He came to this country when he was eighteen years of age, and resided here several years before he was married."

This was another blatant lie. His father emigrated from Ireland to Canada at the age of 22 or 23. William Arthur didn't come to the United States until sometime between March 1822 - when his first child was born in Dunham, Canada - and March 1824 - when his second child was born in Burlington, Vermont. The youngest he could have been when he came to Vermont was 26. So, a third blatant lie.

CONCLUSIONS

I think we've discovered a bit of esoteric history tonight. I've not seen this analysis elsewhere.

It looks like Chester Arthur had something to hide. He burned all of his papers (but the family Bible survived). He moved his age back a year. I think vanity is a poor excuse. Only one year? He lied about his mother's time in Canada. He lied about his father's time in Canada.

By obscuring his parents' past lives and time in Canada, he would have clouded all attempts at researching when his father naturalized. Think about the time period. He ran for Vice-President in 1880. His father, being a law student, and moving his family to the United States, would have probably naturalized as soon as possible. But it might not have been soon enough to make old Chester a natural born citizen.

As discussed above, the time frame between William Arthur's five year residence requirement being met

and the day Chester was born were probably very close.

Then when Chester runs for VP, Hinman comes along basically demanding to see Chester's birth certificate to prove he was born in the United States. This causes a minor scandal easily thwarted by Chester, because Chester was born in Vermont...but at the same time the fake scandal provides cover for the real scandal.

William Arthur was probably not a naturalized citizen at the time of Chester Arthur's birth, and therefore Chester Arthur would have been a British subject at birth and not eligible to be Vice President or President.

Regardless, Chester Arthur lied through his teeth about his father's emigration to Canada and the time his mother spent there married to William. Some sixty years later, Chester lied about all of this and kept his candidacy on track. Back then it would have been impossible to see through this, especially since Arthur's father had died in 1875 as a United States citizen. Had anybody been suspicious, Arthur having changed his age by a year could have protected his eligibility. And without knowledge of his father's time in Canada, researchers in 1880 would have been hard pressed to even know where to start.

Because Chester Arthur lied about his father, any precedent he might have set for Obama is nullified completely as it appears Chester Arthur may have been a usurper to the Presidency. Eventually we will probably unearth William Arthur's naturalization records.

While he did move around alot, he was a resident of Fairfield, Franklin County Vermont, between 1829 when Chester was born, and 1832 when Malvina Almeda was born. This is the most likely time period for his naturalization. The official word from Franklin County was a fast, "We don't have naturalization records for William Arthur."

I have a strong feeling we've uncovered the truth about Chester Arthur. Looks like he was the only ineligible President we've ever had. And he got away with it through his lies. But the light has a way of finding the darkness.

It's no precedent to follow.

Leo C. Donofrio

[99 Comments »](#)

[Next Entries »](#)

•

•

• **Pages**

◦ [About](#)

• **Blogroll**

- [Zapem Mirror](#)

- **comprehensive Radio coverage**

- [Plains Radio Network](#)

- **PRIOR BLOGS**

- [2ND OFFICIAL BLOG](#)
- [ORIGINAL DONOFRIO BLOG - Lower Court Docs](#)

- **SCOTUS PLEADINGS**

- [DONOFRIO V. WELLS, THE SCOTUS STAY APPLICATION DOWNLOAD](#)
- [SCOTUS Supplemental brief for Wrotnowski v. Bisiewicz](#)
- [WROTNOWSKI V. CONNECTICUT SECRETARY OF STATE, SCOTUS STAY APPLICATION](#)

- **Categories**

- [Uncategorized](#) (21)
December 2008

M T W T F S S

[1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#) [5](#) [6](#) 7

[8](#) 9 [10](#) [11](#) 12 13 14

15 16 17 18 19 20 21

22 23 24 25 26 27 28

29 30 31

- **Archives**

- [December 2008](#)

- **Meta**

- [Log in](#)
- [Valid XHTML](#)
- [Valid CSS](#)
- [XFN](#)
- [Atom 1.0](#)
- [Entries RSS](#)
- [Comments RSS](#)
- [WordPress](#)

[Blog at WordPress.com](#). Theme: Black Letterhead by [Ulysses Ronquillo](#).